FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: W. R. TOLAR K-8 SCHOOL

District Name: Liberty

Principal: Link Barber

SAC Chair: Beckie Brown

Superintendent: Dr. Sue Summers

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/18/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Assis Principal	Jeff Sewell	BS/Psychology MS/Educational Leadership (5-9)Social Science	6	1	2011-12 B Assistant Principal Reading Mastery: 55% Math Mastery: 45% Science Mastery: 35% Writing: 78%
Principal	Link Barber	BS/Mathematics Education (6-12) MS/Educational Leadership	3	3	2011-12 B Principal Reading Mastery: 55% Math Mastery: 45% Science Mastery: 35% 2010-11 A, 82% of AYP Criteria Met Assistant Principal Reading Mastery: 65% Math Mastery: 60% Science Mastery: 39% Writing Mastery: 59% 2009-10 C, 85% of AYP Criteria Met Assistant Principal Reading Mastery: 64% Math Mastery: 56%

					Science Mastery: 30% Writing Mastery: 82%

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)
District Reading Coach	Lara Deason	M.Ed Leadership BS - Elem. Ed. Reading Endorsement	2	9	2010-2011 - Grade "A" 2009-2010 - Grade "C" 2011-2012 - Grade "B"

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	Observation/Modeling for new teachers with Principal	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell	6/1/12	
2	Partnering new teachers with veteran staff	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell, Jill Davis	6/1/12	
3	Common planning time for collaboration with teacher teams in order to provide support	Link Barber, Bess Revell, Seth Geiger	6/1/12	
4	Referrals from current employees as well as the Panhandle Area Educational Consortium's website	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell	6/30/12	

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
5 teachers	Training, Peer coaching, Beginning teacher program, more frequent classroom observations with feedback.

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
48	6.3%(3)	31.3%(15)	43.8%(21)	18.8%(9)	37.5%(18)	10.4%(5)	18.8%(9)	0.0%(0)	20.8%(10)

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
Jill Davis	Lori Kern	Beginning Teacher	Classroom visits, completion of the beginning teacher program
Jill Davis	Kristy Copeland	Beginning Teacher	Classroom visits, completion of the beginning teacher program
Jill Davis	Carrie Flowers	Beginning Teacher	Classroom visits, completion of the beginning teacher program
Jill Davis	Cassie Hobby	Beginning Teacher	Classroom visits, completion of the beginning teacher program
Jill Davis	Glenda Hance	Beginning Teacher	Classroom visits, completion of the beginning teacher program

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

The services provided by the Liberty County School District under Title I, Part A are integrated and coordinated with other funding sources in the district to ensure that the needs of disadvantaged children and youth are met. Based on the review of student achievement data and identified needs Title I, Part A provides funds to support instructional positions to increase the academic achievement of disadvantaged students. In addition funds are used to supplement instructional materials in the area of reading and math, to purchase supplemental computer based software and instructional materials to differentiate instruction.

Title I, Part A coordinates with Title II to provide on-going inservice and professional development to assist teachers and staff in core academic subject areas. Planning meetings were held to examine the needs of the district based on the needs of disadvantaged children and youth. Areas of deficiencies included; reading, math, science and writing. Professional development activities were planned to address these needs utilizing research based professional development activities. Research based inservice activities supported by Title I, Part A include; professional development in the area of the Florida Continuous Improvement Model, curriculum development/alignment, positive behavior support, monitored independent reading and support for leadership teams to engage in the analysis and disaggregation of school data.

Through the coordinated use of funds from Title I, Part A and the School Improvement Initiative grant (1003a) parent involvement opportunities are provided to support activities identified in the parent involvement plan. These activities include but are not limited to Family Theme Nights, parent information nights and other activities designed to increase parent involvement and student achievement.

Title I, Part A funds are set aside to support teachers to become highly qualified. These funds also provide incentives for teachers who increase their effectiveness by successfully meeting the requirements for the reading endorsement and CAR-PD. This funding source also provides reimbursement for teachers to add subject areas to their teaching certificate which leads to highly qualified status.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

The district coordinates with the PAEC Migrant Liaison to provide migrant services and support to students and to ensure student needs are met.

Title I, Part D

The district allocates funds to provide counseling and transition services for students returning to the district from DJJ facilities.

Title II

Planning meetings were held to identify the needs for professional development based on student achievement data. Areas of deficiencies included; reading, math, science and writing. Title II, Title I, IDEA and other programs coordinate to provide research based professional development activities in the areas of curriculum development/alignment, differentiated instruction, FCIM, monitored independent reading, leadership teams, and other areas as needs are identified.

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Services(clothing, school supplies, social services referrals) are provided for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

The SAI allocation is used to support guidance and data entry positions. Guidance counselors support teachers and student instruction through the coordination of Response to Intervention, assistance with curriculum alignment, data disaggregation, and facilitation of the progress monitoring assessments and printing of reports. The school offers a non-violence and anti-drug program to students that incorporates field trip, community services and counseling.

Violence Prevention Programs

Character Ed programs are in place at the school level. Second Steps is used in K-5.

Nutrition Programs

The district has a wellness plan to address the nutrition needs of all students in the district.

Housing Programs

NA

Head Start

Our district has both Even Start and Head Start Programs. There is collaboration within these programs and our other school programs (many of which have Title I funding). At monthly principal meetings the Title programs are reviewed and the implementation is monitored through these meetings. Principals and district staff use collaboration between the programs in meeting the needs of the students and to close the achievement gap.

Adult Education

NA

Career and Technical Education

8th Grade Career Course and development of ePEPs.
Microsoft Academy classes offering certification in Microsoft cousreware. (7th and 8th grades)

Job Training

NA

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Link Barber, Principal
Jeff Sewell, Asst. Principal
Bess Revell, Elementary Guidance
Seth Geiger, Middle School Guidance
Dr.Celeste Shuler,School Psychologist

Lynn Guthrie, Technology Specialist
General Education Teachers
ESE Teachers

Principal, Assistant Principal, Guidance Counselors and School Psychologist: Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data and provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation; provides and ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation; facilitates data-based decision making activities; ensures that the school-based team is implementing RtI; conducts assessment of RtI skills of school staff; and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities.

Select General Education Teachers:
Provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.

Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teachers:
Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching.

District Reading Coach:
Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk"; assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring. Provides guidance on K-12 reading plan; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning; supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans.

Technology Specialist:
Develops or brokers technology necessary to operate available software programs and manage and display data; provides professional development and technical support to teachers and staff regarding software and hardware; coordinates contact with an assistive technology specialist.

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 RtI Leadership Team collaborates with the School Leadership Team and grade level teams to maintain an active problem-solving process. At the beginning of the school year, each grade level team will meet and review universal screening data to identify at-risk students. Grade level teams will send a representative to the School Leadership Team/RtI Leadership Team meetings to present the grade level universal screening data and number of students identified as “at-risk”. Universal screening data will be reviewed at least three times per school year to identify at-risk students. Each grade level team representative will provide the SLT/RtI Team with monthly updates on progress monitoring data.
Grade level teams will meet biweekly throughout the school year to review student data and interventions. The leadership team representative will be responsible for leading the grade level team meetings. Teachers will be provided with extended time to meet with the team. Each teacher will keep a binder of information that includes data for every at-risk student in their class. The binder will include student identifying data, parent contact documentation, summaries of contacts with resource providers, interventions utilized, progress monitoring plans, and progress monitoring data. Students who fail show exhibit adequate response to interventions will be referred to the RtI Team.
The RtI Leadership Team seeks to facilitate RtI efforts through a variety of methods. In addition to collaborating with other school based teams, the RtI team will engage in program evaluation activities to ensure continual improvement of the RtI process. Other RtI leadership team efforts will include consensus building, increasing infrastructure, monitoring interventions for fidelity, and practicing new processes/skills to ensure continual progress.

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

The RtI Leadership Team takes an active role in the development and implementation of the SIP. The problem-solving process utilized by the RtI team is essential to both problem identification and implementation of effective solution focused interventions necessary for school improvement. The RtI Leadership Team has identified a variety of concerns across all tiers, which include not only the academic needs but the social/emotional needs of students. To address the needs of students at Tolar, the RtI Leadership Team has recommended intervention strategies which include but are not limited to the following: improvement of behavioral interventions across all tiers, increased focus on core instructional fidelity, increased individual

student progress monitoring, and increased assessment guided instruction using individual student progress monitoring data.

MTSS Implementation

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

FCAT and other assessment data are retrievable through Performance Matters, an online data management system. Each teacher has the capability to view student information and disaggregate data by sub-group. Administration can view by grade, teacher, or student.
Ren Learn is used for RTI proposes in our district. Through STAR Reading and Math the students progress is monitored througout the year. Deficiencies are noted and interventions are suggested throught the software.
Think Link is an online progress monitoring tool. Each teacher has the capability to view student results. Results are displayed in a prescriptive format indicating Achievement Level 1, 2, 3, or 4/5. Administration can view data and create school-wide reports. Teachers also have the capability of creating short term assessments.
PMRN is used to manage FAIR reading assessment data. Individual progress monitoring will be conducted using the probes included in the FAIR Toolkit. Teachers are provided with data management programs (i.e. Excel files) and online data management resources (i.e. Chart Dog) to assist with the management of individual student data. An alternative progress monitoring system is Easy CBM, which is available online.
Easy CBM is an online progress monitoring and data management tool. It was designed by researchers at the University of Oregon as an integral part of the Response to Intervention model and began with a grant from the federal Office of Special Education Programs in 2006. From the start, developers have emphasized the goal of the system to help facilitate good instructional decision-making. The Teacher version of Easy CBM includes progress monitoring measures for reading and math. Individual student reports/graphs are available.
Curriculum based software such as Successmaker aslo has data reporting capabilities are available to teachers and administration.
FOCUS is a data management system used for attendance and grades. Teachers and administration have access to this information as well as parents and students.
FOCUS is also used for tracking behavior information and allows for anecdotal data to be added. RTI:B is used for tracking behavioral data. This online product provides report options to determine location, time, person referring, etc. in easily understandable reports.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The Principal and Assistant Principal will participate in RtI professional development activities provided by the District. The district RtI coordinator will facilitate monthly RtI professional development activities for District Leadership.
The district school psychologist and district reading coach will collaborate on professional development efforts. The main purpose of the collaboration will be to facilitate the integration of RtI related concepts with reading specific assessments (i.e. FAIR) and reading instruction. Initial professional development opportunities will be made available to all teachers during pre-planning. Follow-up activities will be ongoing. The school psychologist and reading coach will meet with teachers throughout the school year to assist in putting theory to practice.
Professional developement for the RTI section of Ren Learn will be provided by the School Psychologist and the District Reading Coach.
Professional development for instructional strategies and intervention programs are provided on an ongoing basis throughout the school year. Training specific to RtI related concepts is provided during weekly staff meetings. The district school psychologist, RtI coordinator, and school RtI: B team leader have provided training for teachers and staff. The guidance counselor has taken part in the training for teachers by guiding them through the process in real-time situations. The principal takes every opportunity to relate curriculum, instruction, and assessment or behavior to the RtI process.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The school's Leadership Team incorporates Literacy Leadership. Each grade level has an elected team leader. The LT also includes a representative from ESE and special areas. The media specialist, both guidance counselors, the assistant principal,

and principal are members of the LT.

As a sub-group of the LLT, the school has an Accelerated Reader Committee that includes a representative from each participating grade 1st-8th, the assistant principal, and the librarian.

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

The LT meets weekly to discuss school-wide issues that include literacy activities and strategies. Each team meets weekly to discuss issues that are pertinent to their grade level or area and shares ideas or concerns within the team. It is the team leader's responsibility to inform team members of school-wide issues and take back news and concerns of their team members to the LT. The AR committee meets quarterly to discuss AR specific issues and this is reported to the LT by the media specialist and to the grade level team by the AR committee member.

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

The major initiative this year is to consistently implement Accelerated Reader to provide students an opportunity to practice reading skills in self-selected, real-world literature which will promote vocabulary acquisition.

The district reading coach assembled a district team during the summer to create an Accelerated Reader manual to assist in consistent implementation.

In addition,with the introduction of common core to K-1 this year there is a big K-2 initiative by the district.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
View uploaded file (Uploaded on 9/20/2012)

*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.

Annual articulation meeting is held between preschool and elementary school at the end of each school year. This meeting includes elementary guidance counselor, preschool coordinator, and teachers as needed. Records are exchanged along with information about specific health needs, special programs,and necessary accommodations.

*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.

As stated in the Middle School Achievement and Instruction section (pg. 19 item 6)of the Comprehensive Reading Plan,content area teachers will use strategies learned from CAR-PD and other professional development to build discussions of text and deepen student understanding. Content area teachers will use extended articles from newspapers, magazines and the Internet to model metacognition.
(pg. 19 item 7) All teachers will require additional writing activities within their content areas to increase comprehension.

*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:	80% of students reading at or above proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56% (216) of students are achieving at or above proficent in Reading. A level 3 was achieved by 153 of the students.	to maintain or improve

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of time for teachers to analyze data and plan instructional strategies based on the data	1. Budget for quarterly team meeting days.	Link Barber	Data analysis and resulting plans that impact student acheivement	Common Assessment results, Classworks, Benchmark Assessments, Performance Matters,FCAT
2	Lack of common assessment instruments to monitor progress of students	Develop common assessments	Link Barber, Bess Revell, Seth Geiger	Team discussions of common assessment results	Common Assessment results, team minutes
3	Inconsistent implementation of Accelerated Reader	1. District AR Guide. 2. Classroom Walkthroughs at AR time incorporating "Look Fors" and "Ask Fors"	1. Lara Deason 2. Link Barber	1. Discussion with Dist. Reading Coach 2. Discussions with Dist. personnel 3. Analyzing assessment data and AR data	1. District AR Guide 2. CWT data 3. AR Reports
4	Lack of resources for teacher and student use.	1. Utilize various funds to provide technology hardware, software, and online resources such as RenLearn, United Streaming, Successmaker, etc.	Link Barber, Lynn Guthrie	Review of available reports, solicit input from teachers through team meetings	Program reports, technology survey
5	Professional development for teachers.	Provide time and resources for the professional development of teachers.	Link Barber. Kathy Oropolla	CWTs data denoting successful and consistent implementation of strategies, programs, and resources	CWT data, discussion with teachers
6	Inconsistent implementation of RtI problem solving model and core reading program	Provide assistance to grade level teams from the Dist. RtI coordinator and guidance counselors.	Link Barber, Dr. Celeste Shuler, Bess Revell, Seth Geiger	Determining if 80% of students scoring at or above AL 3 as prescribed in the RtI model. Discussions with RtI coordinator, guidance couselors, team leaders, and teachers.	Common assessment results, Classsworks, Performance Matters, FCAT, LC Benchmark Assessments
	Teacher use of FAIR data and resources	1. Provide professional development to include conceptual knowledge of	Lara Deason	Discussion/feedback from professional development from instructors and	FAIR results

7		testing statistics, comparison of FAIR results with known/trusted results, FAIR resources		teachers 2. CWTs	

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:	80% of all students taking the FAA will pass the reading portion of the assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0 students score at levels 4,5 and 6 in the reading FAA test. (0 out of 9 students)	To obtain the same or lower levels.

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	Procedural concerns with FAA assessment. Time consuming to administer. Number of students needing FAA is on the rise. Lack of familiarity with FAA testing procedures.	Start assessment early in the assessment window to ensure adequate time is allowed. Increase usage of FAA where appropriate. Provide Professional Development to all personnel who will administer FAA. Allocate sufficient number of staff to conduct assessments.	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell	Assessment Schedule Review of IEP to determine appropriate usage of FAA, training records.	Assessment Schedule , IEP , and FAA 2013 results
2	Lack of understanding of how to interpret and utilize FAA data to improve future performance.	Provide Professional Development regarding FAA data analysis.	Link Barber, Lara Deason, Gay Lewis, Erica Nobles, Challie Eikeland	Guided review of interpretation of student performance data.	2013 FAA results
3	Incorporation of high interest informational and literary texts at appropriate reading levels.	Utilize school library and classroom libraries to supply appropriate leveled informational and literary texts for use in the ESE classroom.	Gay Lewis, Challie Eikeland, Link Barber, Media Specialist	Student Reading Logs, Lesson Plans, and Classroom Observations	AR, Star Reading, and Classworks

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:	80% of students reading at or above prociency
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
25% (85)of student scored above proficent (level 4/5) on 2012 FCAT Reading.	35% (135) scoring above proficient (level 4/5) on the 2013 FCAT Reading test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	SEE Anticipated Barriers for students reading at Proficient	SEE strategies for students reading at Proficient	Link Barber, et al.	SEE processes for students reading at Proficient	See Evaluation tools for students reading at Proficient
2	Lack of time for teachers to analyze data and plan instructional strategies based on the data	1. Budget for quarterly team meeting days.	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell	Data analysis and resulting plans that impact student achievement	Common Assessment results, Classworks, Benchmark Assessments,Performance Matters, FCAT

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	80% or higher scoring on the FAA exam.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
78% (7 out of 9) of the students taking the FAA scored at level 7 or higher on the assessment.	To maintain or improve to 80%.

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	Procedural concerns with FAA assessment. Time consuming to administer. Number of students needing FAA is on the rise. Lack of familiarity with FAA testing procedures.	Start assessment early in the assessment window to ensure adequate time is allowed. Increase usage of FAA where appropriate. Provide Professional Development to all personnel who will administer FAA. Allocate sufficient number of staff to conduct assessments.	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell	Assessment Schedule Review of IEP to determine appropriate usage of FAA, training records.	Assessment Schedule , IEP , and FAA 2013 results
2	Lack of understanding of how to interpret and utilize FAA data to improve future performance.	Provide Professional Development regarding FAA data analysis.	Link Barber, Lara Deason, Gay Lewis, Erica Nobles, Challie Eikeland	Guided review of interpretation of student performance data.	2013 FAA results
3	Incorporation of high interest informational and literary texts at appropriate reading levels.	Utilize school library and classroom libraries to supply appropriate leveled informational and literary texts for use in the ESE classroom.	Gay Lewis, Challie Eikeland, Link Barber, Media Specialist	Student Reading Logs, Lesson Plans, and Classroom Observations	AR, Star Reading, and Classworks

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:	100% of students showing learning gains as specified by student data.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
42% (163) of students made Learning Gains in Reading on 2011 FCAT.	Based on state definition of learning gains, 80% (308) of students will show LG in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teacher buy-in to concept that all students will show learning gains.	Faculty discussions	Link Barber	Continual development of school culture	End of year teacher survey
2	SEE barriers for students reading at proficient level	see strategies for students reading at proficient level	Link Barber, et al.	See processes for students reading at proficient level	See evaluation tools for students reading at proficient level.
3	Professional development for teachers.	Provide time and resources for the professional development of teachers.	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell, Kathy Orapollo, Linda Walker, Donna Spyzerka	CWTs data denoting successful and consistent implementation of strategies, programs, and resources	CWT data, discussion with teachers

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:	80% of the students will show learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
78% of the students showed learning gains (7 out of 9).	80% will show learning gains and growth.

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	Procedural concerns with FAA assessment. Time consuming to administer. Number of students needing FAA is on the rise. Lack of familiarity with FAA testing procedures.	Start assessment early in the assessment window to ensure adequate time is allowed. Increase usage of FAA where appropriate. Provide Professional Development to all personnel who will administer FAA. Allocate sufficient number of staff to conduct assessments.	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell	Assessment Schedule Review of IEP to determine appropriate usage of FAA, training records.	Assessment Schedule , IEP , and FAA 2013 results
2	Lack of understanding of how to interpret and utilize FAA data to improve future performance.	Provide Professional Development regarding FAA data analysis.	Link Barber, Lara Deason, Gay Lewis, Erica Nobles, Challie Eikeland	Guided review of interpretation of student performance data.	2013 FAA results
3	Incorporation of high interest informational and literary texts at appropriate reading levels.	Utilize school library and classroom libraries to supply appropriate leveled informational and literary texts for use in the ESE classroom.	Gay Lewis, Challie Eikeland, Link Barber, Media Specialist	Student Reading Logs, Lesson Plans, and Classroom Observations	AR, Star Reading, and Classworks

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.	100% of students will show learning gains which may be

Reading Goal #4:	student specific.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
51/78 or 65% of student in Lowest Quartile made learning gains in Reading on 2011 FCAT.	79% learning gains as defined by the state.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of student background knowledge	Utilize resources such as United Streaming to build backgroung knowledge.	Team Leaders for each team.	Discussions within team meetings.	End of year teacher survey, assessment results (LC Benchmark, FCAT, etc.)
2	Lack of student vocabulary	Vocabulary building strategies	Lara Deason	Increased student vocabulary, teacher use of vocabulary strategies	AR, STAR,assessment results (Classworks, LC Benchmark, FCAT, etc.)
3	Additional targeted instruction	1. Remediation within the school day that includes creative grouping strategies and consistent implementation of RtI problem solving process 2. After school tutoring	1. Link Barber, Bess Revell, Seth Geiger, Dr. Celeste Shuler 2. Gay Lewis (SES),Mandie Fowler(21st CCLC)	Increased proficiency based on assessments as specified in the RtI plans	Assessments (EZ CBM, FAIR probes, common assessments, Classworks, LC Benchmark, FCAT, etc.)
4	Additional Time for Assignments	W.E.B. Class	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell, and Stacey Sanders	Increased time / opportunity to complete assignments not finished due to absences/inadequatime.	Google Doc FOCUS

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal # 5A : To continually reduce the reading gap as described below each year until all students are reading on grade level.					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	58	63	67	71	74	

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:	79% of all sub-groups will score proficient or higher on FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 58% (164) Black: 31% (15) Hispanic: 47% (16)	White: 79% Black: 79% Hispanic: 79%

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	SEE barriers for previous goals	SEE strategies for previous goals	Link Barber, et al.	SEE processes for previous goals	SEE evaluation tools for previous goals

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:	50% of ELL students to score proficient or better on the 2013 FCAT
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
14% (1) scored proficient or better on the 2012 FCAT	50% (7) students will make satisfactory progress in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	SEE Anticipated Barriers for students reading at Proficient	SEE strategies for students reading at Proficient	Link Barber, et al.	SEE processes for students reading at Proficient	See Evaluation tools for students reading at Proficient

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:	79% will be proficient OR there will be a 10% reduction in the number of students not scoring proficient
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
22% (10 students) scored proficient or higher	The 50% will make satisfactory progress in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	SEE previous barriers	SEE previous strategies	Link Barber, et al., C. Eikland,Gay Lewis ESE teachers	SEE previous processes	SEE previous evaluation tools

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:	80% of students will score proficient or higher in reading or a 10% reduction of students within the subgroup not scoring proficient

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
64% (180) of ED students score at or above proficient	ED students not scoring proficient will reduce by a minimum of 10%

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	SEE previous barriers	SEE previous strategies	Link Barber, et al.	SEE previous processes	SEE previous evaluation tools
2	Lack of materials to use at home by economically disadvantaged students	Provide needed materials to students to complete assignments	Classroom teacher	Team meeting discussions	Completed assignments
3	Lack of help at home to complete assignments/homework	1. Differentiated homework policy 2. After school tutoring homework help	1. Link Barber/Leadership Team 2. Mandie Fowler	Discussion about assignment/homework completion in team meetings	Completed assignments

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Accelerated Reader	K-8	Lara Deason, reading teachers	K-5 self contained and reading teachers to include ESE and middle school teachers	as needed	Team meetings, individual meetings, CWT's	Link Barber
PLC concepts	K-8	Link Barber	School-wide	Pre-planning	Team meetings	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell, team leaders.
FAIR concepts and resources	K-8	Lara Deason, Celeste Shuler, Stacey Sanders, teachers	K-5 self contained and reading teachers to include ESE and middle school teachers	as needed	Team meetings, individual teacher meetings	Lara Deason
Data Days	K-8	Link Barber	School-wide	one per semester	Completion on team assignments and tasks	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell
RTI/Classworks	K-8	Celeste Shuler, Link Barber, Jeff Sewell, Gay Lewis, Jana Hill	School-wide	as needed	Team meetings, individual teacher meetings	Bess Revell, Link Barber, Jeff Sewell, Gay Lewis, Jana Hill, Challie Eikeland
Instructional Practices	K-2	Lara Deason	K-2 teachers	pre-planning and as needed throughout the year	Team meetings	Lara Deason
Instructional Workshops	K-8	Gay Lewis, Lara Deason, Kathy Orapolla, Donna Spyzerka, Linda Walker	K-8	as needed	Team meetings	Gay Lewis

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Supplemental Reading Materials to Improve Instruction	Supplemental Materials for Diff. Instruction.	Title I	$3,600.00
Springboard Materials	Pre-AP Curriculum through the College Board	Title I	$2,382.00
Library Books	New books for library. Focus on complex text to improve independent reading materials.	Title I	$2,977.00
			Subtotal: $8,959.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Renaissance Learning (Star Reading, AR, Early Literacy)	Track student reading progress and test student's reading level. In addition, it sets goals for students for independent reading and tracks it for teacher.	Title I	$4,765.04
Classworks	Progress Monitoring in Reading for Students. In addition, the software acts as supplemental instruction and remediation for students.	Title I	$10,000.00
			Subtotal: $14,765.04
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Common Core Reading	Kathy Oropollo - Common Core Instructional Training	Title I	$11,000.00
			Subtotal: $11,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $34,724.04

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 percent of students scoring proficient in listening/speaking will increase to 85% on the 2013 CELLA.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
12/18 or 67% scored proficient in Listening and Speaking	

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	SEE previous barriers	SEE previous strategies	Link Barber, et al., C. Eikland,Gay Lewis ESE	SEE previous processes	SEE previous evaluation tools

			teachers		
2	Lack of student support	Weekly grade level meetings to communicate student concerns to all stakeholders.	Teachers, Leadership team, Link Barber, Jeff Sewell	Review minutes and discuss as needed.	Minutes and test results
3	Funding	Provide literacy rich school wide environment by purchasing informational text to be used in the library in the classrooms (Title VI Funds)	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell, Lara Deason, Gay Lewis, Teachers	Accelerated reader reports. Group meetings Lesson plan review	Accelerated reader. Lesson plans. Test results
4	Consistency	CIS stratgies will be used in content areas to increase course rigor. Consistent implementation of AR program	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell, Teachers, Lara Deason	AR reports classroom walkthroughs	Classroom walkthroughs. AR reports Test results.

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:	50% of students taking the CELLA test will score proficient.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	
7 out of 18 students (39%) scored proficient in reading.	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	SEE previous barriers	SEE previous strategies	Link Barber, et al., Challie Eikland,Gay Lewis ESE teachers	SEE previous processes	SEE previous evaluation tools
2	Lack of student support	Weekly grade level meetings to communicate student concerns to all stakeholders.	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell, Lara Deason, Gay Lewis, Teachers	Revie minutes and discuss	Minutes from meetings Test results
3	Funding	Provide literacy rich school wide environment by purchasing informational text to be used in the library in the classrooms (Title VI Funds	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell, Lara Deason, Gay Lewis, Teachers	Accelerated reader reports. Group meetings Lesson plan review	Student AR logs Test results Lesson plans
4	Consistency	CIS strategies will be used in classrooms to increase course rigor. Consistent implementation of accelerated reader program.	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell, Lara Deason, Gay Lewis, Teachers	Classroom walkthroughs AR reports	Classroom walkthroughs AR logs Test results

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

CELLA Goal #3:	50% of the students taking the CELLLA test will score proficient in writing

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

8/18 students (44%) scored proficient in Writing

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	See previous barriers	See previous stratgies	Link Barber, et al., C. Eikland,Gay Lewis ESE teachers	SEE previous processes	SEE previous evaluation tools
2	Lack of student support	Weekly grade level meetings to discuss student concerns to all stakeholders	Teachers, Leadership team, Link Barber, Jeff Sewell	Group meetings Lesson plan review	Minutes from meetings Test results
3	Funding	Provide literacy rich school wide environment by purchasing informational text on a complex level. Purchase informational text through Title VI funds	Teachers, Leadership team, Link Barber, Jeff Sewell	Accelerated reader reports. Group meetings Lesson plan review	Student AR logs Lesson plans Test results
4	Consistency	CIS strategies will be used in content areas to increase course rigor. Consistent implementation of AR in all classrooms	Teachers, Leadership team, Link Barber, Jeff Sewell	Accelerated reader reports. Group meetings Lesson plan review	Classroom walkthroughs. AR logs Test results

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:	80% of students will score proficient or higher on FCAT
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
26% (53)of the students scored at (level 3)	50% of students will score proficient or AL 3

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Math series (3rd Yr)will require time and training for successful implementation	Provide professional development for series	Link Barber	Successful implementation of new math series	Common assessment results, results on Classworks, LC Benchmark Assessments, FCAT, Performance Matters
2	Lack of understanding on use of online resources available for new math series	Provide professional development specifically for technology component of new math series. Two embedded days with Linda Walker	Link Barber, Gay Lewis	Utilization of online resources by teachers, students, and parents	Reports, end of year surveys (teacher, student, parent), Assessment results (common, series specific, Classworks, LC Benchmark assessments, FCAT), Performance Matters
3	Lack of time for teachers to analyze data and plan instructional strategies based on the data	Budget for team meeting days.	Link Barber	Data analysis and resulting plans that impact student acheivement	Common Assessment results, Classworks, LC Benchmark Assessments, FCAT , Performance Matters
4	Lack of common assessment instruments to monitor progress of students	Develop common assessments	Link Barber, Bess Revell, Seth Geiger	Team discussions of common assessment results	Common Assessment results, team minutes
5	Lack of resources for teacher and student use.	Utilize various funds to provide technology, classroom materials, manipulatives, hardware, software, and online resources such as Study Island, United Streaming, Classworks, Performance Matters, etc. 2 embedded days with Linda Walker	Link Barber, Lynn Guthrie, Gay Lewis	Review of available reports, solicit input from teachers through team meetings	Program reports, technology survey
	Inconsistent	Provide assistance to	Link Barber,	Determining if 80% of	Common

6	implementation of RtI problem solving model and core math program	grade level teams from the Dist. RtI coordinator and guidance counselors.	Dr. Celeste Shuler, Bess Revell, Seth Geiger	students scoring at or above AL 3 as prescribed in the RtI model. Discussions with RtI coordinator, guidance couselors, team leaders, and teachers.	assessment results,Classworks, FCAT, LC Benchmark Assessments, Performance Matters
7	Inclusion of higher order thinking skills and problem solving activities during instruction	1. Note expectation of the inclusion of HOTS problems. 2. Professional development for teachers regarding teaching methods for the inclusion of HOTS and problem solving in instruction	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell	CWTs to include "Look Fors" and "Ask Fors", team discussions,	CWT data, assessment results
8	New teachers in math positions	Provide professional development, monthly math meetings, make resources readily avaliable.	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell	Classworks, Performance Matters	Classworks, Performance Matters

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:	Our goal is that 80% of our students taking the FAA will score a 4 or higher.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
22% 2 out of 9 scored level 4,5,or 6	Goal of 30% of students will score a level 4,5, or 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	Procedural concerns with FAA assessment. Time consuming to administer. Number of students needing FAA is on the rise. Lack of familiarity with FAA testing procedures.	Start assessment early in the assessment window to ensure adequate time is allowed. Increase usage of FAA where appropriate. Provide Professional Development to all personnel who will administer FAA. Allocate sufficient number of staff to conduct assessments.	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell	Assessment Schedule Review of IEP to determine appropriate usage of FAA, training records.	Assessment Schedule , IEP , and FAA 2013 results
2	Lack of understanding of how to interpret and utilize FAA data to improve future performance.	Provide Professional Development regarding FAA data analysis.	Link Barber, Lara Deason, Gay Lewis, Erica Nobles, Challie Eikeland	Guided review of interpretation of student performance data.	2013 FAA results
3	Implementation of new software that was designed and purchased to increase student achievement.	Professional Development on Classworks Math to ensure successful implementation.	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell, Lynn Guthrie, and Classroom teachers	Periodic review of reports provided by the software.	Progress Monitoring through Classworks program.

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.	80% of students will score at or above proficient on the

Mathematics Goal #2a:	FCAT
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
14%(29) students scored AL 4 or 5 on 2012 FCAT Math.	25% of students will score AL 4 or 5

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	SEE barriers for students scoring proficient	SEE strategies for students scoring proficient	Link Barber, et al.	SEE processes for students scoring proficient	SEE evaluation tools for students scoring proficient

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:	Our goal is that 50% of our students will score a 7 or higher.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
44% 4 out of 9 scored a level 7 or higher	50% of students taking the FAA will score a 7 or higher

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	Procedural concerns with FAA assessment. Time consuming to administer. Number of students needing FAA is on the rise. Lack of familiarity with FAA testing procedures.	Start assessment early in the assessment window to ensure adequate time is allowed. Increase usage of FAA where appropriate. Provide Professional Development to all personnel who will administer FAA. Allocate sufficient number of staff to conduct assessments.	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell	Assessment Schedule Review of IEP to determine appropriate usage of FAA, training records.	Assessment Schedule , IEP , and FAA 2013 results
2	Lack of understanding of how to interpret and utilize FAA data to improve future performance.	Provide Professional Development regarding FAA data analysis.	Link Barber, Lara Deason, Gay Lewis, Erica Nobles, Challie Eikeland	Guided review of interpretation of student performance data.	2013 FAA results
3	Implementation of new software that was designed and purchased to increase student achievement.	Professional Development on Classworks Math to ensure successful implementation.	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell, Lynn Guthrie, and Classroom teachers	Periodic review of reports provided by the software.	Progress Monitoring through Classworks program.

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.	80% of students will make learning gains as defined by the

Mathematics Goal #3a:	state or as defined specific for student
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (63) of students made Learning Gains in Math on the 2011 FCAT.	60% of students will make learning gains as defined by the state

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	SEE previous barriers	SEE previous strategies	Link Barber, et al.	SEE previous processes	SEE previous evaluation tools

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:	70% of students talking the FAA will show learning gains
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
44% 4 out of 9 showed learning gains	70% will show learning gains on the FAA

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	Procedural concerns with FAA assessment. Time consuming to administer. Number of students needing FAA is on the rise. Lack of familiarity with FAA testing procedures.	Start assessment early in the assessment window to ensure adequate time is allowed. Increase usage of FAA where appropriate. Provide Professional Development to all personnel who will administer FAA. Allocate sufficient number of staff to conduct assessments.	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell	Assessment Schedule Review of IEP to determine appropriate usage of FAA, training records.	Assessment Schedule , IEP , and FAA 2013 results
2	Lack of understanding of how to interpret and utilize FAA data to improve future performance.	Provide Professional Development regarding FAA data analysis.	Link Barber, Lara Deason, Gay Lewis, Erica Nobles, Challie Eikeland	Guided review of interpretation of student performance data.	2013 FAA results
3	Implementation of new software that was designed and purchased to increase student achievement.	Professional Development on Classworks Math to ensure successful implementation.	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell, Lynn Guthrie, and Classroom teachers	Periodic review of reports provided by the software.	Progress Monitoring through Classworks program.

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:	80% of students will show learning gains which may be student specific.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
21% of the students in Lowest Quartile made learning gains on the 2012 Math section of FCAT.	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	See previous barrier	See previous strategies	Link Barber, et al.	See previous process	See previous evaluation tools

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

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goal #

5A : To continiously reduce the achievement gap in mathematics continously until is is reduced by 50%

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	50	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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	The AYP target is 80% of students will score at or above proficient on FCAT
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 54% (144)of students scored at or above proficient. Black: 8% (26) Hispanic: 6% (25)	80% for all subgroups

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	SEE previous barriers	SEE previous strategies	Link Barber, et al.	SEE previous processes	SEE previous evaluation tools

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:	50% will score proficient on FCAT Math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

14% (1)scored proficent in mathematics	50% will score proficient in mathematics

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	See Previous Barriers	See Previous Strategies	Link Barber, et al.	See Previous Process	See Previous Evaluation Tools

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:	79% will be proficient or there will be a 10% reduction in the number of students not scoring proficient
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
8% (22) scored proficient on FCAT Math	50% (23)

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	See Previous Barrier	See Previous Strategies	Link Barber, et al.	See previous process	See previous evaluation tools.

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:	The 2011 AYP target is 80% of students scoring at or above proficient.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
62% (174) of students scored at or above proficient	80% (225)of students will score at or above proficient or the number of students not scoring proficient will reduce by 10%

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	SEE previous barriers	SEE previous strategies	Link Barber, et al.	SEE previous processes	SEE previous evaluation tools
2	Lack of materials to use at home by economically disadvantaged students	Provide needed materials to students to complete assignments	Classroom teacher	Team meeting discussions	Completed assignments
3	Lack of help at home to complete assignments/homework	1. Differentiated homework policy 2. After school tutoring homework help	1. Link Barber/Leadership Team 2. Mandie Fowler 3. Seth Geiger	Discussion about assignment/homework completion in team meetings	Completed assignments

Middle 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:	80% will be proficient on the FCAT Mathematics test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
38% (60)scored a level 3 of FCAT Math.	45% of the students will score a level 3 or higher in mathematics

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	Math Series (3nd Year) will require time and training for successful implementation	Provide professional development for series. Meet yearly with Linda Walker to work on curriculum mapping	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell, Gay Lewis, Math teachers	Successful implemenation of the math series. Classworks baseline,mid-year, and end of year assessments	Common assessments, results on Classworks, FCAT testing, other district assessments
2	Lack of understanding of use of online resources for the math series	Provide professional development specifically for technology component of new series. Provide instruction in Classworks computer software.	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell, Gay Lewis, Math teachers, Classworks (techs)	Utilization of online resources by teachers, students and parents	Reports, end of year surveys, Assessments results from FCAT, Classworks, LC Benchmark tests
3	Lack of time for teachers to analyze data and plan instructional strategies based on data	Budget for team meetings day. Budget for Linda Walker to return and provide input to math teachers	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell, Gay Lewis, Math teachers, Classworks (techs)	Data analysis and resulting plans that impact student achievement	Common Assessment results, Classworks, LC Benchmart testing, FCAT Assessments
4	Lack of common assessment instruments to monitor progress of students	Develop common assessments (classworks, LC Benchmarks test, software from books	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell, Gay Lewis, Math teachers, Classworks (techs)	Team discussion on common assessments	Team minutes, Common assessments results.
5	Lack of resources for teacher and student use.	Utilize various funds to provide technology, classroom materials, manipulatives, hardware, software, and online resources such as United Streaming, Classworks, Performance Matters	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell, Gay Lewis, Math teachers, Classworks (techs)	Review of avaliable reports, solicit input from teachers through team meetings	Program reports, technology surveys
6	Facilitating higher order thinking skills and ability to solve complex problems	Utilize higher order thinking questions in daily math lessons requiring students to solve complex problems. Ability group students in order to provide differentated instruction	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell, Math teachers,	Classroom walkthroughs and performance on class tests	Classworks, Classroom walkthrough, FCAT assessments/results

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	70% of the students taking the FAA will score a 4 or higher on the 2012-2013 test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71% (5 out of 7) of the students taking the FAA in grades 6th, 7th and 8th scored a 4 or better on the test	Maintain that percentage or higher on the FAA assessment during the 2012-2013 school year.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Procedural concerns with FAA assessment. Time consuming to administer. Number of students needing FAA is on the rise. Lack of familiarity with FAA testing procedures.	Start assessment early in the assessment window to ensure adequate time is allowed. Increase usage of FAA where appropriate. Provide Professional Development to all personnel who will administer FAA. Allocate sufficient number of staff to conduct assessments.	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell	Assessment Schedule Review of IEP to determine appropriate usage of FAA, training records.	Assessment Schedule , IEP , and FAA 2013 results
2	Lack of understanding of how to interpret and utilize FAA data to improve future performance.	Provide Professional Development regarding FAA data analysis.	Link Barber, Lara Deason, Gay Lewis, Erica Nobles, Challie Eikeland	Guided review of interpretation of student performance data.	2013 FAA results
3	Implementation of new software that was designed and purchased to increase student achievement.	Professional Development on Classworks Math to ensure successful implementation.	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell, Lynn Guthrie, and Classroom teachers	Periodic review of reports provided by the software.	Progress Monitoring through Classworks program.

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:	25% of the students taking the 2012-2013 FCAT will score a level 4 or higher.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
12% (20)scored a level 4 or 5 on FCAT Math.	25% of the students taking the 2012-2013 FCAT will score a level 4 or higher.

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	See previous Anticipated Barriers from 1.A	See previous Strategies from 1.A	See previous responsible personnel from 1.A	See Previous Processes from 1.A	See Previous Evaluation Tools from 1.A

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	50% or higher of the students taking the FAA will score at a level 7 or higher.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
4 out of 7 students (57%) scored a level 7 or higher on the FAA test.	Our goal is to maintain that number (57%) of students scoring a level 7 or higher on the FAA assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Procedural concerns with FAA assessment. Time consuming to administer. Number of students needing FAA is on the rise. Lack of familiarity with FAA testing procedures.	Start assessment early in the assessment window to ensure adequate time is allowed. Increase usage of FAA where appropriate. Provide Professional Development to all personnel who will administer FAA. Allocate sufficient number of staff to conduct assessments.	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell	Assessment Schedule Review of IEP to determine appropriate usage of FAA, training records.	Assessment Schedule , IEP , and FAA 2013 results
2	Lack of understanding of how to interpret and utilize FAA data to improve future performance.	Provide Professional Development regarding FAA data analysis.	Link Barber, Lara Deason, Gay Lewis, Erica Nobles, Challie Eikeland	Guided review of interpretation of student performance data.	2013 FAA results
3	Implementation of new software that was designed and purchased to increase student achievement.	Professional Development on Classworks Math to ensure successful implementation.	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell, Lynn Guthrie, and Classroom teachers	Periodic review of reports provided by the software.	Progress Monitoring through Classworks program.

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:	80% of the students taking the 2012-2013 FCAT will show significant learning gains in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
63% (106)of MS Math students made learning gains on 2011-2012 FCAT Math.	We expect that 70% (or higher) of the students taking the 2012-2013 FCAT will show learning gains in mathematics.

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	See previous barriers from 1.A	See previous Strategies from 1.A	See previous responsible persons from 1.A	See previous process from 1.A	See Previous evaluation tools from 1.A

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	75% of the students taking the FAA test will show learning gains in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
4 out of 9 students (44%) of the students taking the FAA showed learning gains in mathematics	Our goal is that 50%, or higher, of the students taking the FAA will show learning gains on the FAA test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Procedural concerns with FAA assessment. Time consuming to administer. Number of students needing FAA is on the rise. Lack of familiarity with FAA testing procedures.	Start assessment early in the assessment window to ensure adequate time is allowed. Increase usage of FAA where appropriate. Provide Professional Development to all personnel who will administer FAA. Allocate sufficient number of staff to conduct assessments.	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell	Assessment Schedule Review of IEP to determine appropriate usage of FAA, training records.	Assessment Schedule , IEP , and FAA 2013 results
2	Lack of understanding of how to interpret and utilize FAA data to improve future performance.	Provide Professional Development regarding FAA data analysis.	Link Barber, Lara Deason, Gay Lewis, Erica Nobles, Challie Eikeland	Guided review of interpretation of student performance data.	2013 FAA results
3	Implementation of new software that was designed and purchased to increase student achievement.	Professional Development on Classworks Math to ensure successful implementation.	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell, Lynn Guthrie, and Classroom teachers	Periodic review of reports provided by the software.	Progress Monitoring through Classworks program.

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:	50% of the students in the lowest 25% of the students will make learning gains in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
24% (7) of the lowest quartile made learning gains on FCAT Math.	50% of the student scoring in the bottom quartile will make learning gains on the FCAT Mathematics Test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	See previous Barrier	See previous strategies	Link Barber, et al	See previous process	See previous evaluation tools

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

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

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	The AYP target is 80% of students will score at or above proficient on the FCAT
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 54% (144) scored proficient Black: 8% (26) scored proficient Hispanic: 6% (25) scored proficient	White: 60% will score proficient Black: 30% will score proficient Hispanic: 30% will score proficient

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	See previous barriers from 1.A	See Previous Strategies from 1.A	See previous responsible persons from 1.A	See Previous Processes from 1.A	See Previous Evaluation Tools from 1.A
2	Diversity of students in presenting information in an understandable method.	Lesson study of best practices in instruction. Inclusion teacher to help facilitate small group learning. Differentiated learning	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell, Teachers, Inclusion Teachers	Standardized testing, group collaboration, team meetings, classworks, FCAT Test	Team meeting minutes, collaboration, test results

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	50% will score proficient on FCAT mathematics
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
14% (1) student scored proficient on the FCAT math test	50% of the ELL students will score proficient on FCAT Math.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	See anticipated barriers from 1.A	See anticipated strategies from 1.A	See persons responsible from 1.A	See process from section 1.A	See evaluation tools from 1.A
2	Language concerns with the curriculum and the presentation of the text.	One on one instruction. More time with support (inclusion teachers).	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell, Teachers, Inclusion teachers.	Group meetings, child study team meetings, Classworks testings and	Test results (FCAT, Classworks, PMBT), team

		Differentitated instruction		other LC benchmark test	meeting minutes

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:	50% of the student taking the FCAT will be proficient or there will be a 10% reduction in the number of students not scoring proficient.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
8% scored proficient in math.	Our goal is to have 50% score proficient or to reduce the number of those not scoring proficient by 10%.

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	See anticipated barriers from 1.A	See anticipated strategies from 1.A	See persons responsible from 1.A	See strategies from 1.A	See tools from 1.A

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	
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				

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) 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:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:	80% Proficient
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

60% (13)students scored a level 3 of the Algebra EOC.	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	See previous Barrier	See previous strategies	Link Barber, et al	See previous process	See previous evaluation tools
2	Motivation and attendance	Support in class. Support in 30 minute intensive wheel time	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell, teachers	Teachers construction of intesive class rosters	EOC exam results, Benchmarks assessment results.
3	Grade level support	Team meetings Communication in setting class rosters	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell, Guidance, Teachers	Grade level minutes. Linda Walker trainings	Benchmark assessment results. EOC Results
4	Comuputerized state testing requirements	More use of technology in the Algebra classrooms Mobile lab access	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell, Teachers, Guidance, Technology	Reports from progress monitoring (Classworks)	Assessment results. EOC Results

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	The percent scoring level 4 or higher will increase by 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
25% (5) a level 4 or above on the Algebra I EOC.	35% will score 4 or higher on the Algebra EOC

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	See previous Barrier	See previous Strategies	Link Barber, et al	See previous Process	See previous Evaluation Tools
2	Comuterized state testing requirements	More use of technology. Access to the mobile lab	Link Barber, Jeff Sewell, Guidance, Teachers, Technology	Reports from computerized assessments (Classworks)	Testing results. EOC exam results

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

3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Algebra Goal # 3A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra 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 subgroup:	
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3D:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra. Algebra Goal #3E:	
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				

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) 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:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #1:	
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:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:	
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 Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target					
3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Geometry Goal # 3A :			
Baseline data 2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry 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 subgroup:	
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3D:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. Geometry Goal #3E:	
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				

End of Geometry EOC Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Eno Boards	K-8	Lynn Guthrie	all teachers	pre planning	CWTs, team meetings, individual teacher meetings, reports	Link Barber
Ren Learn / Star Math / RTI	K-8	Lara Deason and Dr. Celeste Shuler	K-8	as needed	reports	Link Barber
Linda Walker / Algebra	8th grade teacher	Link Barber	Kristy Pleasant	pre planning and as needed	individual and team meetings	Link Barber
Instructional Practices	K-2	Lara Deason	K-2	pre planning and as needed	teaming and individual meetings	Link Barber
Linda Walker / Math Training	K-8	Linda Walker	School-wide	pre planning	team meetings, individual meetings	Link Barber
PLC concepts	K-8	Link Barber	School-wide	pre planning	Team meetings	Link Barber, team leaders
Data Days	K-8	Link Barber	School-wide	one per semester	Completion of team assignments	Link Barber, team leaders
RTI	K-8	Dr. Celeste Shuler and Lara Deason	School-wide	as needed	team meetings, individual meetings	Link Barber

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Supplemental Go Math Materials	Additional materials needed to supplement text	Title I	$600.00
			Subtotal: $600.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Classworks	Provides Progress Monitoring in Math for teachers. In addition, the software also assists with supplemental instruction and remediation.	Title I	$10,000.00
			Subtotal: $10,000.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Math PD - Curriculum Mapping	Linda Walker	Title I	$6,500.00

			Subtotal: $6,500.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $17,100.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	Increase 20 percent of students scoring at or above proficient in science
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28% (34)of students scored at level 3 on the 2012 FCAT Science test.	40% (49)of students will score AL 3

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of background knowledge in science content	Utilize resources such as United Streaming	Link Barber	CWTs, team discussions, assessment results	CWT data, assessment data (Class Works, Performance Matters, FCAT)
2	Lack of resources	Use various funds to purchase resources such as Study Island, classroom materials, etc.	Link Barber	CWTs, team discussions, assessment results	CWT data, assessment data (Class Works, Performance Matters, FCAT)
3	Limited use of literacy strategies in science content instruction	Provide content area literacy strategies to 5th and 8th grade teachers	Lara Deason	CWTs	CWT data, assessment data (Class Works, Performance Matters, FCAT)

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in 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. Science Goal #2a:	Improve percent of students scoring at or above proficient
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
7% or 9/122 of students scored AL 4 or 5	10% (12)of students will score AL 4 or 5

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	SEE previous barriers	SEE previous strategies	Link Barber	SEE processes	SEE previous evaluation tools

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
Donn Syperka / Science Curriculum Allignment	4-8	Donna Syperka	4th through 8th grade science teachers	pre planning and as needed	Team meetings	Link Barber

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Fusion Curriculum	New Science Curriculum for grades 1-8	School Improvement	$26,000.00
Science Lab	Materials purchased for experiments/labs	Title I	$863.72
			Subtotal: $26,863.72
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Classworks	Provides progress monitoring, testing, and instruction in Science for 3rd, 4th, and 5th grades.	Title I	$10,000.00
			Subtotal: $10,000.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Science Curriculum Mapping	Donna Spyerka	Title I	$6,500.00
			Subtotal: $6,500.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $43,363.72

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:	Increase % of students scoring 3.0 or higher to meet AYP designation
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
72% (87) of the students scored a level 3 or higher on FCAT Writes.	75%
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of time for teachers to participate in professional development, and time for analysis of data.	Budget for PD	Link Barber, Bess Revell	analyze writing assessments	Liberty Writes & My Access

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
My Access	K-8	Lara Deason	School-wide	Pre planning & as needed	Team meetings, discussions	Link Barber, team leaders

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Writing Journals	Journals purchase to assist students in 4th/8th grade with writing.	Title I	$971.00
			Subtotal: $971.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
	Assist student in writing.		

My Access	Students type and submit papers to be scored .	Title I	$1,288.00
			Subtotal: $1,288.00

Professional Development

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

Other

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $2,259.00

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) 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:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics. Civics Goal #1:	
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:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics. Civics Goal #2:	
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
No Data Submitted						

Civics 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 Civics 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:	
	Our Goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease

1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	the number of students with excessive absences and tardies. Excessive absences would be missing more than 5 days per nine weeks and excessive tardies would include being tardy more than 5 times in a nine week grading period.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
Tolar School averaged about 602 students per day last year which means that anywhere from 30 to35 students were absent on any given school day (roughly 8% of the student population).	Our goal is to reduce the average number of students who are absent each day to less than 30 students per day.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
Tolar only had 5 students that missed more that 10 days during the school year.	Our goal is to reduce the number of students missing more than 10 days to zero.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
There are 99 students that were on the excessive tardies (10 or more for the year) list from last year.	Our goal is to reduce the number of students with excessive tardies to below 50 students.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Parental Involvement and Support.	Keeping parents involved in their child's attendence records and aggressively pursuing those in violation of the attendance policy. Automated calling system (AlertNow) that notifies parents of student absence on a daily basis.	Jeff Sewell & Tammy Pullam	Analysis of attendance data.	Attendance records, truancy court dockets.

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						

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:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school term is to maintain, or reduce the number of office referrals that result in In-School Suspension or Out of School Suspensions.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
During the 2011-2012 School Term the office had 522 office referrals. From the 522 office referrals, 111 of them required In School Suspension (which amounted to 368 school days).	Due to changes in our behavior plan and the removal of Saturday Detention and other consequences that are no longer useable we hope to maintain, if not reduce, the number of referrals requiring In School and Out of School Suspension.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
There was a total of 85 students receiving In School Suspension.	85 ISS students or less.
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
During the 2011-2012 School Term the office had 522 office referrals. From the 522 office referrals, 28 of them required Out of School Suspension (which amounted to 82.5 school days).	82.5 days of OSS or less.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
There was a total of 16 students receiving Out of School Suspension.	16 students or less.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	New Policies and Behavioral Consequences are much tougher and strict this upcoming school year.	Teach the Positive Behavior Plan the first week of school. Teach and monitor the expectations of the students. Incorporate Character Building Lessons in the classrooms (Examples would include Second Step (K-5) and Why Try? (6-8). Monitor problem behaviors and locations and be proactive instead of reactive when it comes to discipline issues. Meet quarterly with PBS team members to discuss ways to improve.	Jeff Sewell (Assistant Principal), Link Barber and the PBS Team Members	Continual monitoring of behaviors and effective analyzing of the RTI:B and FOCUS Data Quarterly	RTI:B & FOCUS

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						

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	Continue with activities to include parents, involve parents in the DAC meetings, hold functions throughout the year in which parents will be able to participate in and provide insight for the school.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
Parent involvment is limited at Tolar school with only 10 member in the TPAC committee.	Increase the number of activities and parental involvement throughout the school year. Increase the number of parents on each Council by 5.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of parental input	Invite one parent member for each grade for initial T-PAC meeting.	Link Barber	Participation by parents	T-PAC minutes, end of year survey of participating T-PAC members
2	Lack of communication with parents	1. Email Newsletter 2. Parent data chats for all students that are not proficent in Reading/Math 3. Alert Now automated calling system mesages. 4. Put weekly announcements/accomplishments in the local newspaper.	Link Barber	Feedback from parents; number of parents subscribing to email newsletter, parent survey results	Record of email newsletters, list of subscribers, parent survey
3	Lack of after hours events for parents to participate in	Hold events during evening hours such as Family Theme Night, content specific (math, science fair, speech prep, etc.), transition to next grade, open house, data chats	Link Barber	Feedback from parents, parent survey results	Parent survey

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:	

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						

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)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) 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. CTE CTE Goal #1:	To increase the number of student each year that become certified in available programs.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Familiarity with course and lack of resources (ie computers, personnel, and text)	Purchase necessary resources, and continue to purchase as needed. Provide appropriate PD for teacher to implement course properly and with fidelity.	Nancy Dillmore, Seth Geiger, Jeff Sewell, and Link Barber	Purchase orders Effective Scheduling Search for PD opportunities Classroom observations	Master Schedule Classroom observations

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						

CTE Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s) / Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Microsoft Academy Curriculum	Text and resources needed for Microsoft Academy classes.	Title I	$2,540.00
			Subtotal: $2,540.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $2,540.00

End of CTE 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	Supplemental Reading Materials to Improve Instruction	Supplemental Materials for Diff. Instruction.	Title I	$3,600.00
Reading	Springboard Materials	Pre-AP Curriculum through the College Board	Title I	$2,382.00
Reading	Library Books	New books for library. Focus on complex text to improve independent reading materials.	Title I	$2,977.00
Mathematics	Supplemental Go Math Materials	Additional materials needed to supplement text	Title I	$600.00
Science	Fusion Curriculum	New Science Curriculum for grades 1-8	School Improvement	$26,000.00
Science	Science Lab	Materials purchased for experiments/labs	Title I	$863.72
Writing	Writing Journals	Journals purchase to assist students in 4th/8th grade with writing.	Title I	$971.00
CTE	Microsoft Academy Curriculum	Text and resources needed for Microsoft Academy classes.	Title I	$2,540.00
				Subtotal: $39,933.72

Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Renaissance Learning (Star Reading, AR, Early Literacy)	Track student reading progress and test student's reading level. In addition, it sets goals for students for independent reading and tracks it for teacher.	Title I	$4,765.04
Reading	Classworks	Progress Monitoring in Reading for Students. In addition, the software acts as supplemental instruction and remediation for students.	Title I	$10,000.00
Mathematics	Classworks	Provides Progress Monitoring in Math for teachers. In addition, the software also assists with supplemental instruction and remediation.	Title I	$10,000.00
Science	Classworks	Provides progress monitoring, testing, and instruction in Science for 3rd, 4th, and 5th grades.	Title I	$10,000.00
Writing	My Access	Assist student in writing. Students type and submit papers to be scored .	Title I	$1,288.00
				Subtotal: $36,053.04

Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Common Core Reading	Kathy Oropollo - Common Core Instructional Training	Title I	$11,000.00
Mathematics	Math PD - Curriculum Mapping	Linda Walker	Title I	$6,500.00

Science	Science Curriculum Mapping	Donna Spyerka	Title I	$6,500.00
				Subtotal: $24,000.00
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: $99,986.76

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

○ Priority	○ Focus	○ Prevent	● NA

Are you a reward school: ○ Yes ● No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/18/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

☑ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

The DAC committee will provide ongoing feedback throughout the school year.

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Liberty School District
W. R. TOLAR K-8 SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	74%	68%	83%	48%	273	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	67%	73%			140	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?	65% (YES)	74% (YES)			139	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					552	
Percent Tested = 98%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Liberty School District
W. R. TOLAR K-8 SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	70%	62%	77%	38%	247	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	63%	66%			129	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?	53% (YES)	63% (YES)			116	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					492	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested