

# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

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

School Name: SUWANNEE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Suwannee

Principal: Melissa Moseley

SAC Chair: Melissa Lee

Superintendent: Jerry Scarborough

Date of School Board Approval: October 2012

Last Modified on: 11/14/2012

## PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

### STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

### ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Melissa Moseley	Masters, Ed Leadership, FSU, Masters, Elementary Ed, FAMU, certified in elementary ed 1-6, endorsements--reading, ESOL, Ed Leadership K-12	3	8	<p>Eight years as an administrator, three years as a Reading First Coach, and fourteen years as an educator with additional training in the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Classroom Walk-Through Training</li> <li>• Critical Friends Training</li> <li>• IDEA Training</li> <li>• Targeted Selection</li> <li>• Seven Habits of Highly Effective People</li> <li>• Thomas Crane "The Heart of Coaching"</li> <li>• (ADAPT) Applied Data Analysis for Principals and Teachers</li> <li>• 300 hour ESOL Endorsement</li> <li>• Florida Reading Initiative Trainer</li> <li>• Florida Reading Initiative</li> <li>• Reading First Coach</li> <li>• Reading First</li> <li>• Facilitative Leadership</li> <li>• ACE (Assisting Change in Education)</li> <li>• Support Colleague</li> <li>• Literacy through Leadership</li> <li>• Clinical Educator</li> <li>• Administrative Awareness Training</li> <li>• Reciprocal Teaching Trainer</li> </ul>

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grade Level Chair (K, 1st, 2nd and 3rd)</li> <li>• School Improvement Chairperson/Secretary</li> <li>Florida Reading Endorsement</li> <li>• Team Leader</li> </ul>
Assis Principal	Deidre McManaway	Masters, Ed Leadership, FSU, Masters, Elementary Ed, FAMU, certified in elementary ed 1-6, endorsements--reading, ESOL, Ed Leadership K-12	4	4	

## 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)
	Veronica Daquila	Bachelor, Elementary Ed, Endorsements Reading, ESOL	6	8	2009 FCAT reading scores grew 4% points, level 4 students grew 7% points

## EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1. New teacher orientation with school administration 2. Year-long mentor program for new teachers, mentors have clinical education training 3. Required monthly meetings with new teachers and administration 4. Frequent administrative informal classroom walkthroughs/visits	Principal  Assistant Principal  Reading Coach  Principal/Assistant	Ongoing  Ongoing  Ongoing  Ongoing Ongoing	
2				

## 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
No data submitted	

## 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
53	5.7%(3)	26.4%(14)	35.8%(19)	32.1%(17)	11.3%(6)	101.9%(54)	15.1%(8)	11.3%(6)	79.2%(42)

### 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
Tina Roush	Danielle King	Beginning Teacher Teach the same grade level Mentor is highly successful teacher	The mentor will: 1. provide "how tos" for specific needs such as teaching, class organization, classroom management, parent conferences 2. do class demonstrations 3. share ideas 4. observe and give feedback 5. recognize effort and results 6. provide options that make teacher feel more comfortable 7. co-teach a lesson 8. give on-going personnel support 9. connect teachers with other teachers 10. arrange for teacher observation 11. ensure that teacher has all available resources they need 12. listen and honor teacher concerns 13. remember that no problem is to insignificant 14. feedback from classroom walkthroughs/observations via administration 15. required monthly meetings with administration
Patricia Lambert	Skylar Phillips	Beginning Teacher Mentor is highly successful teacher	The mentor will: 1. provide "how tos" for specific needs such as teaching, class organization, classroom management, parent conferences 2. do class demonstrations 3. share ideas 4. observe and give feedback 5. recognize effort and results 6. provide options that make teacher feel more comfortable 7. co-teach a lesson 8. give on-going personnel support 9. connect teachers with other teachers 10. arrange for teacher observation 11. ensure that teacher has all available resources they need 12. listen and honor teacher concerns 13. remember that no problem is to insignificant 14. feedback from classroom

			walkthroughs/observations via administration 15. required monthly meetings with administration
Connie Leavitt	Teodora Celedon	Beginning Teacher Teach the same grade level Mentor is highly successful teacher	The mentor will: 1. provide "how tos" for specific needs such as teaching, class organization, classroom management, parent conferences 2. do class demonstrations 3. share ideas 4. observe and give feedback 5. recognize effort and results 6. provide options that make teacher feel more comfortable 7. co-teach a lesson 8. give on-going personnel support 9. connect teachers with other teachers 10. arrange for teacher observation 11. ensure that teacher has all available resources they need 12. listen and honor teacher concerns 13. remember that no problem is to insignificant 14. feedback from classroom walkthroughs/observations via administration

## ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

### Coordination and Integration

**Note: For Title I schools only**

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

#### Title I, Part A

Title I, Part A will be utilized to provide Reading Coaches at three Title 1 schools. Funds will also provide paraprofessionals at the Title 1 school to give additional help to students at level 1 or 2 on FCAT. Title I, Part A is also used to provide a District Wide Parent Liaison, Math Coach, Technology Coach, an attendance clerk and a teacher for the Opportunity School to serve all schools in the district.

#### Title I, Part C- Migrant

School based administrators will observe the use of "The Essential Six" reading strategies from the Florida Reading Initiative (FRI) in all classrooms. This initiative is funded by Title I Part C and district professional development funds. ALL activities funded by Title I Part C will be supplementary and will not supplant existing State- and District-funded and required services. Reading First and FRI strategies will be monitored by administrators and reading coaches to ensure successful opportunities for Non-ELL and LEP (ELL) students. Title I Part C funds are used for a Migrant Coordinator, Migrant Tutors and to purchase license for Rosetta Stone, additional computers and other supplies needed for migrant students.

#### Title I, Part D

Funds from Title II, Part D will provide funding for the site license renewals for READ 180 and other computer-based programs and a Technology Specialist.

#### Title II

School based administrators will observe the use of "The Essential Six" reading strategies from the Florida Reading Initiative (FRI) in all classrooms. This initiative is funded by Title II Part A funds are used to fund three Reading Coaches, travel, consultants and the district's professional development funds. ALL activities funded by Title II will be supplementary and will

not supplant existing State- and District-funded and required services. Reading First and FRI strategies will be monitored by administrators and reading coaches to ensure successful opportunities for Non-ELL and LEP (ELL) students.

Title III

Funds from Title III Part A are used to provide tutors for ELL students, purchased instructional materials and software for ELL students. All activities funded by Title III will be supplementary and will not supplant existing State and District funded and required services. Reading First and FRI strategies will be monitored by administrators and reading coaches to ensure successful opportunities for Non-ELL and LEP (ELL) students.

Title X- Homeless

Title X Homeless funds are used to provide supplies, dues, field trip fund and other needs for Homeless students.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school based RtI plans and activities.

Assistant Principal: Role of the AP is to work in collaboration with the principal to ensure that RtI goals are implemented.

Select General Education Teacher: 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.

Guidance Counselor: Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students, and links child-serving community agencies to the schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.

Reading Coach: Evaluates school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum assessment and intervention approaches; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening data to help identify 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; provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring; provides guidance on K-5 reading plan; and supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention plans.

School Psychologist: Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation; and facilitates data-based decision making activities.

Exceptional Student Education Teacher: Collaborates with general education teachers to integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction.

Speech Language Pathologist: Educates the team in the role language plays in curriculum, assessment, and instruction, as a basis for appropriate program design; assists in the selection of screening measures; and helps identify systemic patterns of student need with respect to language skills.

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 will focus on meetings around one question: How do we develop and maintain a problem-solving system to bring out the best in our schools, our teachers, and in our students? The meetings will review universal screening data and link to instructional decisions; review progress monitoring data to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. The team will collaborate regularly, problem solve, evaluate implementation, and make decisions about implementation.

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 met to help in the development of the SIP. The team set clear expectations for instruction; facilitated the development of a systemic approach to teaching; scheduled an uninterrupted school wide 90 minute reading block for all grade levels; identified Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 target students by grade level based on prior end of the year assessments; aligned additional personnel (special area teachers, reading coach, paraprofessionals, ESE resource teacher) to assist in the instruction of Tier 2 children; and decided upon research based interventions to be used for Tier 1, 2, and 3 students.

#### 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.

Baseline data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), Annual Yearly Progress Test  
Progress Monitoring: curriculum based assessments, ThinkGate  
Midyear data: FAIR, Annual Yearly Progress Test  
End of the Year: FAIR, FCAT, Annual Yearly Progress Test  
Frequency of Data Days: once every four weeks

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

During teacher's common planning time professional development will be provided by the school psychologist and guidance counselor throughout the year. The training will begin at the start of the school year. The RtI Leadership team will also evaluate the need for additional staff professional development during the RtI meetings.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

#### Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

##### School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The LLT of Suwannee Elementary School consists of: Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coach, and a representative from each activity team grades 2 and 3

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

The LLT meets once per month to discuss all areas progress in reading and writing. Topics discussed regularly are the 90-minute reading blocks, interventions during iii, reading tutoring groups, implementation/monitoring of Accelerated Reader, review progress monitoring data (CIM, AYP test), implementation/monitoring of the Mary Lewis writing program, and evaluate monthly writing prompts for each grade level.

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

First, the LLT will monitor best practices during iii time to increase reading proficiency for students in the bottom quartile. Also, the team will guide the implementation and fidelity of the Mary Lewis writing program grades 2-3 to increase proficiency on grade 4 FCAT Writes. Finally, the LLT will evaluate the implementation of AR and use of AR goals to broaden the number of students reaching their reading goals.

## Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification  
No Attachment

### \*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

Suwannee Elementary houses only 2nd and 3rd grade students. All incoming kindergarten students attend Suwannee Primry School are assessed prior to or upon entering kindergarten in order to ascertain individual and group needs and to assist in instructional/intervention programs. All students are assessed in the area of letter knowledge, numbers up to 10, counting objects, basic colors and shapes. Data is used to plan for instruction until FAIR, Thinkgate and/or FLKRS is completed. Kindergarten academic and behavioral instruction will include daily explicit instruction, modeling, guided practice and independent practice

### \*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

### \*High Schools Only

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

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

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

## Postsecondary Transition

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

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

## PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

### Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.  Reading Goal #1a:	61% of all third grade students will score at or above a level 3 on 2013 FCAT reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56% of all third grade students scored at or above a level 3 on 2012 FCAT reading.	61% of all third grade students will score at or above a level 3 on 2012 FCAT reading.

#### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Likely increase in percentage of economically disadvantaged students.	1. Informal oral reading fluency assessments 2. Data analysis after each FAIR assessment 3. Grade level meetings 4. Structured iii time 5. Support from reading tutoring groups 6. Accelerated Reader for goal-oriented reading 7. Soar to Success 8. Instructional focus calendars 9. Uninterrupted 90 minute reading block 10. Reciprocal teaching 11. Enrichment for higher level thinking skills 13. Elements of Reading	Principal, Ast. Principal, Academic Coach	1. lesson plans 2. classroom walkthroughs 3. progress monitoring of benchmark skill based assessments 4. annual yearly progress district test 5. monthly data meetings with administration 6. monthly LLT meetings 7. STAR reading assessment	FCAT, ending FAIR data, annual yearly progress district test
2	Guiding teachers to prioritize core lessons to provide students with explicit relevant instruction..	1. Informal oral reading fluency assessments 2. Data analysis after each FAIR assessment 3. Activity Team meetings 4. Structured iii time 5. Support from reading tutoring groups 6. Accelerated Reader for goal-oriented reading 7 Instructional focus calendars 8. Uninterrupted 90 minute reading block 9. Reciprocal teaching 10. Enrichment for higher level thinking skills 11. Elements of Reading 12. Grade level meetings to share best practices 13. Modeling by academic coach	Principal, Ast. Principal, Academic Coach	1. lesson plans 2. classroom walkthroughs 3. progress monitoring of benchmark skill based assessments 4. annual yearly progress district test 5. monthly data meetings with administration 6. monthly LLT meetings 7. STAR reading assessment	FCAT, ending FAIR assessment, Annual Yearly Progress District Test



3				
4				

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading.  Reading Goal #2a:	38% of 2013 3rd grade students will score above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33% (109) of 2012 3rd grade students scored above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in reading.	38% of 2013 3rd grade students will score above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) 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	Higher percentage of student scoring proficient on district AYP entering 3rd grade.	1. Informal oral reading fluency assessments 2. Data analysis after each FAIR assessment. 3. Grade Level Meetings 4. Accelerated Reader for goal-oriented reading 5. Failure Free Reading Instructional focus calendars 7. uninterrupted 90 minute reading block 8. Reciprocal teaching 9. Enrichment for higher level thinking skills.	Principal Ast. Principal Academic Coach	1. lesson plans 2. classroom walkthroughs 3. progress monitoring or benchmark skills 4. annual yearly progress district test 5. monthly data meetings with administration 6. monthly LLT meetings 7. STAR reading assessment	FCAT, ending FAIR assessment, Annual Yearly Progress District Tests

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

of improvement for the following group:

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment:  
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading.  
Reading Goal #2b:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.  
Reading Goal #3a:

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:

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

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.  Reading Goal #4:	
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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal #					
	5A : <input type="text"/>					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.  Reading Goal #5B:	The number of students in the black subgroup not proficient in 3rd grade reading will decrease by 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Black 48% proficient	58% proficient

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

			Person or	Process Used to	
--	--	--	-----------	-----------------	--

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Ineffective differentiated instructional interventions for lowest performing students.	1. Informal oral reading fluency assessments 2. Data analysis after each FAIR assessment. 3. Grade Level Meetings 4. Accelerated Reader for goal-oriented reading 5. Failure Free Reading Instructional focus calendars 7. uninterrupted 90 minute reading block 8. Reciprocal teaching 9. Enrichment for higher level thinking skills. 10 Elements of Reading 11. Monthly RTI meetings to determine intervention needed.	Principal, Assistant Principal Academic Coach	1. lesson plans 2. classroom walkthroughs 3. progress monitoring or benchmark skills 4. annual yearly progress district test 5. monthly data meetings with administration 6. monthly LLT meetings 7. STAR reading assessment	FCAT, ending FAIR Assessment, Annual Yearly Progress District Tests, STAR

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.  Reading Goal #5D:	
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:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.  Reading 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				

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						

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

End of 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:				
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/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
No Data Submitted				

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:				
2012 Current Percent of Students 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
No Data Submitted				

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.				
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.				
CELLA Goal #3:				
2012 Current Percent of Students 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
No Data Submitted				

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





# 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:	59% (205) of all third grade students will score at or above a level 3 on 2012 FCAT math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56% (175) of all third grade students scored at or above a level 3 on 2012 FCAT math.	59% (205) of all third grade students will score at or above a level 3 on 2012 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	Likely increase in percentage of economically disadvantaged students.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One hour math block per day</li> <li>Drops in the Bucket</li> <li>Incorporating manipulatives into everyday lessons</li> <li>Emphasize the reading-math connection</li> <li>Center activities</li> <li>Structured iii time</li> <li>Instructional focus calendars</li> <li>Accelerated Math</li> <li>Impact Math</li> </ol>	Principal, Ast. Principal, Academic Coach	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>lesson plans</li> <li>classroom walkthroughs</li> <li>skill based benchmark assessments</li> <li>monthly grade level data meetings</li> </ol>	FCAT, Annual Yearly Progress District Test STAR Math

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:	28% (82) students scoring at Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
23% (77) students scoring at Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.	28% (82) students scoring at Levels 4 and 5 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
No Data Submitted				

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

of improvement for the following group:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #2a:	28% (82)students scoring at Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
23% (77)students scoring at Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.	28% (82)students scoring at Levels 4 and 5 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	Lower percentage of above grade level students entering 3rd grade.	1. One hour math block per day 2. Drops in the Bucket 3. Incorporating manipulatives into everyday lessons 4. Emphasize the reading-math connection 5. Center activities 6. Structured iii time 7. Instructional focus calendars 8. Provide enrichment activities for higher level thinking skills 9. Modeling by academic coach and district math coach 10. RTI meetings with teachers to design interventions	Principal, Ast. Principal, Academic Coach	1. lesson plans 2. classroom walkthroughs 3. skill based benchmark assessments 4. monthly grade level data meetings 5. RTI data meetings	FCAT, Annual Yearly Progress District Test

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

of improvement for the following group:

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #3a:	
---	--

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:

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #4:	
---	--

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Elementary School Mathematics Goal # 5A : <input type="text"/>				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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:

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #5C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #5D:	
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:

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal E:	
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				

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						

Mathematics Budget:

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

*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:	
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:

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:	
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:

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
No Data Submitted						

Science Budget:

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



## 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:				
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:				
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
No Data Submitted						

Writing Budget:

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

*End of Writing Goals*

## Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance	
Attendance Goal #1:	
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)

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						

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:	
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School

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						

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Parent Involvement					
Parent Involvement Goal #1:		85% of parents will participate in at least one parent involvement activity for the 2011-2012 school year.			
<i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>					
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:		2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:			
89		85			
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	Parents inability to attend night functions at school.	Continue to provide activities after parent workday, schedule events well in advance	Principal, Asst. Principal, Leadership Team	number of parents attending	sign in sheets for each event

(PLC) or PD Activity

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

*End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)*

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:				
1. STEM				
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)

## Additional Goal(s)

### Reading Goal Grade 2 Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1. Reading Goal Grade 2 Goal Reading Goal Grade 2 Goal #1:			86% of students in grade 2 will score proficient in reading on the Annual Yearly Progress District Post Test.		
2012 Current level:			2013 Expected level:		
80%			86%		
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	Likely increase in percentage of economically disadvantaged students.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Informal oral reading fluency assessments</li> <li>2. Data analysis after each FAIR assessment</li> <li>3. Grade level meetings</li> <li>4. Structured iii time</li> <li>5. Support from reading tutoring groups</li> <li>6. Accelerated Reader for goal-oriented reading</li> <li>7. Soar to Success</li> <li>8. Instructional focus calendars</li> <li>9. Uninterrupted 90 minute reading block</li> <li>10. Reciprocal teaching</li> <li>11. Enrichment for higher level thinking skills</li> <li>13. Elements of Reading</li> </ol>	Principal, Ast. Principal, Academic Coach	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. lesson plans</li> <li>2. classroom walkthroughs</li> <li>3. progress monitoring of benchmark skill based assessments</li> <li>4. annual yearly progress district test</li> <li>5. monthly data meetings with administration</li> <li>6. monthly LLT meetings</li> <li>7. STAR reading assessment</li> <li>8. RTI data meeting</li> </ol>	FAIR data, annual yearly progress district tests

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

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

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



Budget:

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

End of Reading Goal Grade 2 Goal(s)

## Math Goal Grade 2 Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1. Math Goal Grade 2 Goal		86% of students in grades k through 2 will score proficient in math on the Annual Yearly Progress District Post Test.			
Math Goal Grade 2 Goal # 1:					
2012 Current level:		2013 Expected level:			
75%		86%			
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	Likely increase in the number of economically disadvantaged students.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. One hour math block per day</li> <li>2. Drops in the Bucket</li> <li>3. Incorporating manipulatives into everyday lessons</li> <li>4. Emphasize the reading-math connection</li> <li>5. Center activities</li> <li>6. Structured iii time</li> <li>7. Instructional focus calendars</li> <li>8. Provide enrichment activities for higher</li> </ol>	Principal, Asst. Principal, Academic Coach	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. lesson plans</li> <li>2. classroom walk-throughs</li> <li>3. skill based benchmark assessments</li> <li>4. monthly grade level data meetings</li> </ol>	Annual Yearly Progress District Tests

		level thinking skills 9. Modeling by academic coach and district math coach		
--	--	--	--	--

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

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

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

Budget:

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

End of Math Goal Grade 2 Goal(s)

# FINAL BUDGET

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

## Differentiated Accountability

### School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school:  Yes  No

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

No Attachment

## School Advisory Council

### School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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



If NO, describe the measures being taken to Comply with SAC Requirement

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

Describe the activities of the School Advisory Council for the upcoming 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  
No Data Found  
No Data Found