

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: KINGSBURY ACADEMY

District Name: Marion

Principal: Tammy Bombly

SAC Chair: Cindy Lowe

Superintendent: Jim Yancey

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/25/2012

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)
Principal	Tammy Bombly	Master of Education Educational Leadership Bachelor of Arts History Professional Educator's Certificate Educational Leadership History Exceptional Student Education	11	5	Alternative School Improvement Rating: 2008-Incomplete, did not test 95% of students. 2009-Declining 2010-Declining 2011-Not Eligible for a School Grade 2012-Declining FCAT: Scale Score-Elementary Increasing, Middle Decreasing, High Increasing Developmental Scale Score-Increasing in all areas except grades 5 and 10 Proficiency-Increasing AYP: Improving since 2007 2011-82% 2010-79% 2009-69% 2008-44 2007-44
		Master of			FCAT: Scale Score-Elementary Increasing, Middle Decreasing, High Increasing

Assis Principal	Katherine Vernon	Education Professional Educator's Certificate Exceptional Student Education Elementary	2	1	Developmental Scale Score-Increasing in all areas except grades 5 and 10 Proficiency-Increasing Alternative School Improvement Rating: 2011-Not Eligible for a School Grade 2012-Declining AYP: 2011-82% 2010-79%
-----------------	------------------	---	---	---	--

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)
Prek/Primary, Elementary Education, Middle Grades Integrated Curriculum, Exceptional Student Education, Educational Leadership & Administration	Emily Parker	BA, UWF - PreK/Primary Education MA, UCF - Exceptional Education EdS, NLU - Educational Leadership	1		2011-12: Kingsbury - 7th/8th grade Reading/Language Arts - 100% of the students enrolled in her class for at least 3/4ths of the year were Level 1 SWD, with the exception of 1 with no prior matching score. 71% of students in this group demonstrated adequate learning gains on FCAT. 18% of students in the group had no comparison score. 2 students showed losses. These students were both multiple-grade repeaters, whose attendance was interrupted by multiple instances of incarceration.

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	District Level Support Match or Exceed Marion County School District pay scale. Provide time and resources for for staff development.	Tammy Bombly	August 2012	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
NA	NA

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
15	40.0%(6)	46.7%(7)	13.3%(2)	0.0%(0)	6.7%(1)	66.7%(10)	20.0%(3)	0.0%(0)	33.3%(5)

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
Emily Parker	Joyce Thomas Kerri Bradley Linda Alonzo	Strength of Content Area	Instructional strategies, lesson planning, and classroom management.
Tammy Bombly	Jonathon Inman Carole Inman	Strength of Content Area	Instructional strategies, lesson planning, and classroom management.
Katherine Vernon	Randall Hensley Sandra Malpica	Strength of Content Area	Instructional strategies, lesson planning, and classroom management.

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 supports the remediation program at Kingsbury Academy. There are two support staff who provides individual or small group remediation in reading and math to enhance the curriculum in the classroom and addresses deficits based on the testing results. A Reading Coach is also provided by Title I A, this position supports classroom teachers in Elementary, Middle and High School. The coach models instructional practices, academic centers, and introduces new strategies to enhance reading.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

District funds are used to purchase:

1. School supplies.
2. Provide an After School Tutorial Program to improve grades, increase promotion, improve attendance and reduce the dropout rate.
3. Fund a Migrant Liaison that works with schools and families to identify students and provide need referrals for families

Families must meet the federal eligibility to participate in the program.

Title I, Part D

N/A

Title II

District provides staff development activities to improve basic educational programs and to assist administrators and teachers in meeting highly qualified status.

District receives supplemental funds for improving their basic education programs through the purchase of small equipment to supplement education programs. Providing technology in classrooms will differentiate instructional strategies. Instructional software will enhance literacy and math skills of struggling students and early childhood students.

District uses funds to purchase SuccessMaker licenses and provide professional development for SuccessMaker.

Title III

Services are provided through the District, for education materials and ELL district support services on an as needed basis to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners.

Title X- Homeless

District Homeless Social Worker provides resources (Clothing, school supplies, social services referrals....) for students identified homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Remediation is provided through a Successmaker Lab and individual tutoring throughout the school day for targeted students in need of intensive academic support.

Violence Prevention Programs

TEACH is the MCSD adopted violence prevention program. Kingsbury Academy employs four TEACH trainers and one-hundred percent of staff are trained to use TEACH.

Nutrition Programs

N/A

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

Students participating in through Career Prep courses.

Other

N/A

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Cindy Lowe, Executive Director
Tammy Bombly, Principal
Connie St. Pierre, LCSW
Laura Trevarrow, Recreational Therapist
Katherine Vernon, Assistant Principal
Emily Parker, Instructional Coach
Keith Evans, Dean of Discipline

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?

Kingsbury Academy is contracted with the Marion County School Board and provides a therapeutic day treatment program for students placed in an alternative setting. 100% of secondary students are identified SWD while the elementary percentage fluctuates dependent upon the student referred. Regardless of designation, the RTI program is approached from an academic and therapeutic perspective at Kingsbury as everything we do is designed to address the needs of the struggling student.

Weekly treatment team meetings are facilitated by therapists, administrators and an instructional coach. The meeting provides for the dissemination of information regarding the students behavior, strengths, progress toward treatment goals and emotional issues. SWD are also monitored through the IEP process.

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 role of the RTI Leadership Team at Kingbury Academy is designed to meet the therapeutic, behavioral, and academic needs of our students. Each member of the team is selected for their expertise to meet the students IEP and pBIP.

The Therapeutic team is responsible for supporting teachers in the development behavioral plans that supports the emotional growth of the students, thus enhancing their academic abilities. Daily group therapy in elementary ESE classes, middle grades self-contained and high school is geared to building self esteem, leadership, self confidence, social and emotional growth. Middle school students participate in Character Counts! curriculum during Social/Personal. A therapist is assigned membership on the School leadership team as a part of restructuring to make AYP.

The instructional team participated in writing the SIP and are responsible for the "smart" goals in the plan.

MTSS Implementation

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

The MTSS leadership team will analyze data. Data sources will include results from behavior tracking, grading reports, comprehensive assessment tests such as FCAT, alternate assessment, end of course exams, FAIR and district assessments. Student behaviors will be monitored through the use of a daily point system, the FBA and pBIP. The data will assist in adjusting program components to meet the complex needs of students.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Continued RTI for all instructional staff.

Consistently share strategies at weekly Treatment Team meeting as part of a Professional Learning Community.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Tammy Bombly-Principal
Katie Vernon-Assistant Principal
Emily Parker-Instructional Coach
Diana Davis-HQ Reading Teacher
Marci Grandstaff-HQ Reading Teacher
Kathryn Chotiner-ESE Reading Program Specialist

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

Literacy Leadership Team meets the second Thursday of each month from 3:30-4:00 at Kingsbury Academy.

The primary function of the the LLT is to ensure KBA is following MCSD Reading Plan with fidelity.

The secondary function of the LLT is to disaggregate reading data provided through remediation, Intensive Reading, FCAT, FCA's and FAIR testing to determine instructional and curriculum support needed for staff and students.

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

The Literacy Leadership Team guide instructional staff in the use of data to improve grade level instruction to help each student achieve their academic 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.

Kingsbury Academy receives students who are referred by MCSD. Pre-School transition is not applicable to KBA.

*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.

Kingsbury Academy will ensure the responsibility that all content area teachers are using literacy strategies in content area instruction based on walk throughs, monthly professional development, weekly teachers' meetings, lesson plans, and data collection.

*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?

All teachers will refer students to a content area question: "How can I apply what I am learning elsewhere?" Also, students will be provided time at the end of each class period to reflect on their learning experiences.

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?

Career education is incorporated in 8th grade Social Science. Students participate in the development of their Individual Education Plan that incorporates a career focus.

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](#)

Students participate in Graduation Review Meeting and Post School Transition is developed as a part of the student's Individual Education Plan.

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:	Eighty-five percent (170) of students will be proficient on the 2013 FCAT. Progress will be measured by increasing the number of students earning within three years proficiency in each grade level and sub-group based on the Developmental Scale Score. Students who have shown proficiency based on the 2012 FCAT will maintain proficiency level or increase DSS by one grade level.
---	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Grade 3: 14 students tested, 21% (3) scored level 3, 5% increased DDS Grade 4: 13 students tested, 23% (3) scored level 3, 5% increased DDS Grade 5: 23 students tested, 13% (3) scored level 3, 5% increased DDS Grade 6: 15 students tested, 0% (0) scored level 3, 0% increased DDS Grade 7: 20 students tested, 10% (2) scored level 3, 10% increased DDS Grade 8: 22 students tested, 18% (4) scored level 3, 6% increased DDS Grade 9: 21 students tested, 5% (1) scored level 3, -3% decreased DDS Grade 10: 17 students tested, 6% (1) scored level 3, 8% increased DDS	Students will increase Developmental Scale Score reflecting one year's growth and students scoring a level 3 on FCAT 2.0 will increase five percent.

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	Attendance, transition, and "buy-in"	1. Teachers, instructional paraprofessionals, and students will participate in scheduled data conferences.	Cindy Lowe Tammy Bombly Katie Vernon Keith Evans	Marion County Instructional Evaluation System Classroom Walk-through Lesson Plan Review Behavior Data Review Attendance	FAIR Test FCA Test Successmaker Attendance Individual Education Plan
2	ESE students with emotional and behavioral issues who are working near or below grade level	1. Teachers will follow MCSD Focus Calendar as part of the Continuous Improvement Model. 2. Students in grades 3-8 will utilize the Successmaker Reading and Math Program. 3. Teachers will teach literacy in the content areas across all curriculums. 4. Tutor will provide individual and small group support for remediation and enhancement.	Cindy Lowe Tammy Bombly Katie Vernon Keith Evans	Marion County Instructional Evaluation System Staff Development Classroom Walk-through Lesson Plan Review	Benchmark Test FCA Test Successmaker Instructional Self-Assessment

	5.Resource teacher will provide remediation in small groups.		
--	--	--	--

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:	Students will increase by one level on Florida Alternate Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Grade 7: 2 students tested, 1 scored level 9 and 1 scored level 5. Grade 9: 1 student tested and scored level 3	Students will increase by one level on Florida Alternate 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	Attendance, transition, and "buy-in"	1. Teachers, instructional paraprofessionals, and students will participate in scheduled data conferences.	Cindy Lowe Tammy Bombly Katie Vernon Keith Evans	Marion County Instructional Evaluation System Classroom Walk-through Lesson Plan Review Behavior Data Review Attendance	FAIR Test Successmaker Attendance Individual Education Plan

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:	Progress on FCAT 2.0 will be measured by increasing the number of student's proficient by five percent and increasing the number of students earning within three years proficiency in each grade level and sub-group based on the Developmental Scale Score. Students who have shown proficiency based on 2012 FCAT will maintain proficiency level or increase DSS by one grade level.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Grade 3: 14 students tested, 21% (3) scored level 3, increased DDS Grade 4: 13 students tested, 23% (3) scored level 3, 5% increased DDS Grade 5: 23 students tested, 13% (3) scored level 3, 5% increased DDS Grade 6: 15 students tested, 0% (0) scored level 3, 0% increased DDS Grade 7: 20 students tested, 10% (2) scored level 3, 10% increased DDS Grade 8: 22 students tested, 18% (4) scored level 3, 6% increased DDS Grade 9: 21 students tested, 5% (1) scored level 3, -3% decreased DDS Grade 10: 17 students tested, 6% (1) scored level 3, 8% increased DDS	Students will increase Developmental Scale Score reflecting one year's growth and students scoring a level 3 on FCAT 2.0 will increase five percent.

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	Attendance, transition, and "buy-in"	1. Teachers, instructional paraprofessionals, and students will participate in scheduled data conferences. 2. Students will participate in an articulation meeting to discuss Graduation Plan.	Cindy Lowe Tammy Bombly Katie Vernon Keith Evans	Marion County Instructional Evaluation System Staff Development Classroom Walk-through Lesson Plan Review Attendance Behavior Data	FAIR Test FCA Test Successmaker Attendance Behavior Data
2	Content Literacy	1. Content area teachers will reinforce content literacy in subject areas.	Tammy Bombly	Staff Development Lesson Plans	FAIR Test Results FCA 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 group:

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	Students will increase by one level on Florida Alternate Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Grade 7: 2 students tested, 1 scored level 9 and 1 scored level 5. Grade 9: 1 student tested and scored level 3	Students will increase by one level on Florida Alternate 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	Attendance, transition, and "buy-in"	1. Teachers, instructional paraprofessionals, and students will participate in scheduled data conferences. 2. Students will participate in an articulation meeting to discuss Graduation Plan.	Cindy Lowe Tammy Bombly Katie Vernon Keith Evans	Marion County Instructional Evaluation System Staff Development Classroom Walk-through Lesson Plan Review Attendance Behavior Data	FAIR Test FCA Test Successmaker Attendance Behavior Data

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	Progress on FCAT 2.0 will be measured by increasing the number of student's proficient by five percent and increasing the number of students earning within three years proficiency in each grade level and sub-group based on the Developmental Scale Score. Students who have shown proficiency based on 2012 FCAT will maintain proficiency level or increase DSS by one grade level.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Grade 3: 14 students tested, 21% (3) scored level 3, Grade 4: 13 students tested, 23% (3) scored level 3, 5% increased DDS Grade 5: 23 students tested, 13% (3) scored level 3, 5% increased DDS Grade 6: 15 students tested, 0% (0) scored level 3, 0%	

<p>increased DDS Grade 7: 20 students tested, 10% (2) scored level 3, 10% increased DDS Grade 8: 22 students tested, 18% (4) scored level 3, 6% increased DDS Grade 9: 21 students tested, 5% (1) scored level 3, -3% decreased DDS Grade 10: 17 students tested, 6% (1) scored level 3, 8% increased DDS</p>	<p>Students will increase Developmental Scale Score reflecting one year's growth and students scoring a level 3 on FCAT 2.0 will increase five percent.</p>
---	---

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	Attendance, transition, and "buy-in"	1. Teachers, instructional paraprofessionals, and students will participate in scheduled data conferences.	Cindy Lowe Tammy Bombly Katie Vernon Keith Evans	Staff Development Classroom Walk-through Lesson Plan Review Attendance Behavior Plann	FAIR Test FCA Test Successmaker Attendance Behavior Plan
2	ESE students with emotional and behavioral issues who are working below grade level	1. Teachers will follow MCSD Focus Calendar as part of the Continuous Improvement Model. 2. Students in grades 3-7 will utilize the Successmaker Reading and Math Program. 3. Teachers will teach literacy in the content areas across all curriculums. 4. Tutor will provide individual and small group instructional support.	Cindy Lowe Tammy Bombly Katie Vernon	Staff Development Classroom Walk-through Lesson Plan Review	FAIR Test FCA Test Successmaker Individual Education Plan
3	ESE students needing Differentiated Instruction.	1. Teachers will enhance instructionn through multi-modes to increase student engagement. 2. Teachers will use Thinking Map strategies.	Cindy Lowe Tammy Bombly Katie Vernon Emily Parker	Lesson Plans Classroom Walk-through	FCA Test Results Benchmark Test Results. Individual Education Plan
4	ESE students working below grade level.	1. Follow the District adopted Reading Plan. 2. Provide Research based supplemental materials to improve reading skills as prescribed by the District Reading Plan. Materials: Sourcebook Reading and Writing Read Naturally Corrective Reading Critical Reading Series Successmaker	Tammy Bombly Katie Vernon	Lesson Plan Review Staff Development Classroom Walk-through	FAIR Test Results FCA Test Results Successmaker Progress Monitoring

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:

<p>3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:</p>	<p>Students will increase by one level on Florida Alternate Assessment.</p>
<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</p>

Grade 7: 2 students tested, 1 scored level 9 and 1 scored level 5. Grade 9: 1 student tested and scored level 3	Students will increase by one level on Florida Alternate 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	ESE students with emotional and behavioral issues who are working below grade level	1. Students in grades 3-7 will utilize the Successmaker Reading and Math Program. 2. Teachers will teach literacy in the content areas across all curriculums. 3. Tutor will provide individual and small group instructional support.	Cindy Lowe Tammy Bombly Katie Vernon Emily Parker	Staff Development Classroom Walk-through Lesson Plan Review	FAIR Test FCA Test Successmaker Individual Education Plan
2	ESE students needing Differentiated Instruction.	1. Teachers will enhance instruction through multi-modes to increase student engagement. 2. Teachers will use Thinking Map Strategies.	Cindy Lowe Tammy Bombly Katie Vernon Emily Parker	Staff Development Lesson Plans Classroom Walk-through	Individual Education Plan

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:	Progress on FCAT 2.0 will be measured by increasing the number of student's proficient by five percent and increasing the number of students earning within three years proficiency in each grade level and sub-group based on the Developmental Scale Score. Students who have shown proficiency based on 2012 FCAT will maintain proficiency level or increase DSS by one grade level.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Grade 3: 14 students tested, 21% (3) scored level 3, 5% increased DDS Grade 4: 13 students tested, 23% (3) scored level 3, 5% increased DDS Grade 5: 23 students tested, 13% (3) scored level 3, 5% increased DDS Grade 6: 15 students tested, 0% (0) scored level 3, 0% increased DDS Grade 7: 20 students tested, 10% (2) scored level 3, 10% increased DDS Grade 8: 22 students tested, 18% (4) scored level 3, 6% increased DDS Grade 9: 21 students tested, 5% (1) scored level 3, -3% decreased DDS Grade 10: 17 students tested, 6% (1) scored level 3, 8% increased DDS	Students will increase Developmental Scale Score reflecting one year's growth and students scoring a level 3 on FCAT 2.0 will increase five percent.

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	Attendance, transition, and "buy-in"	1. Teachers and students will participate in scheduled data conferences	Cindy Lowe Tammy Bombly Katie Vernon	Staff Development Classroom Walk-through Lesson Plan Review	FAIR Test FCA Test Successmaker
	ESE students with	1. Teachers will follow	Cindy Lowe	Staff Development	FAIR Test

2	emotional and behavioral issues who are working below grade level	<p>MCS D Focus Calendar as part of the Continuous Improvement Model.</p> <p>2. Students in grades 3-7 will utilize the Successmaker Reading and Math Program.</p> <p>3. Teachers will teach literacy in the content areas across all curriculums.</p> <p>4. Instructional coach and tutor will provided individual and small group support.</p>	Tammy Bombly	Classroom Walk-through	FCA Test
			Katie Vernon	Lesson Plan Review	Successmaker Individual Education Plan

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 # Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Reading Performance Target will increase proficiency by 45% to 56% by 2016. 5A :				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	11	20	29	38	47	

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:	Progress on FCAT 2.0 will be measured by increasing the number of student's proficient by five percent and increasing the number of students earning within three years proficiency in each grade level and sub-group based on the Developmental Scale Score. Students who have shown proficiency based on 2012 FCAT will maintain proficiency level or increase DSS by one grade level.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Grade 3: No data are reported. Grade 4: No data are reported. Grade 5: No data are reported. Grade 6: No data are reported. Grade 7: White-80% (8)Level 1 Black-No data are reported. Grade 8: White-No data are reported. Black-80% (8) Level 1, 10% (1) Level 2 Grade 9: White-No data are reported. Black-90% (9) Level 1, 10% (1) Level 2 Grade 10: No data are reported.	Students in each sub-group will increase Developmental Scale Score reflecting one year's growth and students scoring a level 3 on FCAT 2.0 will increase five percent.

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	Attendance, transition, and "buy-in"	1. Teachers and students will participate in scheduled data conferences.	Cindy Lowe Tammy Bombly Katie Vernon Keith Evans	Staff Development Classroom Walk-through Lesson Plan Review Attendance	FAIR Test FCA Test Benchmark Test Demand Writes Attendance

2	ESE students with emotional and behavioral issues who are working near or below grade level	1. Teachers will follow MCSD Focus Calendar as part of the Continuous Improvement Model. 2. Students in grades 3-7 will utilize the Successmaker Reading and Math Program. 3. Teachers will teach literacy in the content areas across all curriculums.	Cindy Lowe Tammy Bombly Katie Vernon Keith Evans	Staff Development Classroom Walk-through Lesson Plan Review Behavior Data	FAIR Test FCA Test Demand Writes Behavior Data
3	Reading materials that relate to multiple ethnicities.	1. Provide reading resources and classroom library for students of identify with different ethnicities.	Tammy Bombly	Classroom Walk-through Lesson Plan Review	FAIR Test Results FCA 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 reading. Reading Goal #5C:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
No data reported.	NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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:	Progress on FCAT 2.0 will be measured by increasing the number of student's proficient by five percent and increasing the number of students earning within three years proficiency in each grade level and sub-group based on the Developmental Scale Score. Students who have shown proficiency based on 2012 FCAT will maintain proficiency level or increase DSS by one grade level.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Grade 3: 7 students tested, no data reported Grade 4: 6 students tested, no data reported Grade 5: 12 students tested, 14% (1) scored Level 4 Grade 6: 15 students tested, 0% (0) scored level 3, 0% increased DDS Grade 7: 20 students tested, 10% (2) scored level 3, 10% increased DDS Grade 8: 22 students tested, 18% (4) scored level 3, 6% increased DDS Grade 9: 21 students tested, 5% (1) scored level 3, -3% decreased DDS Grade 10: 17 students tested, 6% (1) scored level 3, 8% increased DDS	Students with Disabilities will increase Developmental Scale Score reflecting one year's growth and students scoring a level 3 on FCAT 2.0 will increase five percent.

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	Attendance, transition, and "buy-in"	1. Teachers, instructional paraprofessionals, and students will participate in scheduled data conferences.	Cindy Lowe Tammy Bombly Katie Vernon Keith Evans	Staff Development Classroom Walk-through Lesson Plan Review	FAIR Test FCA Test Individual Education Plan Attendance
2	ESE students with emotional and behavioral issues who are working near or below grade level.	1. Teachers will follow MCSD Focus Calendar as part of the Continuous Improvement Model. 2. Students in grades 3-7 will utilize the Successmaker Reading and Math Program. 3. Teachers will teach literacy in the content areas across all curriculums.	Cindy Lowe Tammy Bombly Katie Vernon Keith Evans	Staff Development Classroom Walk-through Lesson Plan Review	FAIR Test FCA Test Individual Education Plan
3	ESE students working below grade level due to disability.	1. Enhance instruction through multi-modes to improve student engagement in learning process. 2. Use of LCD projectors to support visual learners.	Tammy Bombly	Classroom Walk-through Lesson Plan Review	FAIR Test Results FCA Test Results Benchmark 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:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	Progress on FCAT 2.0 will be measured by increasing the number of student's proficient by five percent and increasing the number of students earning within three years proficiency in each grade level and sub-group based on the Developmental Scale Score. Students who have shown proficiency based on 2012 FCAT will maintain proficiency level or increase DSS by one grade level.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Grade 3: 13 students tested, 21% (3) scored level 3, Grade 4: 13 students tested, 23% (3) scored level 3, 5% increased DDS Grade 5: 21 students tested, 13% (3) scored level 3, 5% increased DDS Grade 6: 10 students tested, 0% (0) scored level 3, 0% increased DDS Grade 7: 18 students tested, 10% (2) scored level 3, 10% increased DDS Grade 8: 18 students tested, 18% (4) scored level 3, 6% increased DDS Grade 9: 20 students tested, 5% (1) scored level 3, -3% decreased DDS Grade 10: 18 students tested, 6% (1) scored level 3, 8% increased DDS	Students who are Economically Disadvantaged will increase Developmental Scale Score reflecting one year's growth and students scoring a level 3 on FCAT 2.0 will increase five percent.

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	Attendance, transition, and "buy-in"	1. Teachers and students will participate in scheduled data conferences.	Cindy Lowe Tammy Bombly Katie Vernon	Staff Development Classroom Walk-through Lesson Plan Review	FAIR Test FCA Test Attendance

			Keith Evans	Attendance	
2	ESE students with emotional and behavioral issues who are working near or below grade level.	1. Teachers will follow MCS D Focus Calendar as part of the Continuous Improvement Model. 2. Students in grades 3-7 will utilize the Successmaker Reading and Math Program. 3. Teachers will teach literacy in the content areas across all curriculums. 4. Tutor will provide individual and small group support.	Cindy Lowe Tammy Bombly Katie Vernon Keith Evans	Staff Development Classroom Walk-through Lesson Plan Review	FAIR Test FCA Test Individual Education Plan
3	Students who are economically disadvantaged.	1. Kingsbury will coordinate with Title I to increase number of students enrolled in after school tutoring program SES	Tammy Bombly Beth Nelson	Number of Students enrolled at SES	FAIR Test Results FCA Test Results Benchmark Test Results

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Thinking Maps	K-12	Instructional Coach	Intensive Reading Content Area	Orientation, August 12; Teacher Work Day, October 26; Thursday Morning PLC Meetings, Weekly	Lesson Plans Classroom Walkthroughs	Administration Instructional Coach

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Differentiated Instruction	Instructional Coach	Title I A	\$3,594.33
			Subtotal: \$3,594.33
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

Instructional Coach

Resource and classroom support
for instruction

Title I A

\$14,377.00

Subtotal: \$14,377.00

Grand Total: \$17,971.33

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:			NA		
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
NA					
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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:			NA		
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:					
NA					
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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:			NA		

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

CELLA Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	\$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:	Progress on FCAT 2.0 will be measured by increasing the number of students proficient by five percent and increasing the number of students earning within three years proficiency in each grade level and sub-group based on the Developmental Scale Score. Students who have shown proficiency based on 2012 FCAT will maintain proficiency level or increase DSS by one grade level.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Grade 3: 15 students tested, 0%(0) scored a level 3 Grade 4: 12 students tested, 8%(1) scored a level 3 Grade 5: 20 students tested, 5%(1) scored a level 3	Students scoring a level 3 on FCAT 2.0 will increase five percent.

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	Attendance, transition, and "buy-in"	1. Teachers, instructional paraprofessionals, and students will participate in scheduled data conferences.	Cindy Lowe Tammy Bombly Katie Vernon Keith Evans	Marion County Instructional Evaluation System Classroom Walk-through Lesson Plan Review Behavior Data Review Attendance	FAIR Test FCA Test Successmaker Attendance Individual Education Plan
2	ESE students with emotional and behavioral issues who are working near or below grade level	1. Teachers will follow MCSD Focus Calendar as part of the Continuous Improvement Model. 2. Students in grades 3-8 will utilize the Successmaker Reading and Math Program. 3. Teachers will teach literacy in the content areas across all curriculums. 4. Tutor will provide individual and small group support for remediation and enhancement. 5. Resource teacher will provide remediation in small groups.	Cindy Lowe Tammy Bombly Katie Vernon Keith Evans	Marion County Instructional Evaluation System Staff Development Classroom Walk-through Lesson Plan Review	Benchmark Test FCA Test Successmaker Instructional Self-Assessment

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1b:	NA
---	----

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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:	Progress on FCAT 2.0 will be measured by increasing the number of student's proficient by five percent and increasing the number of students earning within three years proficiency in each grade level and sub-group based on the Developmental Scale Score. Students who have shown proficiency based on 2012 FCAT will maintain proficiency level or increase DSS by one grade level.
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Grade 3: 15 students tested, 0% (0) scored a level 3, Grade 4: 12 students tested, 8% (1) scored a level 3, 0% (0) DDS increase Grade 5: 20 students tested, 5% (1) scored a level 3, -2% (1) DDS decrease	Students will increase Developmental Scale Score reflecting one year's growth and students scoring a level 3 on FCAT 2.0 will increase five percent.

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	Attendance, transition, and "buy-in"	1. Teachers, instructional paraprofessionals, and students will participate in scheduled data conferences. 2. Students will participate in an articulation meeting to discuss Graduation Plan.	Cindy Lowe Tammy Bombly Katie Vernon Keith Evans	Marion County Instructional Evaluation System Staff Development Classroom Walk-through Lesson Plan Review Attendance Behavior Data	FAIR Test FCA Test Successmaker Attendance Behavior Data

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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:	Progress on FCAT 2.0 will be measured by increasing the number of student's proficient by five percent and increasing the number of students earning within three years proficiency in each grade level and sub-group based on the Developmental Scale Score. Students who have shown proficiency based on 2012 FCAT will maintain proficiency level or increase DSS by one grade level.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Grade 3: 15 students tested, 0% (0) scored a level 3, Grade 4: 12 students tested, 8% (1) scored a level 3, 0% (0) DDS increase Grade 5: 20 students tested, 5% (1) scored a level 3, -2% (1) DDS decrease	Students will increase Developmental Scale Score reflecting one year's growth and students scoring a level 3 on FCAT 2.0 will increase five percent.

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	Attendance, transition, and "buy-in"	1. Teachers, instructional paraprofessionals, and students will participate in scheduled data conferences.	Cindy Lowe Tammy Bombly Katie Vernon Keith Evans	Staff Development Classroom Walk-through Lesson Plan Review Attendance Behavior Plann	FAIR Test FCA Test Successmaker Attendance Behavior Plan
2	ESE students with emotional and behavioral issues who are working below grade level	1. Teachers will follow MCSD Focus Calendar as part of the Continuous Improvement Model. 2. Students in grades 3-7 will utilize the Successmaker Reading and Math Program. 3. Teachers will teach literacy in the content areas across all curriculums. 4. Tutor will provide individual and small group instructional support.	Cindy Lowe Tammy Bombly Katie Vernon	Staff Development Classroom Walk-through Lesson Plan Review	FAIR Test FCA Test Successmaker Individual Education Plan
3	ESE students needing Differentiated Instruction.	1. Teachers will enhance instructionn through multi-modes to increase student engagement. 2. Teachers will use Thinking Map strategies.	Cindy Lowe Tammy Bombly Katie Vernon Emily Parker	Lesson Plans Classroom Walk-through	FCA Test Results Benchmark Test Results. Individual Education Plan

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:		NA		
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
NA		NA		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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:	Progress on FCAT 2.0 will be measured by increasing the number of student's proficient by five percent and increasing the number of students earning within three years proficiency in each grade level and sub-group based on the Developmental Scale Score. Students who have shown proficiency based on 2012 FCAT will maintain proficiency level or increase DSS by one grade level.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Grade 3: 15 students tested, 0% (0) scored a level 3, Grade 4: 12 students tested, 8% (1) scored a level 3, 0% (0) DDS increase Grade 5: 20 students tested, 5% (1) scored a level 3, -2% (1) DDS decrease	Students will increase Developmental Scale Score reflecting one year's growth and students scoring a level 3 on FCAT 2.0 will increase five percent.

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	Attendance, transition, and "buy-in"	1. Teachers and students will participate in scheduled data conferences	Cindy Lowe Tammy Bombly Katie Vernon	Staff Development Classroom Walk-through Lesson Plan Review	FAIR Test FCA Test Successmaker
2	ESE students with emotional and behavioral issues who are working below grade level	1. Teachers will follow MCSD Focus Calendar as part of the Continuous Improvement Model. 2. Students in grades 3-7 will utilize the Successmaker Reading and Math Program. 3. Teachers will teach literacy in the content areas across all curriculums. 4. Instructional coach and tutor will provided individual and small group support.	Cindy Lowe Tammy Bombly Katie Vernon	Staff Development Classroom Walk-through Lesson Plan Review	FAIR Test FCA Test Successmaker Individual Education Plan

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 #				
		Based on Ambitious but Achievable Measurable Objectives (AMOs), Mathematics Performance Target proficiency will increase will by 47 percent to 53% by 2017.				
5A :						
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	6	15	24	33	47	

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:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
No data reported.	NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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:	No data reported.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
No data reported.	No data reported.

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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Not data to report.	NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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:	Eighty-six percent of students will be proficient on the 2012 FCAT. Progress will be measured by increasing the number of students earning within three years proficiency in each grade level and sub-group based on the Developmental Scale Score. Students who have shown proficiency based on 2012 FCAT will maintain proficiency level or increase DSS by one grade level.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Grade 6: 14 students tested 7% (1) Grade 7: 19 students tested 0% (0) Grade 8: 20 students tested 0% (0)	Students will increase DSS by one grade level.

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	Attendance, transition, and "buy-in"	1. Teachers, instructional paraprofessionals, and students will participate in scheduled data conferences.	Cindy Lowe Tammy Bombly Katie Vernon Keith Evans	Marion County Instructional Evaluation System Classroom Walk-through Lesson Plan Review Behavior Data Review Attendance	FAIR Test FCA Test Successmaker Attendance Individual Education Plan
2	ESE students with emotional and behavioral issues who are working near or below grade level	1. Teachers will follow MCSD Focus Calendar as part of the Continuous Improvement Model. 2. Students in grades 3-8 will utilize the Successmaker Reading and Math Program. 3. Teachers will teach literacy in the content areas across all curriculums. 4. Tutor will provide individual and small group support for remediation and enhancement. 5. Resource teacher will provide remediation in small groups.	Cindy Lowe Tammy Bombly Katie Vernon Keith Evans	Marion County Instructional Evaluation System Staff Development Classroom Walk-through Lesson Plan Review	Benchmark Test FCA Test Successmaker Instructional Self-Assessment

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1b:	Students taking Comparative Florida Alternate Assessment will increase by one level.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Grade 6: NA Grade 7: 2 students tested, scoring a level 5 and level 8 Grade 8: NA	Students will increase by one level.

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	Attendance, transition, and "buy-in"	1. Teachers, instructional paraprofessionals, and students will participate in scheduled data conferences.	Cindy Lowe Tammy Bombly Katie Vernon Keith Evans	Marion County Instructional Evaluation System Classroom Walk-through Lesson Plan Review Behavior Data Review Attendance	FAIR Test Successmaker Attendance Individual Education Plan

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:	Eighty-six percent of students will be proficient on the 2013 FCAT. Progress will be measured by increasing the number of students earning within three years proficiency in each grade level and sub-group based on the Developmental Scale Score. Students who have shown proficiency based on 2012 FCAT will maintain proficiency level or increase DSS by one grade level.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Grade 6: 14 students tested 0% (0) Grade 7: 19 students tested 5% (2) Grade 8: 20 students tested 0% (0)	Students will increase DSS by one grade level.

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	Attendance, transition, and "buy-in"	1. Teachers, instructional paraprofessionals, and students will participate in scheduled data conferences. 2. Students will participate in an articulation meeting to discuss Graduation Plan.	Cindy Lowe Tammy Bombly Katie Vernon Keith Evans	Marion County Instructional Evaluation System Staff Development Classroom Walk-through Lesson Plan Review Attendance Behavior Data	FAIR Test FCA Test Successmaker Attendance Behavior Data

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	Students taking Comparative Florida Alternate Assessment will increase by one level.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Grade 6: NA Grade 7: 2 students tested, scoring a level 5 and level 8 Grade 8: NA	Students taking Comparative Florida Alternate Assessment will increase by one level.

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	Attendance, transition, and "buy-in"	1. Teachers, instructional paraprofessionals, and students will participate in scheduled data conferences. 2. Students will participate in an articulation meeting to discuss Graduation Plan.	Cindy Lowe Tammy Bombly Katie Vernon Keith Evans	Marion County Instructional Evaluation System Staff Development Classroom Walk-through Lesson Plan Review Attendance	FAIR Test FCA Test Successmaker Attendance Behavior Data

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	Eighty-six percent of students will be proficient on the 2013 FCAT. Progress will be measured by increasing the number of students earning within three years proficiency in each grade level and sub-group based on the Developmental Scale Score. Students who have shown proficiency based on 2012 FCAT will maintain proficiency level or increase DSS by one grade level
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Grade 6: 14 students tested, 57% (8) matched 3%(1) Grade 7: 19 students tested, 84% (15) matched 15% (3) Grade 8: 20 students tested, 80% (15) matched 3% (1)	Students will increase DSS by one grade level.

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	Attendance, transition, and "buy-in"	1. Teachers, instructional paraprofessionals, and students will participate in scheduled data conferences.	Cindy Lowe Tammy Bombly Katie Vernon Keith Evans	Staff Development Classroom Walk-through Lesson Plan Review Attendance Behavior Plann	FAIR Test FCA Test Successmaker Attendance Behavior Plan
2	ESE students with emotional and behavioral issues who are working below grade level	1. Teachers will follow MCSD Focus Calendar as part of the Continuous Improvement Model. 2. Students in grades 3-7 will utilize the Successmaker Reading and Math Program. 3. Teachers will teach literacy in the content areas across all curriculums. 4. Tutor will provide individual and small group instructional support.	Cindy Lowe Tammy Bombly Katie Vernon	Staff Development Classroom Walk-through Lesson Plan Review	FAIR Test FCA Test Successmaker Individual Education Plan
3	ESE students needing Differentiated Instruction.	1. Teachers will enhance instruction through multi-modes to increase student engagement. 2. Teachers will use Thinking Map strategies.	Cindy Lowe Tammy Bombly Katie Vernon Emily Parker	Lesson Plans Classroom Walk-through	FCA Test Results Benchmark Test Results. Individual Education Plan

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:	Students taking Comparative Florida Alternate Assessment will increase by one level.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Grade 6: NA	

Grade 7: 2 students tested, scoring a level 5 and level 8
Grade 8: NA

Students taking Comparative Florida Alternate Assessment will increase by one level.

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	ESE students with emotional and behavioral issues who are working below grade level	1. Students in grades 3-7 will utilize the Successmaker Reading and Math Program. 2. Teachers will teach literacy in the content areas across all curriculums. 3. Tutor will provide individual and small group instructional support.	Cindy Lowe Tammy Bombly Katie Vernon Emily Parker	Staff Development Classroom Walk-through Lesson Plan Review	FAIR Test FCA Test Successmaker Individual Education Plan
2	ESE students needing Differentiated Instruction.	1. Teachers will enhance instruction through multi-modes to increase student engagement. 2. Teachers will use Thinking Map Strategies.	Cindy Lowe Tammy Bombly Katie Vernon Emily Parker	Staff Development Lesson Plans Classroom Walk-through	Individual Education Plan

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:	Eighty-six percent of students will be proficient on the 2013 FCAT. Progress will be measured by increasing the number of students earning within three years proficiency in each grade level and sub-group based on the Developmental Scale Score. Students who have shown proficiency based on 2012 FCAT will maintain proficiency level or increase DSS by one grade level
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Grade 6: 57% of students matched, 3% made gains Grade 7: 84% of students matched, 15% made gains Grade 8: 80% of students matched, 3% made gains	Students will increase DSS within 3 years of proficiency.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Attendance, transition, and "buy-in"	1. Teachers and students will participate in scheduled data conferences	Cindy Lowe Tammy Bombly Katie Vernon	Staff Development Classroom Walk-through Lesson Plan Review	FAIR Test FCA Test Successmaker
2	ESE students with emotional and behavioral issues who are working below grade level	1. Teachers will follow MCSD Focus Calendar as part of the Continuous Improvement Model. 2. Students in grades 3-7 will utilize the Successmaker Reading and Math Program. 3. Teachers will teach literacy in the content areas across all curriculums.	Cindy Lowe Tammy Bombly Katie Vernon	Staff Development Classroom Walk-through Lesson Plan Review	FAIR Test FCA Test Successmaker Individual Education Plan

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:	Eighty-six percent of students will be proficient on the 2013 FCAT. Progress will be measured by increasing the number of students earning within three years proficiency in each grade level and sub-group based on the Developmental Scale Score. Students who have shown proficiency based on 2012 FCAT will maintain proficiency level or increase DSS by one grade level.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Grade 6: 14 students tested 93% (13) Level 1, 7% (1) Level 3 Grade 7: 19 students tested 83% (10) Level 1, 12% (2) Level 2, 6% (1) Level 4 Grade 8: 20 students tested 90% (18) Level 1, 10% (2) Level 2 Total percent of SWD making gains 21%(4)	Students with Disabilities will increase DSS within 3 years of proficiency.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	ESE students with emotional and behavioral issues who are working near or below grade level.	1. Teachers will follow MCSD Focus Calendar as part of the Continuous Improvement Model. 2. Students in grades 3-7 will utilize the Successmaker Reading and Math Program. 3. Teachers will teach literacy in the content areas across all curriculums.	Cindy Lowe Tammy Bombly Katie Vernon Keith Evans	Staff Development Classroom Walk-through Lesson Plan Review	FAIR Test FCA Test Individual Education Plan

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:	Eighty-six percent of students will be proficient on the 2013 FCAT. Progress will be measured by increasing the number of students earning within three years proficiency in each grade level and sub-group based on the Developmental Scale Score. Students who have shown proficiency based on 2012 FCAT will maintain proficiency level or increase DSS by one grade level.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Grade 6: 14 students tested 90% (12) Level 1, 10% (2) Level 3 Grade 7: 19 students tested 82% (15) Level 1, 12% (2) Level 2, 6% (1) Level 4 Grade 8: 20 students tested 90% (18) Level 1, 10% (2) Level 2 Total percent of SWD making gains 21%(4)	Student proficiency rate will increase by ten percent.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students who are economically disadvantaged.	1. Kingsbury will coordinate with Title I to increase number of students enrolled in after school tutoring program SES	Tammy Bombly Beth Nelson	Number of Students enrolled at SES	FAIR Test Results FCA Test Results Benchmark Test Results

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (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. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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:

3. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percent of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	NA

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

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:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
No data reported	NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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 Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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%.	Algebra Goal #					
	NA					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	

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.	NA				
Algebra Goal #3B:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
No data reported.	NA				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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.	NA				
Algebra Goal #3C:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
No data reported.	NA				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
No data reported.	NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
No data reported	NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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 : <input type="text"/>				
Baseline data 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"/>

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
Thinking Maps	K-12	Emily Parker Anna Rooks	K-12 Content, Intensive, and Self-Contained ESE	August 14, October 16, and a PLC group every Thursday morning.	Lesson Plans, Evaluations	Principal and Assistant Principal

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Differentiated Instruction	Instructional Coach	Title I A	\$3,594.33
			Subtotal: \$3,594.33
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Individual or small group intensive instruction.	Tutor	Title I A	\$8,529.00
Instructional Coach and Resource Teacher	Instructional Coach	Title I A	\$14,377.00
			Subtotal: \$22,906.00
			Grand Total: \$26,500.33

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

** When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents next to the percentage (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. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2:			NA		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
NA			NA		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Biology 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 Biology. Biology Goal #1:			NA		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
NA			NA		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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 Biology. Biology Goal #2:			NA		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
NA			NA		

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

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

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

in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	On the 2013 FCAT Writes 60% of all students tested will achieve a 3.5 or above.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Grade 4: 11 students tested, 2.0 mean scale score Grade 8: 19 students tested, 2.2 mean scale score Grade 10: 18 students tested, 2.2 mean scale score	The mean scale score will increase to 3.5 for 60 percent of all students tested.

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	1. Students working below grade level 2. Attendance 3. Student "buy-in" 4. Student emotional and behavioral issues	1. Teachers will utilize Thinking Maps during classroom instruction. 2. Teachers will follow MCS D Demand Writes as part of the Continuous Improvement Model. 3. Teachers and students will participate in scheduled data conferences. 4. Students will participate in remediation and enrichment activities as part of an extended day.	Tammy Bombly	Demand Writes, Lesson Plan Review, IPDP	Demand Writes, 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 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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
Differentiated Instruction	Instructional Coach	Title I A	\$3,594.33
			Subtotal: \$3,594.33
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Instructional Support and student resource	Instructional Coach	Title I A	\$14,377.00
			Subtotal: \$14,377.00
			Grand Total: \$17,971.33

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:		N/A			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
N/A		N/A			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/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:

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics. Civics Goal #2:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Civics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Civics Goals

U.S. History 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 U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #1:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/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:

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History. U.S. History Goal #2:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

U.S. History 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 U.S. History EOC 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:	In 2011-2012, Kingsbury Academy exceeded the daily attendance goal of 80% with a rate of 81%. For 2012-2013, KBA will increase the daily attendance rate to 83%.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
During the 2011-2012 school year 81 percent of students enrolled attended daily.	Eighty-three percent of currently enrolled students will attend daily.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
One Hundred forty-three Students had Excessive Absences in the 2011-12 school year.	One Hundred students or less students will have Excessive Absences during the 2013 school year.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)

Four Students had Excessive Tardies in the 2011-12 school year.	Two Students or less will have Excessive Tardies in the 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	1. Parent Involvement 2. Students working below grade level 3. Students credit/unit deficient	1. Frequent Communication with Parents 2. Remediation 3. Thinking Maps 4. Credit/unit Recovery 5. Alert Now	Homeroom Teacher Therapist	Daily Attendance	Phone Logs, Credit/unit Recovery completion

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
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

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:		Reduce the number of Out-of-School Suspension to 100 and the number of students to 100.			
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions		2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions			
0		0			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School		2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School			
0		0			
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions		2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions			
Student Suspension Rates 2010-2011: 274 2011-2012: 144 OSS days while students were enrolled in KBA.		100			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School		2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School			
Student Suspension Rates 2010-2011: 74 2011-2012: 130 students that received OSS while enrolled at KBA (out of 402).		100			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Kingsbury Academy serves students placed in an alternative environment due to behavioral difficulties.	1. Targeted Aggression Control Training 2. Daily group therapy for secondary students. 4. School-wide behavior modification system. 4. Sight and sound supervision 5. Weekly parent contact. 6. RtI process to provide additional interventions as needed.	Dean of Students Principal Executive Director	Treatment Registers Behavior Data Graphs RtI packet Treatment team minute notes	Treatment Registers Behavior data tracking

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)

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Note: Required for High School - F.S., Sec. 1003.53

* 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. Dropout Prevention Dropout Prevention Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.</i>	Reduce the amount of student dropouts by 2% for the 2012-2013 school year.
2012 Current Dropout Rate:	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:
Approximately 10% (7 of 75) 1 student was coded as W05 (students 16+ who left voluntarily with no-intent to reenroll) 6 students were coded as W13 (withdrawn due to court action, not djj)	Approximately 10% (7 of 75)
2012 Current Graduation Rate:	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:

Approximately 82% (7 of 9)of seniors graduated.		Approximately 83% (10 of 12) of seniors will graduate.			
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	1. Kingsbury serves a transient population. 2. Students are credit deficient. 3. DJJ affiliation.	1. Offer Credit Recovery. 2. Provide Diploma Options for students.	Tammy Bombyly	Monitor student withdrawals	Data

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

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

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

Dropout Prevention 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 Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:

1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	To develop open healthy communication and parental involvement with a minimum of 75% of the parents whose students are involved with Kingsbury Academy as demonstrated by the response on the Parent Survey and participation in the quarterly Parent Activity Involvement Nights.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
Twenty percent of parents participated in Parent Activity Involvement Night.	Fifty Percent of parents will participate in Parent Activity Involvement Night.

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	Due to the economic hardship of many of our parents, many are unable to attend due to transportation difficulties and the location of our school in proximity to home addresses. Kingsbury Academy serves students county wide.	To develop open healthy communication and parental involvement with a minimum of 50% of the parents whose students are involved with Kingsbury Academy as demonstrated by the response on the Parent Survey and participation in the quarterly Parent Activity Involvement Nights.	Cindy Lowe Tammy Bombly	Review Attendance at Parent Parties. Document Parent attendance at IEP meetings. Review of provided feedback forms or surveys.	Parent contact logs Parent Survey Parent Participation

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
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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
Communication through newsletters and post cards	Stamps	Title I A	\$880.00
Provide opportunity for parents to be involved during school day and have lunch with the Principal.	Refreshments	Title I A	\$425.00
			Subtotal: \$1,305.00
			Grand Total: \$1,305.00

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			N/A		
STEM Goal #1:			N/A		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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:			N/A		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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
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 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	NA	NA	NA	\$0.00
CELLA	NA	NA	NA	\$0.00
Science	NA	NA	NA	\$0.00
Civics	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Attendance	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	NA	NA	NA	\$0.00
CELLA	NA	NA	NA	\$0.00
Science	NA	NA	NA	\$0.00
Civics	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Attendance	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Differentiated Instruction	Instructional Coach	Title I A	\$3,594.33
CELLA	NA	NA	NA	\$0.00
Mathematics	Differentiated Instruction	Instructional Coach	Title I A	\$3,594.33
Science	NA	NA	NA	\$0.00
Writing	Differentiated Instruction	Instructional Coach	Title I A	\$3,594.33
Civics	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Attendance	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$10,782.99
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Instructional Coach	Resource and classroom support for instruction	Title I A	\$14,377.00
CELLA	NA	NA	NA	\$0.00
Mathematics	Individual or small group intensive instruction.	Tutor	Title I A	\$8,529.00
Mathematics	Instructional Coach and Resource Teacher	Instructional Coach	Title I A	\$14,377.00
Writing	Instructional Support and student resource	Instructional Coach	Title I A	\$14,377.00
Civics	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Attendance	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Parent Involvement	Communication through newsletters and post cards	Stamps	Title I A	\$880.00
Parent Involvement	Provide opportunity for parents to be involved during school day and have lunch with the Principal.	Refreshments	Title I A	\$425.00
				Subtotal: \$52,965.00
				Grand Total: \$63,747.99

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

<input type="radio"/> Priority	<input type="radio"/> Focus	<input type="radio"/> Prevent	<input type="radio"/> 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 9/7/2012)

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.



No. Disagree with the above statement.

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

Kingsbury Academy will invite staff, parents and community members to participate in our SAC during registration, orientation, and parent activities nights. In addition we will work to adhere to SAC by-laws.

Kingsbury Academy School Advisory Council
By-Laws

ARTICLE I: NAME

The name of this organization shall be the Kingsbury Academy School Advisory Council

ARTICLE II: PURPOSE

The Kingsbury Academy School Advisory Council is established to:

- Perform the duties mandated for school advisory councils in the statues of the State of Florida
- Provide members of Kingsbury Academy (parents, students, teachers, and educational support employees) and the community the opportunity to give input to the school improvement process to include evaluation of data to develop the SIP, and evaluation of the SIP
- To act as a forum for discussion on issues important to the school

ARTICLE III: MEMBERSHIP

The selection for membership to the Kingsbury Academy SAC is offered to every parent whose child is enrolled at Kingsbury. A survey is completed upon admission and all parents who document their interest in the SAC are invited to the first meeting. Appointment to the SAC is made after parents attend 2 SAC meetings as voting members.

ARTICLE IV. ELIGIBILITY

Kingsbury Academy SAC shall be comprised of the principal, student services coordinator, students on executive status, parents, teachers, educational support employees and interested members of the community. All interested persons are eligible for consideration for membership to the advisory council

SECTION 2: DUTIES

The School Advisory Council shall perform the following duties:

- Assist in the preparation and evaluation of and approve the annual School Improvement Plan required by Section 230.23 (16), Florida Statutes.
- Define adequate progress for the school and for each school goal in the School Improvement Plan.
- Provide input into the budget for school improvement at Kingsbury Academy
- Perform those functions as prescribed in the School Improvement Plan
- Provide notice, meet, and maintain minutes of meetings in accordance with Florida Statute 286.011.
- Review reports regarding the performance of students and educational programs.

SECTION 3: COUNCIL SIZE and COMPOSITION

The intent of the Kingsbury Academy SAC is that all interested personas shall be allowed to serve on the Advisory Council with the following restrictions.

- a. A majority (greater than 50%) of the members of the council must be persons not employed by the school
- b. The SAC must be representative of the ethnic, racial and economic make-up of the community served by the school
- c. The Advisory Council will have a minimum of 10 members
- d. The principal shall be a permanent member, but may not serve as Chair
- e. A minimum of two students who have achieved Executive Status will be Advisory Council Members
- f. Membership may include Business partnerships

SECTION 4: NOMINATION AND ELECTION

- A. Prospective members shall be selected based on their expressed interest in participating in the SAC as demonstrated on the admission survey and attendance
- B. Members must attend 2 meetings to have voting privileges and become members
- C. Students must have achieved Executive Status to be recommended to attend
- D. Teachers will be selected based on their availability during the meeting time so not to take away time from the students
- E. Community members are invited based on their interaction with the students, staff and services at Kingsbury Academy
- F. The Business Partner shall be identified based on interest from the community.
- G. The names of the newly elected members will be forwarded to the School Board for approval and documented on the SIP website.

SECTION 5: TERM OF MEMBERSHIP

- A. The term of office shall be one year. A member may serve no more that four consecutive terms
- B. A member must attend at least 2 consecutive meetings during the year
- C. Any member may resign from the Advisory Council upon written notice to the Chair
- D. A member may be terminated by two-thirds vote of the Advisory Council

Grounds for termination may include:

- Conduct unbecoming a member
- Actions prejudicial to the school or council
- Lack of attendance when the member has missed two unexcused consecutive absences.

SECTION 6: VOTING PRIVILEGES

Each elected member of the council shall be entitled to one vote

SECTION 7: VACANCIES

Vacancies caused by termination shall be filled by the Chair who will appoint a replacement member from the same peer group. The appointee shall serve for the remainder of the term.

ARTICLE IV: OFFICERS

SECTION I. OFFICES

The Advisory Council shall have a Chair, Vice-Chair and a Secretary

SECTION II: ELECTION

Officers shall be nominated and elected by the School Advisory Council at the first regular meeting in September.

SECTION 3: TERMS

Officers shall serve for a term of one year. Any officer may be re-elected to the same office as long as he/she is a member in good standing of the Advisory Council.

SECTION 4: DUTIES

A. Chair:

- Preside at all meetings of the School Advisory Council utilizing Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised.
- Appoint persons to fill vacancies
- Appoint special committees as needed for the running of the Advisory Council
- Sign documents on behalf of the Advisory Council
- See that all orders and resolutions of the Advisory Council are implemented
- Meet with the Principal regarding the agenda

B. Vice-Chair:

- Perform the duties of the Chair in his/her absence

C. Secretary:

- Communicate with non-school members (by telephone, mail or email) prior to meetings
- Keep all records and minutes of the Advisory Council and see that they are distributed to all council members
- Send notice of meetings
- Prepare the agenda

ARTICLE V. COMMITTEES

The Chair, with the Advisory Council Approval, may appoint members to committees to perform special functions. The committees will automatically dissolve at the end of the Advisory Council Term or when their task is completed, whichever comes first.

ARTICLE VI: MEETINGS

All meetings of the Kingsbury Academy School Advisory Committee shall be open to the public. Notice of the meetings to the school community shall be give at least three school days prior to the meetings. Notification shall be sent to all parents in the school newsletter that is distributed in the mail with report cards. Each meeting shall have an agenda, minutes will be recorded and a sign-in sheet of those present will be kept.

SECTION 1: REGULAR MEETINGS

The School Advisory Council shall meet a minimum of 4 times per year. A School Advisory Council meeting call by the Principal shall be held during the first 45 days of the new school year. The SAC shall meet prior to the Parent Night in an effort to have more parental attendance. The dates are: August 21st 11:30, October 23, 4:30, January 13, 4:30, March 26th 4:30 and May 21st 11:30 unless there is a conflict with the school calendar. The regular meeting schedule may be changed as long as notice is given to all Advisory Council members and the school community.

SECTION 2: SPECIAL MEETINGS

Special meetings of the SAC may be called by:

- Principal
- The Chair
- A minimum of three members

SECTION 3: QUORUM

At any regular or duly called special meeting a quorum shall consist of a majority of members. Membership shall be established at the 2nd meeting and non attending members withdrawn from the list.

ARTICLE VII: RATIFICATION AND AMENDMENTS

These bylaws may be adopted, amended or revised by a 2/3 vote of the members present at a regular meeting providing the notice of the meeting contains the ext of the proposed revision. Proposed revisions should be submitted in writing to the Chair at least 15 days prior to the next scheduled regular meeting.

ARTICLE VIII: PARLIMENTARY PROCEDURE

The current edition of the Robert's Rules of Order Revised Edition shall be the final source of authority in all questions of parliamentary procedure.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
NA	\$0.00

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

School Advisory Council will meet 4 times during the school year. The meetings will discuss the implementation of the SIP, PIP, DA, review of Restructuring progress and review of overall program implementation.

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