

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

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

School Name: TAYLOR RANCH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Sarasota

Principal: Dr. Bill Bolander

SAC Chair: Shawn Singeisen

Superintendent: Lori White

Date of School Board Approval: November 20, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/10/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Dr. Bill Bolander	EdD Educational Leadership School Principal		23	2011-2012 Performance Data: School Grade: A AYP Criteria Met: na Reading Proficiency: 76% Math Proficiency: 72% Writing Proficiency: 93% Science Mastery: 71% 71% demonstrated learning gains in reading 78% demonstrated learning gains in math 68% of lowest 25% demonstrated learning gains in reading 69% of lowest 25% demonstrated learning gains in math 44% Free and Reduced

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)
N/A	N/A				

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	Meeting with new teachers (ESE) throughout the school year	Principal	On-going	
2	Partnering our new teacher (ESE) with a SCIP mentor	Principal	On-going	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
No data submitted	

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
43	9.3%(4)	9.3%(4)	48.8%(21)	32.6%(14)	83.7%(36)	0.0%(0)	2.3%(1)	2.3%(1)	69.8%(30)

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
			SCIP District Mentoring Program - Assist level one teacher with first day school routines and procedures. Familiarize teacher with the teacher performance appraisal system (TES/PRIDE).

Dr. Marilyn Meub	Meghan Levick	Best Match	Assist with the development of effective lesson plans, classroom rules/procedures, and parent communication. Meet and discuss best practices in the area of instruction and learning throughout the 2012-13 school year.
Dr. Marilyn Meub	Amy Patterson	Best Match	SCIP District Mentoring Program - Assist level one teacher with first day school routines and procedures. Familiarize teacher with the teacher performance appraisal system (TES/PRIDE). Assist with the development of effective lesson plans, classroom rules/procedures, and parent communication. Meet and discuss best practices in the area of instruction and learning throughout the 2012-13 school year.
Jackie Detert	Rachel Garvin	Best Match	SCIP District Mentoring Program - Assist level one teacher with first day school routines and procedures. Familiarize teacher with the teacher performance appraisal system (TES/PRIDE). Assist with the development of effective lesson plans, classroom rules/procedures, and parent communication. Meet and discuss best practices in the area of instruction and learning throughout the 2012-13 school year.
Tracey Cardenas	Amanda Goode	Similar grades taught	SCIP District Mentoring Program - Assist level one teacher with first day school routines and procedures. Familiarize teacher with the teacher performance appraisal system (TES/PRIDE). Assist with the development of effective lesson plans, classroom rules/procedures, and parent communication. Meet and discuss best practices in the area of instruction and learning throughout the 2012-13 school year.

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 C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

At Taylor Ranch School the RtI Leadership Team is comprised of the following individuals:

Principal - Dr. Bill Bolander

Assistant Principal Intern - Dr. Lisa Cline

School Counselor - Amanda Porvaznik
Social Worker - Stephanie Burger
School Psychologist - Larry Beck
ESE Liaison - Michele Archer
Speech/Language Pathologist - Therese Kosary

Describe how the school-based MTSS Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?

The RtI Leadership team meets once a week to participate in the following discussions:

- review summative and formative data to identify school, grade, team, and class level academic needs.
- individual student information. Based on the data review, instructional strategies will be identified and a timeline of implementation will be constructed.
- student progress will be monitored and individual cases reviewed to determine progress and reassess further instructional interventions.

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 school-based RTI Leadership Team will utilize input from grade level teams, SAC and district teams comprised of specialists in the areas of instructional need for the development and implementation of the SIP.

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.

Our school uses a variety of reports produced by the District Office of Research, Assessment and Evaluation on the academic achievement of students at all Tiers.
In addition to the above we will also use disaggregated AMO subgroup data for Reading, Mathematics, Science and Writing. We will examine the FAIR Reading data as well as SM4 Reading and Mathematics data.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

We will review the RtI module from the District with staff. Administration will visit grade level CPT's to discuss updates and provide on-going professional development in the area of research based strategies.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

A substitute will be provided to allow the teachers of the students under review to be present at all meetings.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) is made up of classroom teachers who represent each grade level, team, or specials area and administration.

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

The Literacy Leadership Team identifies and discusses best practices in the area of reading instruction. The information that is gathered and discussed is then shared out to the SAC committee, team leaders, and grade level teams. This team includes: Dr. Bill Bolander, Dr. Lisa Cline, Kaye Bodily, Nathan Figueroa, Aimee Duzs, Gretchen Eidelbus, Courtney Francese, Allison Chunco, and Amanda Goode.

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

One major initiative for the Literacy Leadership Team this school year will be to promote Literacy in all classrooms as well as homes. The team will communicate with teachers and families, throughout the year, providing strategies and resources to encourage reading. Teachers will do a book study on Text Complexity: Raising Rigor in Reading, by Fisher, Frey and Lapp. This book study will translate in the classroom as teachers expecting students to read, interpret and write in response to material of higher text complexity in preparation for the new Common Core Standards.

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.

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (at identified level). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (at identified level).
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28%(101)	32%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Insufficient supports in place to provide early intervention for struggling students.	Increase use of data to progress monitor students at all grade levels. Restructure the SuccessMaker time and use of SM data to provide appropriate Tier II interventions.	SWST Assistant Prin. Principal CPT Leaders	Strategic use of FAIR and SM data, also with other diagnostic tests.	FAIR and SM reports. SWST weekly log.
2	Students struggling with the increased demand to read and understand more complex text.	Provide PD for teachers on text complexity by doing a book study and encouraging teachers to attend text complexity trainings.	Principal CPT Leaders	Monthly meetings with team leaders to discuss the book related activities each team is doing.	Text Complexity Lesson Plans FCAT results

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (at identified level). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (at identified level).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
47%(170)	49%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Insufficient supports in place to provide early intervention for struggling students.	Increase use of data to progress monitor students at all grade levels. Restructure the SuccessMaker time and use of SM data to provide appropriate Tier II interventions. Contract with reading specialist to provide Tier III interventions where needed.	SWST Assistant Prin. Principal CPT Leaders	Strategic use of FAIR and SM data, also with other diagnostic tests.	FAIR and SM reports. SWST weekly log.
2	Students struggling with the increased demand to read and understand more complex text.	Provide PD for teachers on text complexity by doing a book study and encouraging teachers to attend text complexity trainings.	Principal CPT Leaders	Monthly meetings with team leaders to discuss the book related activities each team is doing.	Text Complexity Lesson Plans FCAT 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:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
68%(149)	72%

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	Insufficient supports in place to provide early intervention for struggling students.	Increase use of data to progress monitor students at all grade levels. Restructure the SuccessMaker time and use of SM data to provide appropriate Tier II interventions. Contract with reading specialist to provide Tier III interventions where needed.	SWST Assistant Prin. Principal CPT Leaders	Strategic use of FAIR and SM data, also with other diagnostic tests.	FAIR and SM reports. SWST weekly log.
2	Students struggling with the increased demand to read and understand more complex text.	Provide PD for teachers on text complexity by doing a book study and encouraging teachers to attend text complexity trainings.	Principal CPT Leaders	Monthly meetings with team leaders to discuss the book related activities each team is doing.	Text Complexity Lesson Plans FCAT 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:

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase in the number of students demonstrating a learning gain in the lowest quartile.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
66%(40)	70%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Insufficient supports in place to provide early intervention for struggling students.	Increase use of data to progress monitor students at all grade levels. Restructure the SuccessMaker time and use of SM data to provide appropriate Tier II interventions. Contract with reading specialist to provide Tier III interventions where needed.	SWST Assistant Prin. Principal CPT Leaders	Strategic use of FAIR and SM data, also with other diagnostic tests.	FAIR and SM reports. SWST weekly log.
2	Students struggling with the increased demand to read and understand more complex text.	Provide PD for teachers on text complexity by doing a book study and encouraging teachers to attend text complexity trainings.	Principal CPT Leaders	Monthly meetings with team leaders to discuss the book related activities each team is doing.	Text Complexity Lesson Plans FCAT results

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 #					
	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your school's total population for SY 2012-2013 and the 5 year projection (2016-2017) is					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	80	82	84	85	87	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White 75%(238) Hispanic 83%(14)	White 83% Hispanic 81% Exceeded AMO Target

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	Insufficient supports in place to provide early intervention for struggling students.	Increase use of data to progress monitor students at all grade levels. Restructure the SuccessMaker time and use of SM data to provide appropriate Tier II interventions. Contract with reading specialist to provide Tier III interventions where needed.	SWST Assistant Prin. Principal CPT Leaders	Strategic use of FAIR and SM data, also with other diagnostic tests.	FAIR and SM reports. SWST weekly log.
2	Students struggling with the increased demand to read and understand more complex text.	Provide PD for teachers on text complexity by doing a book study and encouraging teachers to attend text complexity trainings.	Principal CPT Leaders	Monthly meetings with team leaders to discuss the book related activities each team is doing.	Text Complexity Lesson Plans FCAT 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:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
47%	69%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Insufficient supports in place to provide early intervention for struggling students.	Increase use of data to progress monitor students at all grade levels. Restructure the SuccessMaker time and use of SM data to provide appropriate Tier II interventions. Contract with reading specialist to provide Tier III interventions where needed.	SWST Assistant Prin. Principal ESOL Aide and Liaison	Strategic use of FAIR and SM data, also with other diagnostic tests.	FAIR and SM reports. SWST weekly log. CELLA testing.

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

40%						48%
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					
2	Insufficient supports in place to provide early intervention for struggling students.	Increase use of data to progress monitor students at all grade levels. Restructure the SuccessMaker time and use of SM data to provide appropriate Tier II interventions. Contract with reading specialist to provide Tier III interventions where needed.	SWST Assistant Prin. Principal CPT Leaders	Strategic use of FAIR and SM data, also with other diagnostic tests.	FAIR and SM reports. SWST weekly log.	
3	Students struggling with the increased demand to read and understand more complex text.	Provide PD for teachers on text complexity by doing a book study and encouraging teachers to attend text complexity trainings	Principal CPT Leaders	Monthly meetings with team leaders to discuss the book related activities each team is doing.	Text Complexity Lesson Plans FCAT 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:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-2013 to 2016-2017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
69%	78%

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	Insufficient supports in place to provide early intervention for struggling students.	Increase use of data to progress monitor students at all grade levels. Restructure the SuccessMaker time and use of SM data to provide appropriate Tier II interventions. Contract with reading specialist to provide Tier III interventions where needed.	SWST Assistant Prin. Principal CPT Leaders	Strategic use of FAIR and SM data, also with other diagnostic tests.	FAIR and SM reports. SWST weekly log.	
2	Students struggling with the increased demand to read and understand more complex text.	Provide PD for teachers on text complexity by doing a book study and encouraging teachers to attend text complexity trainings.	Principal CPT Leaders	Monthly meetings with team leaders to discuss the book related activities each team is doing.	Text Complexity Lesson Plans FCAT results	

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core Integration	K-5	Reading Committee Principal	K-5 Grade Level Teams	Throughout the 2012-13 School Year	CPT Agendas and Minutes FAC Meetings	Principal
Text Complexity: Raising Rigor in Reading - Book Study	K-5	Team Leaders Principal	K-5 Grade Level Teams	Throughout the 2012-13 School year	CPT Feedback FAC Meetings	Principal

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Improve staff's understanding of text complexity by doing a book study	Text Complexity: Raising Rigor in Reading	Renaissance	\$920.00
			Subtotal: \$920.00
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: \$920.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.	

CELLA Goal #1:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2. Students scoring proficient in reading.

CELLA Goal #2:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

CELLA Budget:

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for Level 3 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 3 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
--	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 3 - 32% (114) Level 3,4,5 - 72%(258)	Level 3 - 34% Level 3,4,5 - 74%

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	Changing standards has created additional gaps in knowledge for many students.	Increase differentiation especially including hands-on, inquiry lessons and flexible grouping with guided instruction.	Classroom Teachers	Classroom Observations by Principal	PRIDE Observation Forms
2	Lower performing students lack automaticity with regard to basic math facts.	Develop or purchase a system (Rocket Math) designed to build automaticity of math facts by using structured practice and explicit timing, and connect this program to a school-wide recognition program.	Principal Math Leadership Team Classroom Teachers	Program data monitoring piece	Student progress charts FCAT results
3	Lack of math enrichment activities to motivate extended learning	Increase use of SuccessMaker during extend math time.	Assistant Principal Classroom Teachers	SuccessMaker data analyzed to check for growth beyond the grade level targets	SM reports FCAT Level 4 and 5 performance.

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a one percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 4,5 - 40% (144) Level 3,4,5 - 72% (258)	Level 4,5 - 42% Level 3,4,5 - 74%

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	Changing standards has created additional gaps in knowledge for many students.	Increase differentiation especially including hands-on, inquiry lessons and flexible grouping with guided instruction.	Classroom Teachers	Classroom Observations by Principal	PRIDE Observation Forms
2	Students lack automaticity with regard to basic math facts.	Develop or purchase a system (Rocket Math) designed to build automaticity of math facts by using structured practice and explicit timing, and connect this program to a school-wide recognition program.	Principal Math Leadership Team Classroom Teachers	Program data monitoring piece	Student progress charts FCAT results
3	Lack of math enrichment activities to motivate extended learning	Increase use of SuccessMaker during extend math time.	Assistant Principal Classroom Teachers	SuccessMaker data analyzed to check for growth beyond the grade level targets	SM reports FCAT Level 4 and 5 performance.

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
76% (166)	78%

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	Same as above.				
2	Changing standards has created additional gaps in knowledge for many students.	Increase differentiation especially including hands-on, inquiry lessons and flexible grouping with guided instruction.	Classroom Teachers	Classroom Observations by Principal	PRIDE Observation Forms
3	Lower performing students lack automaticity with regard to basic math facts.	Develop or purchase a system (Rocket Math) designed to build automaticity of math facts by using structured practice and explicit timing, and connect this program to a school-wide recognition program.	Principal Math Leadership Team Classroom Teachers	Program data monitoring piece	Student progress charts FCAT results
4	Lack of math enrichment activities to motivate extended learning	Increase use of SuccessMaker during extend math time.	Assistant Principal Classroom Teachers	SuccessMaker data analyzed to check for growth beyond the grade level targets	SM reports FCAT Level 4 and 5 performance

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	F.By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase in the number of students demonstrating a learning gain in the lowest quartile.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
70%(39)	74%

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	Same as above.				
2	Changing standards has created additional gaps in knowledge for many students.	Increase differentiation especially including hands-on, inquiry lessons and flexible grouping with guided instruction.	Classroom Teachers	Classroom Observations by Principal	PRIDE Observation Forms
3	Lower performing students lack automaticity with regard to basic math facts.	Develop or purchase a system (Rocket Math) designed to build automaticity of math facts by using structured practice and explicit timing, and connect this program to a school-wide recognition program.	Principal Math Leadership Team Classroom Teachers	Program data monitoring piece	Student progress charts FCAT results
4	Lack of math enrichment activities to motivate extended learning	Increase use of SuccessMaker during extend math time.	Assistant Principal Classroom Teachers	SuccessMaker data analyzed to check for growth beyond the grade level targets	SM reports FCAT Level 4 and 5 performance.

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 #					
	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your school's total population for SY 2012-2013 and the 5 year project ion (2016-2017) is					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	75	78	80	82	84	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Hispanic 79% White 72%	Hispanic 74% Exceeded AMO Target White 78%

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				
2	Changing standards has created additional gaps in knowledge for many students.	Increase differentiation especially including hands-on, inquiry lessons and flexible grouping with guided instruction.	Classroom Teachers	Classroom Observations by Principal	PRIDE Observation Forms
3	Lower performing students lack automaticity with regard to basic math facts.	Develop or purchase a system (Rocket Math) designed to build automaticity of math facts by using structured practice and explicit timing, and connect this program to a school-wide recognition program.	Principal Math Leadership Team Classroom Teachers	Program data monitoring piece	Student progress charts FCAT results
4	Lack of math enrichment activities to motivate extended learning	Increase use of SuccessMaker during extend math time.	Assistant Principal Classroom Teachers	SuccessMaker data analyzed to check for growth beyond the grade level targets	SM reports FCAT Level 4 and 5 performance.

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67%	69%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A				
2	Changing standards has created additional gaps in knowledge for many students.	Increase differentiation especially including hands-on, inquiry lessons and flexible grouping with	Classroom Teachers	Classroom Observations by Principal	PRIDE Observation Forms

		guided instruction.			
3	Lower performing students lack automaticity with regard to basic math facts.	Develop or purchase a system (Rocket Math) designed to build automaticity of math facts by using structured practice and explicit timing, and connect this program to a school-wide recognition program.	Principal Math Leadership Team Classroom Teachers	Program data monitoring piece	Student progress charts FCAT results
4	Lack of math enrichment activities to motivate extended learning	Increase use of SuccessMaker during extend math time.	Assistant Principal Classroom Teachers	SuccessMaker data analyzed to check for growth beyond the grade level targets	SM reports FCAT Level 4 and 5 performance.

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
35%	58%

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				
2	Changing standards has created additional gaps in knowledge for many students.	Increase differentiation especially including hands-on, inquiry lessons and flexible grouping with guided instruction.	Classroom Teachers	Classroom Observations by Principal	PRIDE Observation Forms
3	Lower performing students lack automaticity with regard to basic math facts.	Develop or purchase a system (Rocket Math) designed to build automaticity of math facts by using structured practice and explicit timing, and connect this program to a school-wide recognition program.	Principal Math Leadership Team Classroom Teachers	Program data monitoring piece	Student progress charts FCAT results
4	Lack of math enrichment activities to motivate extended learning	Increase use of SuccessMaker during extend math time.	Assistant Principal Classroom Teachers	SuccessMaker data analyzed to check for growth beyond the grade level targets	SM reports FCAT Level 4 and 5 performance.

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

66%		73%			
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	Same as above.				
2	Changing standards has created additional gaps in knowledge for many students.	Increase differentiation especially including hands-on, inquiry lessons and flexible grouping with guided instruction.	Classroom Teachers	Classroom Observations by Principal	PRIDE Observation Forms
3	Lower performing students lack automaticity with regard to basic math facts.	Develop or purchase a system (Rocket Math) designed to build automaticity of math facts by using structured practice and explicit timing, and connect this program to a school-wide recognition program.	Principal Math Leadership Team Classroom Teachers	Program data monitoring piece	Student progress charts FCAT results
4	Lack of math enrichment activities to motivate extended learning	Increase use of SuccessMaker during extend math time.	Assistant Principal Classroom Teachers	SuccessMaker data analyzed to check for growth beyond the grade level targets	SM reports FCAT Level 4 and 5 performance.

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Math facts automaticity program	K-5	Principal	All teachers	October 2012	Monthly CPT Meetings Observation of progress monitoring tools in classrooms	Principal Math Committee

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
To improve automaticity of basic math facts through a strategy of explicit timing and focused practice.	Rocket Math program will be tailored to our school.	School Advisory Council Funds	\$700.00
Subtotal:			\$700.00
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: \$700.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5) Any subgroup that is 90% or higher can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 3 - 40%(55) Level 3,4,5 - 71%(97)	Level 3 - 44% Level 3,4,5 - 73%

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	Difficulty in reading and comprehending the text complexity of science text.	Training teachers to better understand text complexity and how to scaffold the teaching of strategies to comprehend complex text by doing a book study on Text Complexity: Raising Rigor in Reading.	Principal Reading Committee CPT Leaders	Quality of lessons designed by teams during CPT	FCAT results Classroom observations

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

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

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5) Any subgroup that is 90% or higher can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 4,5 - 31%(42) Level 3,4,5 - 71%(97)	Level 4,5 - 35% Level 3,4,5 - 73%

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	Same as above.				
2	Difficulty in reading and comprehending the text complexity of science text.	Training teachers to better understand text complexity and how to scaffold the teaching of strategies to comprehend complex text by doing a book study on Text Complexity: Raising Rigor in Reading.	Principal Reading Committee CPT Leaders	Quality of lessons designed by teams during CPT	FCAT results Classroom observations

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

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

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Text Complexity: Raising Rigor in Reading - Book Study	K-5	Team Leaders Principal	K-5 Grade Level Teams	Throughout the 2012-13 School year	CPT Feedback FAC Meetings	Principal

Science Budget:

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 75% are currently demonstrating 3.0 or higher on the writing essay. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 75% or more are currently demonstrating 3.0 or higher on the writing essay. Any subgroup that is 90% or higher must maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
92%(92)	92%

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	It is difficult to maintain high performance.	Continue to focus on school-wide writing prompts. Display samples of student work in the media center.	Nathan Figueroa	Analysis of student work.	School-wide and district-wide writing prompts.
2	There is a new emphasis on mechanics and detail in the FCAT Writing.	Develop a systematic approach to writing K-5 to provide a scaffolding of skills building toward the competency level of students at grade 4. This process will be supported by using district level consultants to provide trainings specific to each grade level.	Principal District Consultants Writing Committee	Analysis of student work CPT notes Classroom observations	School-wide and district-wide writing prompts. FCAT Writes

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:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 75% are currently demonstrating 4.0 or higher on the writing essay. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 75% or more are currently demonstrating 4.0 or higher on the writing essay. Any subgroup that is 90% or higher must maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
58%(58)	62%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

No Data Submitted

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Text Complexity: Raising Rigor in Reading - Book Study	K-5	Team Leaders Principal	K-5 Grade Level Teams	Throughout the 2012-13 School year	CPT Feedback FAC Meetings	Principal
Writing Training in Systematic approach to FCAT Writes and PARCC	K-5	District level writing consultants	K-5 Teachers	Throughout the 2012-13 School Year	CPT Feedback on Writing Prompts Classroom Observation	Principal Writing Committee

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
	Attendance Goal - Rate For the attendance year 2012-2013, the attendance rate will increase. If the current attendance rate is less than

1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	90%, there will be a minimum of a 4 percentage point increase. If the attendance rate is 90% or higher, there will be a minimum of a 2 percentage point increase. Attendance Goal - Absences By the year 2013, there will be a decrease of students who are absent ten or more days. When 40% or more of the students have ten or more absences annually, there will be a minimum of a 4 percentage point decrease. If less than 40% of the students have ten or more absences annually, there will be a minimum of a 2 percentage point decrease. Attendance Goal - Tardy By the year 2013, there will be a decrease of students who are Tardy ten or more days. When 40% or more of the students have ten or more Tardies annually, there will be a minimum of a 4 percentage point decrease. If less than 40% of the students have ten or more Tardies annually, there will be a minimum of a 2 percentage point decrease.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
95% (677/713)	97%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
239	225
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
107	93

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	Large number of students being brought to school by parents	Daily phone messages to parents of absent students Periodic meetings with Attendance Worker and Registrar	Principal SWST	Review of Attendance Reports	Daily Attendance Records

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	By the year 2013, there will be a reduction of referrals from the previous year. If the current percentage of referrals is 10% or less, the school will maintain or decrease the percentage. If the current percentage is between 11-49%, the school will reduce the percentage by 5%. If the current percentage is 50% or higher than the previous year, the school will reduce the percentage by 10%.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
9	9
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
8	8
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
19	19

2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School				
14	14				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Compared to the district data, our school's percentage of suspensions (28) is relatively low. This amount is difficult to maintain or decrease.	Revamp of Positive Behavior Support Initiative including school-wide recognition for students demonstrating STAR behavior. Individual Behavior plans/contracts when needed	Principal PBS Committee	Decreased suspension rate	Discipline Records

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
Improve school climate and student behavior by enhancing our positive behavior program to incorporate academic areas and focused behavior recognitions.	A variety of food and merchandise items that students can purchase with the token tender they earn through academic and behavior rewards.	PTO and various school fundraisers	\$5,000.00
			Subtotal: \$5,000.00
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: \$5,000.00

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	There will be an increased involvement of parents and other community members in the development and implementation of a special week of activity in the area of Reading during the month of October.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
Over 3500 volunteer hours were reported in support areas (i.e. field trips, school events, Boosters, SAC, etc.).	We expect an increase in volunteer hours reported for the 2012-2013 school year.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Getting information to as many stakeholders as possible.	Trailblazer newsletter will be on the school's Web site and also available in print form when requested. Principal Blog on Web site. Regular Connect-ed Messages Monthly Boosters Meetings Monthly SAC Meetings Events and Information posted on the school's Marquee	Principal	Attendance at Special Events	Report of Volunteer hours from the PALS office Climate Surveys

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:				
1. STEM				
STEM Goal #1:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

N/A Goal:

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

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

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

Budget:

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

End of N/A Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Improve staff's understanding of text complexity by doing a book study	Text Complexity: Raising Rigor in Reading	Renaissance	\$920.00
Mathematics	To improve automaticity of basic math facts through a strategy of explicit timing and focused practice.	Rocket Math program will be tailored to our school.	School Advisory Council Funds	\$700.00
Suspension	Improve school climate and student behavior by enhancing our positive behavior program to incorporate academic areas and focused behavior recognitions.	A variety of food and merchandise items that students can purchase with the token tender they earn through academic and behavior rewards.	PTO and various school fundraisers	\$5,000.00
				Subtotal: \$6,620.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
				Grand Total: \$6,620.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 9/24/2012)

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

We are currently searching for one parent and community partner.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
Math Automaticity Program	\$1,000.00
Teacher special projects and transportation	\$5,000.00

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

SAC will consider a variety of teacher requests to fund special projects and transportation. The committee will provide active support for school-wide initiatives in math and reading/writing.

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

Sarasota School District TAYLOR RANCH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	92%	90%	89%	80%	351	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	70%	67%			137	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	70% (YES)	67% (YES)			137	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					625	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Sarasota School District TAYLOR RANCH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	90%	90%	91%	72%	343	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	69%	67%			136	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	68% (YES)	65% (YES)			133	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					612	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested