FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: TEMPLE TERRACE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Hillsborough

Principal: Carol K Brown

SAC Chair: Tammy Srom and Lauren White

Superintendent: MaryEllen Elia

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 12/20/2012

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	Carol Kay Brown	BA K-6 MA Leadership ESOL	12	7	2011-12:C 2010-11:C 79% AYP 2009-10:A 95% AYP 2008-09:A 100% AYP
Assis Principal	Jennifer Slade	BA K-6 MA Leadership	2	2	2011-12:C 2010-11:C 79% AYP 2009-10:A 95% AYP (Sykes Elementary) 2008-09:A 100% AYP (Sykes Elementary)

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.

			# of	# of Years as	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Years at Current School	an Instructional Coach	Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Janet Mistretta	Elementary Ed (K-6) ESOL	6	4	2011-12:C 2010-11:C 79% AYP 2009-10:A 95% AYP 2008-09:A 100% AYP
Reading Coach	Joy Gaillard	Elementary Ed (K-6)	1	5	
Writing	Dr. Latricia McCoy	Elementary Ed (K-6)	5	3	2011-12:C 2010-11:C 79% AYP 2009-10:A 95% AYP 2008-09:A 100% AYP
Math	Lakeisha Dupree	Elementary Ed (K-6) ESOL	5	1	2011-12:C 2010-11:C 79% AYP 2009-10:A 95% AYP 2008-09:A 100% AYP

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	Teacher Interview Day	Prinicipal Asst. Principal	June	
2	District Mentor Program	District Mentors	Ongoing	
3	District Peer Program	District Peers	Ongoing	
4	School Based Teacher Recognition	Principal Asst. Principal	Ongoing	
5	Opportunities for Teacher Leadership	Principal Asst. Principal	Ongoing	
6	Regular Time for Teacher Collaboration	Principal Asst. Principal	Ongoing	

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
Teachers * 4 out of field	Depending on the needs of the teacher, one or more of the following strategies are implemented. Administrators Meet with the teachers four times per year to discuss progress on: • Waiting for arrival of certification • Completing classes need for certification • Provide substitute coverage for the teachers to observe other teachers • Discussion of what teachers learned during the observation(s) Academic Coach • The coach co-plans, models, co-teaches, observes and conferences with the teacher on a

	regular basis PLC/ instructional coach • The teachers will attend PLC meetings for on-going adult learning, striving to understand how they as an individual teacher and PLC member can improve learning for all.

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
59	6.8%(4)	30.5%(18)	40.7%(24)	22.0%(13)	33.9%(20)	93.2%(55)	1.7%(1)	3.4%(2)	64.4%(38)

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
Catherine Reed	Mandy Sierra Brianna Rich Jessica Ely Katherine Gramentz Alexandra Hertenstein	The district-based mentor is with the EET initiative. The mentor has strengths in the areas of leadership, mentoring, and increasing student achievement.	Weekly visits to include modeling, co-teaching, analyzing student work/data, developing assessments, conferencing and problem solving.

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

Services are provided to ensure students who need additional remediation are provided support through: after school and summer programs, quality teachers through professional development, content resource teachers, and mentors.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

The district receives funds to support the Alternative Education Program which provides transition services from alternative education to school of choice.

Title II

The district receives funds for staff development to increase student achievement through teacher training.

Title III

Services are provided through the district for education materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners.

Title X- Homeless

The district receives funds to provide resources (social workers and tutoring) for students for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school, reading coaches, and extended learning opportunity programs.

Violence Prevention Programs

NA

Nutrition Programs

NA

Housing Programs

NA

Head Start

We utilize information from students in Head Start to transition into Kindergarten.

Adult Education

NA

Career and Technical Education

NA

Job Training

NA

Other

NA

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Carol Kay Brown, Principal
Jennifer Slade, Asst. Principal
Tracey Pate, Guidance Counselor
Shannon Khan, School Psychologist
Angela Thomas, Social Worker
Joy Gaiilard, Reading Coach
Janet Mistretta, Reading Resource
Lakeisha Dupree, Math Resource
Latricia McCoy, Writing Resource
Monika Schuler, Bank Street/ Gifted Lead
Jennifer Albert, ESE Resource

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 Leadership team meets regularly (monthly). Specific responsibilities include:
• Oversee the multi-layered model of instructional delivery (Tier 1/Core, Tier 2/Supplemental and Tier 3/Intensive)
• Create, manage and update the school resource map
• Ensure the master schedule incorporates allocated time for intervention support at all grade levels. (Listed on schedules as

"Tiger Time")
• Determine scheduling needs, and assist teacher teams in identifying research-based instructional materials and intervention resources at Tiers2/3
• Facilitate the implementation of specific programs (e.g., Extended Learning Programs during and after school; Saturday Academies) that provide intervention support to students identified through data sorts/chats conducted by the PLCs.
• Determine the school-wide professional development needs of faculty and staff and arrange trainings aligned with the SIP goals. Instructional coaches survey teachers and offer trainings based on needs/ requests.
• Organize and support systematic data collection (e.g., district and state assessments; during-the-grading period school assessments/checks for understanding; in-school surveys) All teachers collect pertinant data on a common data collection form that is utilized in PLC's and academic review.
• Assist and monitor teacher use of SMART goals per unit of instruction. (data will be collected and analyzed by PLCs and reported to the Leadership Team/PSLT) PLC logs with SMART goals are posted on the school site internal for administrator and PSLT review and feedback.
• Strengthen the Tier 1 (core curriculum) instruction through the:
o Implementation and support of PLCs
o Review of teacher/PLC core curriculum assessments/chapters tests/checks for understanding (data will be collected and analyzed by PLCs and reported to the Leadership Team/PSLT)
o Use of Common Core Assessments by teachers teaching the same grade/subject area/course (data will be collected and analyzed by PLCs and reported to the Leadership Team/PSLT)
o Implementation of research-based scientifically validated instructional strategies and/or interventions. (as outlined in our SIP)
o Communication with major stakeholders (e.g., parents, business partners, etc.) regarding student outcomes through data summaries and conferences.
• On a monthly basis, assist in the evaluation of teacher fidelity data and student achievement data collected during the month.
• Support the planning, implementing, and evaluating the outcomes of supplemental and intensive interventions in conjunction with PLCs and Specialty PSLT.
• Work collaboratively with the PLCs in the implementation of the C-CIM (Core Continuous Improvement Model) on core curriculum material.
• Coordinate/collaborate/integrate with other working committees, such as the Literacy Leadership Team (which is charged with developing a plan for embedding/integrating reading and writing strategies across all other content areas). Facilitated by instructional coaches during PLC's.

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 Chair of SAC is a member of the Leadership Team/PSLT.
• The administration, leadership team, teachers and SAC are involved in the School Improvement Plan development and monitoring throughout the school year.
• The School Improvement Plan is the working document that guides the work of the Leadership Team and all teacher teams. The large part of the work of the team is outlined in the Expected Improvements/Problem Solving Process sections (and related professional development plans) for school-wide goals in Reading, Math, Writing, Science, Attendance and Suspension/Behavior.
• Given that one of the main tasks is to monitor student data related to instruction and interventions, the Leadership Team/PLST monitors the effectiveness of instruction and intervention by reviewing student data as well as data related to implementation fidelity (teacher walk-through data).
• The Leadership Team/PSLT communicates with and supports the PLCs in implementing the proposed strategies by distributing Leadership Team members across the PLCs to facilitate planning and implementation. Once strategies are put in place, the Leadership Team members who are part of the PLCs regularly report on their efforts and student outcomes to the larger Leadership Team/PSLT.
• The Leadership Team/PSLT and PLCs both use the problem solving process (Problem Identification, Problem Analysis, Intervention Design and Implementation and Evaluation to:
o Use the problem-solving model when analyzing data:
1. What is the problem? (Problem Identification)
2. Why is it occurring? (Problem Analysis and Barrier Identification)
3. What are we going to do about it? (Action Plan Design and Implementation)
4. Is it working? (Monitor Progress and Evaluate Action Plan Effectiveness)
o Identify the problem (based on an analysis of the data disaggregated via data sorts) in multiple areas – curriculum content, behavior, and attendance
o Develop and test hypotheses about why student/school problems are occurring (changeable barriers).
o Develop and target interventions based on confirmed hypotheses.
o Identify appropriate progress monitoring assessments to be administered at regular intervals matched to the intensity of the level of instructional/intervention support provided.
o Develop grading period or units of instruction//intervention goals that are ambitious, time-bound, and measureable (e.g., SMART goals).
o Review progress monitoring data at regular intervals to determine when student(s) need more or less support (e.g., frequency, duration, intensity) to meet established class, grade, and/or school goals (e.g., use of data-based decision-making to fade, maintain, modify or intensify intervention and/or enrichment support).

o Each PLC develops PLC action plan for SIP strategy implementation and monitoring.
o Assess the implementation of the strategies on the SIP using the following questions:
1. Does the data show implementation of strategies are resulting in positive student growth?
2. To what extent are we making progress toward the school's SIP goals?
3. If we are making progress, what can we do to sustain what is working?
4. What barriers to implementation are we facing and how will we address them?
5. What should we do next? What should be our plan of action?

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.

Data Source Database Person(s) Responsible

FCAT release tests School-generated excel spreadsheet Reading Coach-Joy Gaillard,
FCAT release data and curriculum binders Math Coach- Lakeisha Dupree,

Baseline/ Midyear District Assessments Scantron Achievement Series PLC's, Individual teachers
from the Office of Assessment and Data Walls Instructional Coaches
Accountability
- Math Formatives 1,2 and 3
- Reading Formatives A, B and C

FAIR Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network Reading Coach- Joy Gaillard
Data Walls Reading Resource- Janet Mistretta
PLC's, Individual teachers

CELLA Sagebrush (IPT) ELL/ PSLT representative
Terry Governale

Teachers' common core curriculum PLC logs/ database Individual teachers K-1
assessments on unit of instruction/
big ideas

DRA-2 School generated database Individual teachers 1-5

Reports on Demand/ Crystal Reports District generated database Principal- Carol K. Brown

Extended Learning Program (ELP) School generated databse in excel Leadership team and
Ongiong Progress Monitoring ELP Facilitator- Janet Mistretta
Mini-Assessments

Differentiated mini assessments Individual/ PLC database PLC's, Individual teachers
based on core curriculum assessments

Other curriculum based measure EASY CBM Leadership team, PLC's,
Individual teachers

Research-based computer-assisted i-station, FASTT Math Individual teachers
instrucional programs

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The Leadership Team/will continue to work to build consensus with all stakeholders regarding a need for and a focus on school improvement efforts. The Leadership Team will work to align the efforts of other school teams that may be addressing similar identified issues.

As the District's RtI Committee/RtI Facilitators develop(s) resources and staff development trainings on PS/RtI, these tools and staff development sessions will be conducted with staff when they become available. Professional Development sessions, as identified by teacher needs assessment and/or EET evaluation data, will occur during faculty meeting times or rolling faculty meetings. The Leadership Team will send school team representatives to ongoing PS/RtI trainings/support sessions that are offered district-wide. Our school will invite our area RtI Facilitator to visit quarterly (or as needed) to review our progress in implementation of PS/RtI and provide on-site coaching and support to our Leadership Teams/PLCs. New staff will be directed to participate in trainings relevant to PLCs and PS/RtI as they become available.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Response to Intervention (RtI) has also been described in Florida as a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) for providing high quality instruction and intervention matched to student needs using learning rate over time and level of performance to inform instructional decisions. In order to support MTSS in our schools, we will:
• Consistently promote the shared vision of one system meeting the needs of ALL students with MTSS as the platform for integrating all school initiatives (i.e., PLC, PSLT, Steering, and SAC meetings, lesson study, school-wide behavior management plans).
• Provide designated school personnel with the requisite knowledge and experience to support coordination and implementation of MTSS.
• Provide continued training and support to all school based personnel in problem solving, responding to student data and the use of a systematic method to increase student achievement.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Carol Kay Brown, Principal
Jennifer Slade, Asst. Principal
Joy Gaillard, Reading Coach
Janet Mistretta, Reading Resource
Latricia McCoy, Writing Resource
Jennifer Albert, ESE Resource
Terry Governale, ESOL/ ELL Resource
Lakeisha Dupree, Math Resource

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

The LLT is a subset of the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The team provides leadership for the implementation of the reading goals and strategies identified on the SIP.

The principal is the LLT chairperson. The reading coach is a member of the team and provides extensive expertise in data analysis and reading interventions. The reading coach and principal collaborate with the team to ensure that data driven instructional support is provided to all teachers.

The principal also ensures that the LLT monitors reading data, identifies school-wide and individual teachers' reading-focused instructional strengths and weaknesses, and creates a professional development plan to support identified instructional needs in conjunction with the Problem Solving Leadership team's support plan. Additionally the principal ensures that time is provided for the LLT to collaborate and share information with all site stakeholders including other administrators, teachers, staff members, parents and students.

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

• Implementation and evaluation of the SIP reading goals/strategies across the content areas
• Professional Development
• Co-planning, modeling and observation of research-based reading strategies within lessons across the content areas
• Data analysis (on-going)
• Implementation of the K-12 Reading Plan

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
View uploaded file (Uploaded on 10/12/2012)

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

In Hillsborough County Public schools, all kindergarten children are assessed for Kindergarten Readiness using the FLKRS (Florida Kindergarten Readiness Screener.) This state-selected assessment contains a subset of the Early Childhood Observation System and the first two measures of the Florida Assessments in Reading (FAIR). The instruments used in the screening are based upon the Florida Voluntary Prekindergarten (VPK) Education Standards. Parents are provided with a letter from the Commissioner of Education, explaining the assessments. Teachers will meet with parents after the assessments have been completed to review student performance. Data from the FAIR will be used to assist teachers in creating homogeneous groupings for small group reading instruction. Children entering Kindergarten may have benefited from the Hillsborough County Public Schools' Voluntary Prekindergarten Program. This program is offered at elementary schools in the summer and during the school year in selected Head Start classrooms and as a blended program in several Early Exceptional Learning Program (EELP) classrooms. Starting in the 2012-2013 school year, students in the VPK program will be given the state-created VPK Assessment that looks at Print Knowledge, Phonological Awareness, Mathematics and Oral Language/Vocabulary. This assessment will be administered at the start and end of the VPK program. A copy of these assessments will be mailed to the school in which the child will be registered for kindergarten, enabling the child's teacher to have a better understanding of the child's abilities from the first day of school. Parent Involvement events for Transitioning Children into Kindergarten include Kindergarten RoundUp. This event provides parents with an opportunity to meet the teachers and hear about the academic program. Parents are encouraged to complete the school registration procedure at this time to ensure that the child is able to start school on time.

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	The percentage of students scoring a level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT reading will increase from 50% to 54%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50%	54%

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					
2	1.1 -Teachers knowledge base of this strategy needs professional development. Training for this strategy is being rolled out in 12-13. -Training all content area teachers	1.1 Common Core Reading Strategy Across all Content Areas Reading comprehension improves when students are engaged in grappling with complex text. Teachers need to understand how to select/identify complex text, shift the amount of informational text used in the content curricula, and share complex texts with all students. All content area teachers are responsible for implementation. Action Steps Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.	1.1 Who -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses How -Reading PLC Logs -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -Administration and coach rotate through PLCs looking for complex text discussion. -Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis.	1.1 Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ instructional coach shares SMART Goal data with the Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	1.1 3x per year - FAIR During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)
	1.2 -Teachers knowledge	1.2 Common Core Reading	1.2 Who	1.2 Teacher Level	1.2 3x per year

	3	base of this strategy needs professional development. Training for this strategy is being rolled out in 12-13. -Training all content area teachers	Strategy Across all Content Areas Common Core Questions of all types and levels are necessary to scaffold students' understanding of complex text. Teachers need to understand and use higher-order, text-dependent questions at the word/phrase, sentence, and paragraph/passage levels (Webb's, Bloom, Costas). Student reading comprehension improves when students are required to provide evidence to support their answers to text-dependent questions. Scaffolding of students' grappling with complex text through well-crafted text-dependent question assists students in discovering and achieving deeper understanding of the author's meaning. All content area teachers are responsible for implementation. Action Steps Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.	-Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -Resource Teachers How -Reading PLC Logs -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Reading Coach observations and walk-throughs -Administrative walk-throughs looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency. -Administrator and Reading Coach aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation.	-Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the development of their individual/PLC SMART Goal PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/instructional coach shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	- FAIR During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)
	4	1.3 -Teachers knowledge base of this strategy needs professional development. Training for this strategy is being rolled out in 12-13. -Training all content area teachers	1.3 Common Core Reading Strategy Across all Content Areas Teachers need to understand how to design and deliver a close reading lesson. Student reading comprehension improves when students are engaged in close reading instruction using complex text. Specific close reading strategies include: 1) multiple readings of a passage 2) asking higher-order, text-dependent questions, 3) writing in response to reading and 4) engaging in text-based class discussion. All content area teachers are responsible for implementation. Action Steps Action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.	1.3 Who -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses How -Reading Logs -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis. -Reading Coach observations and walk-throughs -Administrative walk-throughs looking for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency. -Administrator and	1.3 Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the development of their individual/PLC SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/instructional coach SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team.	1.3 3x per year - FAIR During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit, intervention checks)

			Reading Coach aggregate the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation.	-Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	The percentage of students a level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 24% to 26%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
24%	26%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1		See Goals 1, 3, & 4			

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
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:	Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT reading will increase from 57 points to 59 points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
57 points	59 points

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	3.1 -PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum conversations and data analysis to deepen their leaning. To address this barrier, this year PLCs are being trained to use the Plan-Do-Check-Act "Instructional Unit" log	3.1 Strategy Student achievement improves through teachers working collaboratively to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: 1. What is it we expect them to learn? 2. How will we if they have learned it? 3. How will we respond if they don't learn? 4. How will we respond if they already know it? Actions/Details -Grade level/like-course PLCs use a Plan-Do-Check-Act "Unit of Instruction" log to guide their discussion and way of work. Discussions are summarized on log. -Additional action steps for this strategy are	3.1 Who -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses How PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators and coaches attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis.	3.1 School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, and/or leadership team	3.1 3x per year FAIR During the Grading Period Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)

		outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.			
2	3.2 -Teachers tend to only differentiate after the lesson is taught instead of planning how to differentiate the lesson when new content is presented. -Teachers are at varying levels of using Differentiated Instruction strategies. -Teachers tend to give all students the same lesson, handouts, etc.	3.2 Strategy/Task Student achievement improves when teachers use on-going student data to differentiate instruction. Actions/Details Within PLCs Before Instruction and During Instruction of New Content -Using data from previous assessments and daily classroom performance/work, teachers plan Differentiated Instruction groupings and activities for the delivery of new content in upcoming lessons. In the classroom -During the lessons, students are involved in flexible grouping techniques PLCs After Instruction -Teachers reflect and discuss the outcome of their DI lessons. -Teachers use student data to identify successful DI techniques for future implementation. -Teachers, using a problem-solving question protocol, identify students who need re-teaching/interventions and how that instruction will be provided. (Questions are listed in the 2012-2013 Technical Assistance Document under the Differentiation Cross Content strategy). -Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLCs.	3.2 Who -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses How -PLC logs turned into administration, and/or coaches. -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team. -Administration shares the positive outcomes observed in PLC meetings on a monthly basis.	3.2 Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards the development of their individual/PLC SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ instructional coach Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	3.2 3x per year FAIR During the Grading Period Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)

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:	Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT reading will increase from 58 points to 62 points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
58 points	62 points

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
	4.1 -Scheduling time for the principal/AP to meet with the academic coach on a regular basis. -Teachers willingness to accept support from the coach.	4.1 Strategy Across all Content Areas Strategy/Task Student achievement improves through teachers' collaboration with the academic coach in all content areas. Actions/Details Academic Coach -The academic coach and administration conducts one-on-one data chats with individual teachers using the teacher's student past and/or present data. -The academic coach rotates through all subjects' PLCs to: --Facilitate lesson planning that embeds rigorous tasks --Facilitate development, writing, selection of higher-order, text-dependent questions/activities, with an emphasis on Webb's Depth of Knowledge question hierarchy --Facilitate the identification, selection, development of rigorous core curriculum common assessments --Facilitate core curriculum assessment data analysis	4.1 Who Administration How- -Review of coach's log -Review of coach's log of support to targeted teachers. -Administrative walk-throughs of coaches working with teachers (either in classrooms, PLCs or planning sessions)	4.1 -Tracking of coach's participation in PLCs. -Tracking of coach's interactions with teachers (planning, co-teaching, modeling, de-debriefing, professional development, and walk throughs) -Administrator-Instructional Coach meetings to review log and discuss action plan for coach for the upcoming two weeks	4.1 3x per year - FAIR During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)

	1		--Facilitate the planning for interventions and the intentional grouping of the students. -Using walk-through data, the academic coach and administration identify teachers for support in co-planning, modeling, co-teaching, observing and debriefing. -The academic coach trains each subject area PLC on how to facilitate their own PLC using structured protocols. -Throughout the school year, the academic coach/administration conducts one-on-one data chats with individual teachers using the data gathered from walk-through tools. This data is used for future professional development, both individually and as a department. Leadership Team and Coach -The academic coach meets with the principal/AP to map out a high-level summary plan of action for the school year. -Every two weeks, the academic coach meets with the principal/AP to: --Review log and work accomplished and --Develop a detailed plan of action for the next two weeks.			
	2	4.2 -The Extended Learning Program (ELP) does not always target the specific skill weaknesses of the students or collect data on an ongoing basis. -Not always a direct correlation between what the students is missing in the regular classroom and the instruction received during ELP. -Minimal communication between regular and ELP teachers	4.2 Strategy Students' reading comprehension improves through receiving ELP supplemental instruction on targeted skills that are not at the mastery level. Action Steps -Classroom teachers communicate with the ELP teachers regarding specific skills that students have not mastered. -ELP teachers identify lessons for students that target specific skills that are not at the mastery level. -Students attend ELP sessions. -Progress monitoring data collected by the ELP teacher on a weekly or biweekly basis and communicated back to the regular classroom teacher.	4.2 Who Administrators How Monitored Administrators will review the communication logs and data collection used between teachers and ELP teachers outlining skills that need remediation.	4.2 Supplemental data shared with leadership and classroom teachers who have students.	4.2 Curriculum Based Measurement (Easy CBM) (From District RtI/Problem Solving Facilitators.)

		-When the students have mastered the specific skill, they are exited from the ELP program.			

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target						
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.			Reading Goal # 5A : In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.			
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	50%	55%	59%	65%	70%	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	The percentage of White students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 69% to 72%. The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 46% to 51%. The percentage of Hispanic students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT/FAA Reading will increase from 41% to 47%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 69% Black: 46% Hispanic: 41%	White: 72% Black: 51% Hispanic:47%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1		See Goals 1, 3, & 4			

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 29% to 36%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29%	36%

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	5C.1 -Improving the proficiency of ELL students in our student is of high priority. -The majority of the teachers are unfamiliar with this strategy. To address this barrier, the school will schedule professional development delivered by the school's ERT. -Teachers implementation of CALLA is not consistent across core courses. -ELLs at varying levels of English language acquisition and acculturation is not consistent across core courses. -Administrators at varying skill levels regarding use of CALLA/ in order to effectively conduct a CALLA fidelity check walk-through.	5C.1 ELLs (LYs/LFs) comprehension of course content/standard improves through participation in the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA) strategy across Reading, Language Arts, Math, Social Studies and Science. Action Steps -ESOL Resource Teacher (ERT) provides professional development to all content area teachers on how to embed CALLA into core content lessons. -ERT models lessons using CALLA. -ERT observes content area teachers using CALLA and provides feedback, coaching and support. -District Resource Teachers (DRTs) provide professional development to all administrators on how to conduct walk-through fidelity checks for use of CALLA. -Core content teachers set SMART goals for ELL students for upcoming core curriculum assessments. -Core content teachers administer and analyze ELLs performance on assessments. -Teachers aggregate data to determine the performance of ELLs compared to the whole group. -Based on data core content teachers will differentiate instruction to remediate/enhance instruction.	5C.1 Who -School based Administrators -District Resource Teachers -ESOL Resource Teachers How -Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using the walkthrough from from: The CALLA Handbook, p. 101, Table 5.4 "Checklist for Evaluating CALLA Instruction.	5C.1 Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual ELL SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the ELL SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -ERTs meet with Reading, Language Arts, Social Studies and Science PLCs on a rotating basis to assist with the analysis of ELLs performance data. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the ELL SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/instructional coach shares ELL SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. -ERTs meet with RtI team to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs)	5C.1 -FAIR -CELLA During the Grading Period -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for ELL performance
	5C.2 -Improving the proficiency of ELL students in our school is of high priority. -The majority of the teachers are unfamiliar with this strategy. To address this barrier, the school will schedule professional development delivered by the school's ERT. -Teachers implementation of A+ Rise is not consistent across core courses. -Administrators at varying skill levels regarding use of A+ Rise in order to effectively	5C.2 ELLs (LYA, LYB & LYC) comprehension of course content/standards increases in reading, language arts, math, science and social studies through the use of the district's on-line program A+Rise located on IDEAS under Programs for ELL. Action Steps -ESOL Resource Teacher (ERT) provides professional development to all content area teachers on how to access and use A+ Rise Strategies for ELLs at	5C.2 Who -School based Administrators -District Resource Teachers -ESOL Resource Teachers How -Administrative and District Walk Throughs	5C.2 Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual ELL SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the ELL SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson	5C.2 -FAIR -CELLA During the Grading Period -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for ELL performance

2	conduct an A+ Rise fidelity check walk-through.	http://arises2s.com/s2s/ into core content lessons. -ERT models lessons using A+ Rise Strategies for ELLs. -ERT observes content area teachers using A+Rise and provides feedback, coaching and support. -District Resource Teachers (DRTs) provide professional development to all administrators on how to conduct walk-through fidelity checks for use of A+ Rise strategies for ELLs.		outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -ERTs meet with Reading, Language Arts, Social Studies and Science PLCs on a rotating basis to assist with the analysis of ELLs performance data. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the ELL SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ instructional coach shares ELL SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. -ERTs meet with RtI team to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs)	
3	5C.3 -Lack of understanding teachers can provide ELL accommodations beyond FCAT testing. -Bilingual Education Paraprofessionals at varying levels of expertise in providing support. -Allocation of Bilingual Education Paraprofessional dependent on number of ELLs. -Administrators at varying levels of expertise in being familiar with the ELL guidelines and job responsibilities of ERT and Bilingual paraprofessional.	5C.3 ELLs (LYA, LYB & LYC) comprehension of course content/standards improves through participation in the following day-to-day accommodations on core content and district assessments across Reading, Writing, Math, and Science 1.Extended time (lesson and assessments) 2.Small group testing 3.Para support (lesson and assessments) 4.Use of heritage language dictionary (lesson and assessments)	5C.3 Who -School based Administrators -ESOL Resource Teachers How -Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using the walk-throughs look for Committee Meeting Recommendations. In addition, tools from the RtI Handbook and ELL RtI Checklist, and ESOL Strategies Checklist can be used as walk-through forms	5C.3 Analyze core curriculum and district level assessments for ELL students. Correlate to accommodations to determine the most effective approach for individual students.	5C.3 During the Grading Period -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests
	5C.4 -Improving the proficiency of ELL students in our school is of high priority. -Teachers need support in drilling down their core assessments to the ELL level.	5C.4 ELLs (LYA, LYB & LYC) comprehension of course content/standards improves in reading, language arts, math, science and social studies through teachers working collaboratively to focus on ELL student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model to structure their way of work for ELL students. Action Steps -Teachers analyze CELLA data to identify ELL students who need assistance in the areas of listening/speaking,	5C.4 Who -School based Administrators -ESOL Resource Teachers -PLC Facilitators How PLC logs (with specific ELL information) for like courses/grades.	5C.4 Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual ELL SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the ELL SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used	5C.4 Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual ELL SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the ELL SMART goal data

4		reading and writing. -Teachers use time during PLCs to reinforce and strengthen targeted ELL effective teaching strategies (CALLA and A+ Rise) in the areas of listening/speaking, reading and writing. -Teachers use time during PLCs to reinforce and strengthen targeted ELL Differentiated Instruction lessons using the district provided ELL Differentiated Instruction binders (provided by the ELL Department) in Reading, Language Arts, Math, Science and Social Studies. -PLCs generate SMART goals for ELL students for upcoming units of instruction. -PLCs/teachers plan for upcoming lessons/units using targeted CALLA and A+ Rise strategies and Differentiated Instruction strategies based on ELLs needs in the areas of listening/speaking, reading and writing. -PLCs/teachers plan for accommodations for core curriculum content and assessment. -When conducting data analysis on core curriculum assessments, PLCs aggregate the ELL data. -Based on the data, PLCs/teachers plan interventions for targeted ELL students using the resources from CALLA, A+ Rise, and Differentiated instruction binders.		to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the ELL SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ instructional coach shares ELL SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. -ERTs meet with RtI team to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs)	across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -ERTs meet with Reading, Language Arts, Social Studies and Science PLCs on a rotating basis to assist with the analysis of ELLs performance data. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the ELL SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ instructional coach shares ELL SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. -ERTs meet with RtI team to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs) 5C.4 -FAIR -CELLA During the Grading Period -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for ELL 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 reading. Reading Goal #5D:	The percentage of SWD scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 14% to 23%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
14%	23%
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5D.1 -Need to provide a school organization structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEPs by both the general education and ESE teacher. To address this barrier, the APC will put a system in place for this school year.	5D.1 Strategy SWD student achievement improves through the effective and consistent implementation of students' IEP goals, strategies, modifications, and accommodations. -Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity. -Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/SWD strategies and modifications into lessons.	5D.1 Who Principal, Site Administrator, Assistance Principal ESE Specialist How IEP Progress Reports reviewed by APC	5D.1 Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ instructional coach shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	5D.1 -FAIR During the Grading Period -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for SWD performance
	5D.2 -Improving the proficiency of SWD in our school is of high priority. -Teachers need support in drilling down their core assessments to the SWD level. -General educational teacher and ESE teacher need consistent, on-going co-planning time	5D.2 Strategy/Task SWD student achievement improves through teachers' implementation of the Plan-Do-Check-Act model in order to plan/carry out lessons/assessments with appropriate strategies and modifications. Actions Plan For an upcoming unit of instruction determine the following: -What do we want our SWD to learn by the end of the unit? -What are standards that our SWD need to learn? -How will we assess these skills/standards for our SWD? -What does mastery look like? -What is the SMART goal for this unit of instruction for our SWD? Plan for the "Do" What do teachers need to do in order to meet	5D.2 Who -School based Administrators -PLC Facilitators How PLC logs (with specific SWD information) for like courses/grades.	5D.2 Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SWD SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SWD SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SWD SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/instructional coach shares SWD SMART Goal data with	5D.2 -FAIR During the Grading Period -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for SWD performance

			the SWD SMART goal? -What resources do we need? -How will the lessons be designed to maximize the learning of SWD? -What checks-for-understanding will we implement for our SWD? -What teaching strategies/best practices will we use to help SWD learn? -Specifically how will we implement the _____strategy during the lesson? -What are teachers going to do during the lesson for SWD? -What are SWD going to do during the lesson to maximize learning? Reflect on the "Do"/Analyze Checks for Understanding and Student Work during the unit. For lessons that have already been taught within the unit of instruction, teachers reflect and discuss one or more of the following regarding their SWD: -What worked within the lesson? How do we know it was successful? Why was it successful? -What didn't work within the lesson? Why? What are we going to do next? -For the implementation of the _____ strategy, what worked? How do we know it was successful? Why was it successful? What checks for understanding were used during the lessons? -For the implementation of the _____ strategy, what didn't work? Why? What are we going to do next? -What were the outcomes of the checks for understanding? And/or analysis of student performance? -How do we take what we have learned and apply it to future lessons? Reflect/Check – Analyze Data Discuss one or more of the following: -What is the SWD data? -What is the data telling us as individual teachers? -What is the data telling us as a grade level/PLC/department? -What are SWD not		the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.		
	2						

		learning? Why is this occurring? -Which SWD are learning? Act on the Data After data analysis, develop a plan to act on the data. -What are we going to do about SWD not learning? -What are the skills/concepts/standards that need re-teaching/interventions (either to individual SWD or small groups)? -How are we going to re-teach the skill differently? -How we will know that our re-teaching/interventions are working?			

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 percentage of economically disadvantaged students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 44% to 50%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
44%	50%

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	5D.1 Need to provide a school organization structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEPs by both the general education and ESE teacher. To address this barrier, the APC will put a system in place for this school year.	5D.1 Strategy Economically Disadvantaged student achievement improves through the effective and consistent implementation of students' IEP goals, strategies, modifications, and accommodations. -Throughout the school year, teachers of economically disadvantaged students review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity. -Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/economically disadvantaged strategies	5D.1 Who Principal Assistance Principal ESE Specialist How IEP Progress Reports reviewed by AP	5D.1 Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal.	5D.1 -FAIR During the Grading Period -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data disaggregated for economically disadvantaged students performance

		and modifications into lessons.		Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Department Heads shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	
	5D.2 -Improving the proficiency of economically disadvantaged students in our school is of high priority. -Teachers need support in drilling down their core assessments to the SWD level. -General educational teacher and ESE teacher need consistent, on-going co-planning time	5D.2 Strategy/Task Economically disadvantaged student achievement improves through teachers' implementation of the Plan-Do-Check-Act model in order to plan/carry out lessons/assessments with appropriate strategies and modifications. Actions Plan For an upcoming unit of instruction determine the following: -What do we want our economically disadvantaged students to learn by the end of the unit? -What are standards that our economically disadvantage students need to learn? -How will we assess these skills/standards for our economically disadvantaged students? -What does mastery look like? -What is the SMART goal for this unit of instruction for our economically disadvantaged students? Plan for the "Do" What do teachers need to do in order to meet the SMART goal for economically disadvantage students? -What resources do we need? -How will the lessons be designed to maximize the learning of economically disadvantaged students? -What checks-for-understanding will we implement for our economically disadvanyaged students? -What teaching strategies/best practices will we use to help economically disadvantaged students learn? -What are teachers going to do during the lesson for economically disadvantage students?	5D.2 Who -School based Administrators -PLC Facilitators How PLC logs (with specific economically disadvantage students information) for like courses/grades.	5D.2 Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual economically disadvantage students SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the economically disadvantage students SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SWD SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ Department Heads shares economically disadvantage students SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	5D.2 -FAIR During the Grading Period -Core curriculum end of core common unit/ segment tests with data aggregated for economically disadvantage students performance

			-What are economically disadvantage students going to do during the lesson to maximize learning? Reflect on the "Do"/Analyze Checks for Understanding and Student Work during the unit. For lessons that have already been taught within the unit of instruction, teachers reflect and discuss one or more of the following regarding their economically disadvantage students: -What worked within the lesson? How do we know it was successful? Why was it successful? -What didn't work within the lesson? Why? What are we going to do next? -For the implementation of the _____ strategy, what worked? How do we know it was successful? Why was it successful? What checks for understanding were used during the lessons? -For the implementation of the _____ strategy, what didn't work? Why? What are we going to do next? -What were the outcomes of the checks for understanding? And/or analysis of student performance? -How do we take what we have learned and apply it to future lessons? Reflect/Check – Analyze Data Discuss one or more of the following: -What is the economically disadvantage student data? -What is the data telling us as individual teachers? -What is the data telling us as a grade level/PLC/department? -What are economically disadvantage students not learning? Why is this occurring? -Which economically disadvantage students are learning? Act on the Data After data analysis, develop a plan to act on the data. -What are we going to				
	2						

		do about economically disadvantage students not learning? -What are the skills/concepts/standards that need re-teaching/interventions (either to individual economically disadvantage students or small groups)? -How are we going to re-teach the skill differently? -How we will know that our re-teaching/interventions are working?			
3					

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
The 3 S's of Complex Text: Selecting / Identifying Complex Text, Shifting to Increased Use of Informational Text, and Sharing of Complex Text with All Students (K-12)	K-5	- Reading Coach	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	ongoing	Classroom walk-throughs	Administration Team Instructional Coaches
Differentiated Instruction	K-5	-Reading Coach - PLC's	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	ongoing	Classroom walk-throughs Optional peer teacher observations	Administration Team Instructional Coaches
Identifying and Creating Text-Dependent Questions to Deepen Reading Comprehension (K-12)	K-5	- Reading Coach	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	ongoing	Classroom walk-throughs	Administration Team Instructional Coaches
Designing and Delivering a Close Reading Lesson Using in-Depth Questioning (K-12)	K-5	- Reading Coach	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	ongoing	Classroom walk-throughs	Administration Team Instructional Coaches

ELL Strategies	K-5	English Language Learner Resource Teacher (ERT)	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	ongoing	Classroom walk-throughs	Administration Team

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			$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 Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	The percentage scoring proficient on the 2013 listening/speaking section of the CELLA will increase from 17% to 21%.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
17%	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1		See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3, and 5C.4.			

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:	The percentage scoring proficent on the 2013 reading section of the CELLA will increase from 16% to 20%.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	
16%	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1		See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3, and 5C.4.			

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	The percentage of students scoring proficient on the 2013 Writing section of the CELLA will increase from 16% to 20%.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:	
16%	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1		See Reading ELL Goal 5C.1, 5C.2, 5C.3, and 5C.4.			

CELLA Budget:

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

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

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	The percentage of students scoring a level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT math will increase from 46% to 48%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
46%	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	1.1 -Lack of infrastructure to support technology -Teachers at varying understanding of the intent of the CCSS	1.1 Strategy Students' math achievements improves through the use of technology and hands-on activities to implement the Common Core State Standards. In addition, student practice taking on-line assessments to prepare students for on-line state testing. Action Steps -PLCs use their core curriculum information to learn more about hands-on and technology activities. -Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.	1.1 Who - Principal -Technology Specialist -Math Coach/Resource Teacher How Monitored -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy. -Administrator and coach aggregates the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation	1.1 PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 75% mastery on units of instruction. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends.	1.1 2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing During the Grading Period -Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, etc.)
	1.2 -Teachers are at varying skill levels with higher order questioning techniques. -PLC meetings need to focus on identifying and writing higher order questions to deliver during the lessons. -Finding time to conduct Webb's Depth of Knowledge walk-throughs is sometimes challenging.	1.2 Strategy/Task Students math achievement improves through frequent participation in higher order questions/discussion activities to deepen and extend student knowledge. These quality questions/prompts and discussion techniques promotes thinking by students, assisting them to arrive at new	1.2 Who -Principal -Technology Specialist -Math Coach/Resource Teacher How Monitored -PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is	1.2 PLCs will review unit assessments and chart the increase in the number of students reaching at least 75% mastery on units of instruction. PLC facilitator will share data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. The Problem Solving Leadership Team will review assessment data for positive trends.	1.2 2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing During the Grading Period -Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, interventions etc.)

	2		understandings of complex material. Actions/Details Within PLCs -Teachers work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively use higher order questions/activities. -Teachers plan higher order questions/activities for upcoming lessons to increase the lessons' rigor and promote student achievement. -Teachers plan for scaffolding questions and activities to meet the differentiated needs of students. -After the lessons, teachers examine student work samples and classroom questions using Webb's Depth of Knowledge to evaluate the sophistication/complexity of students' thinking. -Use student data to identify successful higher order questioning techniques for future implementation. In the classroom During the lessons, teachers: -Ask questions and/or provides activities that require students to engage in frequent higher order thinking as defined by Webb's Depth of Knowledge. -Wait for full attention from the class before asking questions. -Provide students with wait time. -Use probing questions to encourage students to elaborate and support assertions and claims drawn from the text/content. -Allow students to "unpack their thinking" by describing how they arrive at an answer. -Encourage discussion by using open-ended questions. -Ask questions with multiple correct answers or multiple approaches. -Scaffold questions to help students with incorrect answers. -Engage all students in the discussion and ensure that all voices are heard.	complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their Logs. -Classroom walk-throughs using Webb's Depth of Knowledge wheel as a higher order walk-through form. They look for implementation of strategy with fidelity and consistency -Administrator and coach aggregates the walk-through data school-wide and shares with staff the progress of strategy implementation			

		During the lessons, students: -Have opportunities to formulate many of the high-level questions based on the text/content. -Have time to reflect on classroom discussion to increase their understanding (and without teacher mediation). School Leadership -The coach/resource teacher/PLC member/administrator collects higher order questioning walk-through data using Webb's Depth of Knowledge wheel. -Monthly, school leaders conduct one-on-one data chats with individual teachers using the data gathered from walk-through tools. This teacher data/chats guides the leadership's team professional development plan (both individually and whole faculty).			

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	The percentage of students scoring a level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT math will increase from 17% to 19%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

17%	19%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1		See Goals 1, 3 & 4			

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

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:	Points earned from students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 60 points to 64 points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
60 points	64 points

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
	3.1 -PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum and data analysis discussion to deepen their leaning. To address this barrier, this year	3.1 Strategy Students' math achievement improves through teachers working collaboratively to focus on student learning.	3.1 Who -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -PLC facilitators of	3.1 School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, and/or leadership team.	3.1 2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing

	1	PLCs are being trained to use the Plan-Do-Check-Act “Instructional Unit” log.	Specifically, they use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: 1. What is it we expect them to learn? 2. How will we know if they have learned it? 3. How will we respond if they don’t learn? 4. How will we respond if they already know it? Actions/Details -This year, the like-course PLCs will administer common end-of-chapter assessments. The assessments will be identified/generated prior to the teaching of the unit. -Grade level/like-course PLCs use a Plan-Do-Check-Act “Unit of Instruction” log to guide their discussion and way of work. Discussions are summarized on log. -Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.	like grades and/or like courses How PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators and coaches attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis.		During the Grading Period Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)
	2	3.2 -Teachers tend to only differentiate after the lesson is taught instead of planning how to differentiate the lesson when new content is presented. -Teachers are at varying levels of using Differentiated Instruction strategies. -Teachers tend to give all students the same lesson, handouts, etc.	3.2 Strategy/Task Students’ math achievement improves when teachers use on-going student data to differentiate instruction. Actions/Details Within PLCs Before Instruction and During Instruction of New Content -Using data from previous assessments and daily classroom performance/work, teachers plan Differentiated Instruction groupings and activities for the delivery of new content in upcoming lessons. In the classroom -During the lessons, students are involved in flexible grouping techniques PLCs After Instruction -Teachers reflect and discuss the outcome of their DI lessons. -Use student data to identify successful DI techniques for future implementation. -Using a problem-solving question protocol, identify students who	3.2 Who -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses	3.2 Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers maintain their assessments in the on-line grading system. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students’ progress towards the development of their individual/PLC SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ instructional coach shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive	3.2 2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing During the Grading Period Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)

		need re-teaching/interventions and how that instruction will be provided. -Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLCs.		teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	

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:	Points earned from students in the bottom quartile making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT math will increase from 68 points to 72 points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
68 points	72 points

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
	4.1 -Scheduling time for the principal/APC to meet with the academic coach on a regular basis. -Teachers willingness to accept support from the coach.	4.1 Strategy Across all Content Areas Strategy/Task Students' math achievement improves through teachers' collaboration with the academic coach in all content areas. Actions/Details	4.1 Who Administration How -Review of coach's log -Review of coach's log of support to targeted teachers. -Administrative walk-throughs of	4.1 Tracking of coach's participation in PLCs. -Tracking of coach's interactions with teachers (planning, co-teaching, modeling, de-debriefing, professional development, and walk throughs. -Administrator-Instructional Coach meetings to review log	4.1 2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing During the Grading Period - Common assessments (pre,

	1		Academic Coach -The academic coach and administration conducts one-on-one data chats with individual teachers using the teacher's student past and/or present data. -The academic coach rotates through all subjects' PLCs to: --Facilitate lesson planning that embeds rigorous tasks --Facilitate development, writing, selection of higher-order , text-dependent questions/activities, with an emphasis on Webb's Depth of Knowledge question hierarchy --Facilitate the identification, selection, development of rigorous core curriculum common assessments, --Facilitate core curriculum assessment data analysis --Facilitate the planning for interventions and the intentional grouping of the students -Using walk-through data, the academic coach and administration identify teachers for support in co-planning, modeling, co-teaching, observing and debriefing. -The academic coach trains each subject area PLC on how to facilitate their own PLC using structured protocols. -Throughout the school year, the academic coach/administration conducts one-on-one data chats with individual teachers using the data gathered from walk-through tools. This data is used for future professional development, both individually and as a department. Leadership Team and Coach -The academic coach meets with the principal/APC to map out a high-level summary plan of action for the school year. -Every two weeks, the academic coach meets with the principal/APC to: --Review log and work accomplished and --Develop a detailed plan of action for the next two weeks.	coaches working with teachers (either in classrooms, PLCs or planning sessions)	and discuss action plan for coach for the upcoming two weeks.	post, mid, section, end of unit)

2	4.2 -The Extended Learning Program (ELP) does not always target the specific skill weaknesses of the students or collect data on an ongoing basis. -Not always a direct correlation between what the students is missing in the regular classroom and the instruction received during ELP. -Minimal communication between regular and ELP teachers.	4.2 Strategy Students' math achievement improves through receiving ELP supplemental instruction on targeted skills that are not at the mastery level. Action Steps -Classroom teachers communicate with the ELP teachers regarding specific skills that students have not mastered. -ELP teachers identify lessons for students that target specific skills that are not at the mastery level. - Students attend ELP sessions. - Progress monitoring data collected by the ELP teacher on a weekly or biweekly basis and communicated back to the regular classroom teacher. -When the students have mastered the specific skill, they are exited from the ELP program.	4.2 Who Administrators How Monitored Administrators will review the communication logs and data collection used between teachers and ELP teachers outlining skills that need remediation.	4.2 Supplemental data shared with leadership and classroom teachers who have students.	4.2 Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM) (From District RtI/Problem Solving Facilitators.)

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target						
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.			Elementary School Mathematics Goal # 5A : In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.			
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	46%	52%	57%	62%	67%	

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 percentage of White students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 64% to 68%. The percentage of Black students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 40% to 46%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 64% Black: 40% Hispanic: 41%	White: 68% Black: 46% Hispanic:47%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1		See goals 1, 3 & 4			

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	The percentage of ELL students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 29% to 36%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29%	36%

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	5C.1 -Improving the proficiency of ELL students in our student is of high priority. -The majority of the math teachers are unfamiliar with this strategy. To address this barrier, the school will schedule professional development delivered by the school's ERT. -Math teachers implementation of CALLA is not consistent across math courses. -ELLs at varying levels of English language acquisition and acculturation is not consistent across core courses. -Administrators at varying skill levels regarding use of CALLA/ in order to effectively conduct a CALLA fidelity check walk-through.	5C.1 ELLs (LYs/LFs) comprehension of course content/standard improves through participation in the Cognitive Academic Language Learning Approach (CALLA) strategy in math. Action Steps -ESOL Resource Teacher (ERT) provides professional development to all math area teachers on how to embed CALLA into core content lessons. -ERT models lessons using CALLA. -ERT observes content area teachers using CALLA and provides feedback, coaching and support. -District Resource Teachers (DRTs) provide professional development to all administrators on how to conduct walk-through fidelity checks for use of CALLA. -Math teachers set SMART goals for ELL students for upcoming core curriculum assessments. -Math teachers administer and analyze ELLs. In particular, teachers aggregate data to determine the performance of ELLs compared to the whole group. -Based on data math teachers differentiate	5C.1 Who -School based Administrators -District Resource Teachers -ESOL Resource Teachers How -Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using the walkthrough form from: The CALLA Handbook, p. 101, Table 5.4 "Checklist for Evaluating CALLA Instruction	5C.1 Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual ELL SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the ELL SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -ERTs meet with Math PLCs on a rotating basis to assist with the analysis of ELLs performance data. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the ELL SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ instructional coach shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. -ERTs meet with RtI team to review performance data and progress of ELLs	5C.1 2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing During the Grading Period -Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)

		instruction to remediate/enhance instruction.		(inclusive of LFs)	
2	5C.2 -Improving the proficiency of ELL students in our student is of high priority. -The majority of the math teachers are unfamiliar with this strategy. To address this barrier, the school will schedule professional development delivered by the school's ERT. -Math teachers implementation of A+ Rise is not consistent across core courses. -Administrators at varying skill levels regarding use of A+ Rise in order to effectively conduct an A+ Rise fidelity check walk-through.	5C.2 ELLs (LYA, LYB & LYC) comprehension of course content/standards increases in math through the use of the district's on-line program A+Rise located on IDEAS under Programs for ELL. Action Steps -ESOL Resource Teacher (ERT) provides professional development to all math area teachers on how to access and use A+ Rise Strategies for ELLs at http://arises2s.com/s2s/ into math lessons. - ERT models lessons using A+ Rise Strategies for ELLs. - ERT observes content area teachers using A+Rise and provides feedback, coaching and support. - District Resource Teachers (DRTs) provide professional development to all administrators on how to conduct walk-through fidelity checks for use of A+ Rise Strategies for ELLs.	5C.2 Who -School based Administrators -District Resource Teachers -ESOL Resource Teachers How -Administrative and ERT walk-throughs looking for implementation of A+ Rise strategies.	5C.2 Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual ELL SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the ELL SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -ERTs meet with Math PLCs on a rotating basis to assist with the analysis of ELLs performance data. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the ELL SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ instructional coach shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. -ERTs meet with RtI team to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs)	5C.2 2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing During the Grading Period -Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)
3	5C.3 -Lack of understanding that math teachers can provide ELL accommodations beyond FCAT testing. -Bilingual Education Paraprofessionals at varying levels of expertise in providing heritage language support. -Allocation of Bilingual Education Paraprofessional dependent on membership of ELLs. -Administrators at varying levels of expertise in being familiar with the ELL Program guidelines and job responsibilities of ERT and Bilingual	5C.3 ELLs (LYA, LYB & LYC) comprehension of course content/standards improves through participation in the following day-to-day accommodations on core content and district assessments in math: -Extended time (lesson and assessments) -Small group testing -Para support (lesson and assessments) -Use of heritage language dictionary (lesson and assessments)	5C.3 Who -School based Administrators -ESOL Resource Teachers How -Administrative and ERT walk-throughs using the walk-throughs look for Committee Meeting Recommendations. In addition, tools from the RtI Handbook and ELL RtI Checklist, and ESOL Strategies Checklist can be used as walk-through forms	5C.3 Analyze math core curriculum and district level assessments for ELL students. Correlate to accommodations to determine the most effective approach for individual students.	5C.3 2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing During the Grading Period -Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)

	paraprofessional				
4	5C.4 -Improving the proficiency of ELL students in our school is of high priority. -Teachers need support in drilling down their core assessments to the ELL level.	5C.4 ELLs (LYA, LYB & LYC) comprehension of course content/standards improves in math through teachers working collaboratively to focus on ELL student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model to structure their way of work for ELL students. Action Steps -Teachers use time during PLCs to reinforce and strengthen targeted ELL effective teaching strategies (CALLA and A+ Rise) in order to integrate them into the math lessons. -Teachers use time during PLCs to reinforce and strengthen targeted ELL Differentiated Instruction lessons using the district provided ELL Differentiated Instruction binders (provided by the ELL Department) in math. -PLCs generate SMART goals for ELL students for upcoming units of instruction. -PLCs/teachers plan for upcoming lessons/units using targeted CALLA, A+ Rise strategies and Differentiated Instruction strategies based on ELLs needs. -PLCs math teachers plan for accommodations for core curriculum content and assessment. -When conducting data analysis on core curriculum assessments, PLCs aggregate the ELL data. -Based on the data, PLCs/teachers plan interventions for targeted ELL students using the resources from CALLA, A+ Rise, and Differentiated Instruction binders.	5C.4 Who -School based Administrators -ESOL Resource Teachers -PLC Facilitators How PLC logs (with specific ELL information) for like courses/grades.	5C.4 Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual ELL SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the ELL SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -ERTs meet with Math PLCs on a rotating basis to assist with the analysis of ELLs performance data. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the ELL SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ instructional coach shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction. -ERTs meet with RtI team to review performance data and progress of ELLs (inclusive of LFs)	5C.4 2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing During the Grading Period -Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)

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 percentage of SWD scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 18% to 25%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
18%	25%

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	5D.1 -Need to provide a school organization structure and procedure for regular and on-going review of students' IEPs by both the general education and ESE teacher. To address this barrier, the APC will put a system in place for this school year.	5D.1 Strategy SWD student achievement improves through the effective and consistent implementation of students' IEP goals, strategies, modifications, and accommodations. -Throughout the school year, teachers of SWD review students' IEPs to ensure that IEPs are implemented consistently and with fidelity. -Teachers (both individually and in PLCs) work to improve upon both individually and collectively, the ability to effectively implement IEP/SWD strategies and modifications into lessons.	5D.1 Who Principal, Assistance Principal How IEP Progress Reports reviewed by APC	5D.1 Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SWD SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SWD SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SWD SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ instructional coach shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	5D.1 2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing During the Grading Period Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)
	5D.2 -Improving the proficiency of SWD in our school is of high priority. -Teachers need support in drilling down their core assessments to the SWD level. -General educational teacher and ESE teacher need consistent, on-going co-planning time.	5D.2 Strategy/Task SWD student achievement improves through teachers' implementation of the Plan-Do-Check-Act model in order to plan/carry out lessons/assessments with appropriate strategies and modifications. Actions Plan For an upcoming unit of instruction determine the following: -What do we want our SWD to learn by the end of the unit? -What are standards that our SWD need to learn? -How will we assess these skills/standards for our SWD?	5D.2 Who -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses How -PLC logs turned into administration/coaches. Administration/coaches provides feedback -Administrators attended targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team	5D.2 School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SWD SMART goal outcomes to administration, instructional coach, and/or leadership team.	5D.2 School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period of SWD SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, and/or leadership team.

	2		-What does mastery look like? -What is the SMART goal for this unit of instruction for our SWD? Plan for the “Do” What do teachers need to do in order to meet the SWD SMART goal? -What resources do we need? -How will the lessons be designed to maximize the learning of SWD? -What checks-for-understanding will we implement for our SWD? -What teaching strategies/best practices will we use to help SWD learn? -Specifically how will we implement the _____strategy during the lesson? -What are teachers going to do during the lesson for SWD? -What are SWD student going to do during the lesson to maximize learning? Reflect on the “Do”/Analyze Checks for Understanding and Student Work during the unit. For lessons that have already been taught within the unit of instruction, teachers reflect and discuss one or more of the following regarding their SWD: -What worked within the lesson? How do we know it was successful? Why was it successful? -What didn’t work within the lesson? Why? What are we going to do next? -For the implementation of the _____ strategy, what worked? How do we know it was successful? Why was it successful? What checks for understanding were used during the lessons? -For the implementation of the _____ strategy, what didn’t work? Why? What are we going to do next? -What were the outcomes of the checks for understanding? And/or analysis of student performance? -How do we take what we have learned and apply it to future lessons? Reflect/Check – Analyze				

		Data Discuss one or more of the following: -What is the SWD data? -What is the data telling us as individual teachers? -What is the data telling us as a grade level/PLC/department? -What are SWD not learning? Why is this occurring? -Which SWD are learning? Act on the Data After data analysis, develop a plan to act on the data. -What are we going to do about SWD not learning? -What are the skills/concepts/standards that need re-teaching/interventions (either to individual SWD or small groups)? -How are we going to re-teach the skill differently? -How we will know that our re-teaching/interventions are working?			

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:	The percentage of economically disadvantaged students scoring proficient/satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Math will increase from 40% to 46%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
40%	46%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1		See goals 1, 3 & 4			

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
Differentiated Instruction	K-5	Math Coach	Math Coach PLC team	PLC Meetings every two weeks	Administrators conduct targeted classroom walk-throughs to monitor DI implementation	Administration Team
ELL Strategies	K-5	English Language Learner Resource Teacher (ERT	All teachers Faculty Professional Development and on-going PLCs	ongoing	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Team

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
To increase teacher knowledge of math concepts and skills (common core)	Scholastic Math Solutions Training	Title I	$15,000.00
			Subtotal: $15,000.00
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
To increase student accountability talk and number talks.	Scholastic Math Solutions Training/ Coaching Cycle		$7,000.00
			Subtotal: $7,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $22,000.00

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:	The percentage of students scoring at a level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will incease from 37% to 40%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
37%	40%
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	1.1 -Teachers are at varying skill levels in the use of inquiry and the 5E lesson plan model. -Lack of common planning time to facilitate and hold PLCs for like courses	1.1 Strategy Students' science skills will improve through participation in the 5E instructional model. Action Steps -Teachers will attend District Science training and share 5 E Instructional Model information with their PLCs. -PLCs write SMART goals based for units of instruction. -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time collaboratively building 5E Instructional Model for upcoming lessons. -PLC teachers instruct students using the 5E Instructional Model. -At the end of the unit, teachers give a common assessment identified from the core curriculum material. -Teachers bring assessment data back to the PLCs. -Based on the data, teachers discuss effectiveness of the 5E Lesson Plans to drive future instruction.	1.1 Who Principal APC How Monitored -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy.	1.1 Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. -For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ instructional coach shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	1.1 2x per year District-level baseline and mid-year tests During the Grading Period -Core Curriculum Assessments (pre, mid, end of unit, chapter, intervention checks, etc.)
	1.2 -PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum conversations and data analysis to deepen their leaning. To address this barrier, this year PLCs are being trained to use the Plan-Do-Check-Act "Instructional Unit" log.	1.2 Strategy Student achievement improves through teachers working collaboratively to focus on student learning using the 5E Instructional Model. Specifically, they use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for unit of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: 1. What is it we expect them to learn? 2. How will we know if they have learned it? 3. How will we respond if they don't learn?	1.2 Who -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses How -PLC logs turned into administration/coaches provides feedback -Administrators attended targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis.	1.2 School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, and/or leadership team.	1.2 2x per year District Baseline and Mid-Year Testing During the Grading Period Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)

	2		4. How will we respond if they already know it? Actions/Details Within PLCs: -PLCs will use a PLC log to monitor the following: --Guide their Plan-Do-Check-Act conversations and way of work. --Monitor the frequency of meetings. All grade level/subject area PLCs collaborate _____ times per month for curriculum planning, reflection, and data analysis.) -Working with the core curriculum, within grade level PLCs teachers will: --Unpack the benchmark and identify what students need to understand, know, and do. --Plan for checks for understanding during the unit. --Plan for the End-of-Unit Assessment --Plan upcoming lessons/units using the 5E Instructional Model. --Reflect on the outcome of lessons taught --Analyze checks for understanding and core curriculum assessments. --Act on the core curriculum data by planning interventions for the whole class or small group. -PLCs will generate SMART goals for upcoming units of instruction. -PLCs will report SMART goal data through their logs. As a Science Department -PLC, share action plan successes and challenges of the grade levels courses. -PLCs will adjust action plans based on teacher/coach walk-through data, PLC collaboration, and student data.				
		1.3 -Teachers are at varying skill levels in using appropriate instructional,	1.3 Strategy Student understanding of the nature of science and	1.3 Who Principal APC	1.3 Teacher Level -Teachers reflect on lesson outcomes and use this knowledge to	1.3 2x per year District-level baseline and mid-year tests	

	3	scientific and laboratory technology (animations, probeware, digital microscopy) -Administrators are at varying skill levels in using appropriate instructional, scientific and laboratory technology (animations, probeware, digital microscopy)	scientific inquiry improves when students are intellectually active in learning important and challenging science content through the use of appropriate instructional methods, scientific processes, laboratory experiences, and uses of technology (animations, probeware, digital microscopy). Action Steps -As a Professional Development activity in their PLCs, teachers spend time sharing, researching, teaching, and modeling technology and hands-on strategies. -Within PLCs, teachers plan for engaging exploration of science content using hands-on learning experiences, inquiry, labs, technology (such as probeware, simulations and animations) within the 5E Instructional Model. -Teachers implement the 5E Instructional Model to promote learning experiences that cause students to think, make connections, formulate and test hypotheses and draw conclusions. -Teachers facilitate student-centered learning through the use of the 5E Instructional Model. -Common Core Literacy Standards for both Reading and Writing are appropriately embedded throughout the 5E Instruction Model. -Each teacher maintains a record of the number of occurrences of engagement tasks (hands-on-learning experiences, labs, and technology) per week. This data is then reported on the Science PLC log. -Monthly, school leaders conduct one-on-one data chats	How Monitored -Classroom walk-throughs observing this strategy.	drive future instruction. -Teachers use the on-line grading system data to calculate their students' progress towards their PLC and/or individual SMART Goal. PLC Level -Using the individual teacher data, PLCs calculate the SMART goal data across all classes/courses. -PLCs reflect on lesson outcomes and data used to drive future instruction. - For each class/course, PLCs chart their overall progress towards the SMART Goal. Leadership Team Level -PLC facilitator/ instructional coach shares SMART Goal data with the Problem Solving Leadership Team. -Data is used to drive teacher support and student supplemental instruction.	During the Grading Period -Unit assessments	

		with individual teachers using the data gathered from walk-through tools and engagement task records. These teacher data/chats guide the leadership's team professional development plan (both individually and whole faculty).			

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:	The percentage of student scoring a Level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase from 4% to 7%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
4%	7%

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
	2.1 -Not all teachers have received the CCLS for Science overview. -Not all teachers understand how to integrate close reading with the 5E instructional model. -Not all PLCs routinely look at curriculum	2.1 Strategy Students' comprehension of science text improves when students are engaged in close reading techniques using on-grade-level content-based text (textbooks and other	2.1 Who Principal AP Reading Coach Reading Leadership Team How Monitored Administration, instructional	2.1 Science PLC Resource meetings Reading Leadership Team PLCs will track achievement on the benchmark attached to the Close Reading passage comparing	2.1 3x-per year District level baseline, mid-year, and pre-EOC administration During the Grading Period -mini-

		materials beyond those posted on the curriculum guide	supplemental texts). Science teachers engage students in the close reading model (appropriately placed within the 5E instructional model) using their textbooks or other appropriate high-Lexile, complex supplemental texts at least twice times per nine weeks. Action Steps Professional Development -The Reading Coach along with the Departmental Leaders/instructional coach conduct small group departmental trainings to develop teachers' ability to use the close reading model. -The Reading Coach attends science departmental PLCs to co-plan with teachers, developing lessons using the close reading model. -Teachers within departments attend professional development provided by the district/school on text complexity and close reading models that are most applicable to science classrooms and support the 5E instructional model. In PLCs/Department -Teachers work in their PLCs to locate, discuss, and disseminate appropriate texts to supplement their textbooks. -PLCs review Close Reading Selections to determine word count and high-Lexile.	coach walk-throughs -PLC logs turned into administration. -Administration provides feedback.	baseline achievement level to 80% mastery using the proximal evaluation tool.	assessments -unit assessments	
	1		-PLCs assign appropriate NGSSS benchmark to Close Reading passage -To increase stamina, teachers select high-Lexile, complex and rigorous texts that are shorter and progress throughout the year to longer texts that are high-Lexile, complex and rigorous - Teachers debrief lesson implementation to determine effectiveness and level of student				

		comprehension and retention of the text. Teachers use this information to build future close reading lessons. During the lessons, teachers: -Guide students through text without reading or explaining the meaning of the text using the following: --Introducing critical vocabulary to ensure comprehension of text. --Stating an essential question prior to reading --Using questions to check for understanding. --Using question to engage students in discussion. --Requiring oral and written responses to text. -Ask text-based questions that require close reading of the text and multiple reads of the text. During the lessons, students: -Grapple with complex text. -Re-read for a second purpose and to increase comprehension. -Engage in discussion to answer essential question using textual evidence. -Write in response to essential question using textual evidence.			

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
Inquiry and the 5E Instructional Model	K-5	Technology Resource	PLC's	ongoing	Administrators conduct targeted walk-throughs to monitor 5 E Instructional Model lessons.	Administration Team
Close Reading	K-5	Reading Coach Leadership Team	PLC's	ongoing	Reading Coach walk-throughs	Administration Team and Reading Coach

Science Budget:

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	The percentage of students scoing Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writes will increase from 76% to 79%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
76%	79%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1 -Not all teachers know how to plan and execute writing lessons with a focus on mode-based writing. -Not all teachers know how to review student writing to determine trends and needs in order to drive instruction. -All teachers need training to score student writing accurately during the 2012-2013 school year using information provided by the state.	1.1 Strategy Students' use of mode-specific writing will improve through use of Writers' Workshop/daily instruction with a focus on mode-specific writing. Action Steps -Based on baseline data, PLCs write SMART goals for each Grading Period. (For example, during the first Grading Period, 50% of the students will score 4.0 or above on the end-of-the Grading Period writing prompt.) Plan: -Professional Development for updated rubric courses -Professional Development for instructional delivery of mode-specific writing -Training to facilitate data-driven PLCs -Using data to identify trends and drive instruction -Lesson planning based on the needs of students Do: -Daily/ongoing models and application of appropriate mode-specific writing based on teaching points -Daily/ongoing conferencing Check: Review of daily drafts and scoring monthly demand writes	1.1 Who Principal AP District (Writing Team, Supervisors, Writing Resources, Academic Coaches, and DRTs) How Monitored -PLC logs -Classroom walk-throughs Observation Form -Conferencing while writing walk-through tool (for coaches)	1.1 See “Check” & “Act” action steps in the strategies column	1.1 -Student monthly demand writes/formative assessments -Student daily drafts -Student revisions -Student portfolios

		-PLC discussions and analysis of student writing to determine trends and needs Act: -Receive additional professional development in areas of need -Seek additional professional knowledge through book studies/research -Spread the use of effective practices across the school based on evidence shown in the best practice of others -Use what is learned to begin the cycle again, revise as needed, increase scale if possible, etc. -Plan ongoing monitoring of the solution(s)			
2	1.2 -PLCs struggle with how to structure curriculum and data analysis discussion to deepen their leaning. To address this barrier, this year PLCs are being trained to use the Plan-Do-Check-Act "Instructional Unit" log.	1.2 Strategy Student achievement improves through teachers working collaboratively to focus on student learning. Specifically, they use the Plan-Do-Check-Act model and log to structure their way of work. Using the backwards design model for units of instruction, teachers focus on the following four questions: 1. What is it we expect them to learn? 2. How will we know if they have learned it? 3. How will we respond if they don't learn? 4. How will we respond if they already know it? Actions/Details -Grade level/like-course PLCs use a Plan-Do-Check-Act "Unit of Instruction" log to guide their discussion and way of work. Discussions are summarized on log. -Additional action steps for this strategy are outlined on grade level/content area PLC action plans.	1.2 Who -Principal -AP -Instruction Coaches -PLC facilitators of like grades and/or like courses How PLCS turn their logs into administration and/or coach after a unit of instruction is complete. -PLCs receive feedback on their logs. -Administrators and coaches attend targeted PLC meetings -Progress of PLCs discussed at Leadership Team -Administration shares the data of PLC visits with staff on a monthly basis.	1.2 School has a system for PLCs to record and report during-the-grading period SMART goal outcomes to administration, coach, and/or leadership team.	1.2 During the Grading Period Common assessments (pre, post, mid, section, end of unit)

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.	

Writing Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Writing Holistic Scoring Training	K-5	PLC Facilitator Writing Coach	Language Arts Teachers PLC-grade level and vertical teams	ongoing	PLC logs turned into administration	Principal AP PLC Facilitator Writing Coach
Mode-based Writing Training	K-5	PLC Facilitator Writing Coach	Language Arts Teachers PLC-grade level and vertical teams	On-going	C logs turned into administration and walkthroughs	Principal AP PLC Facilitator Writing Coach

Writing Budget:

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

Subtotal: $0.00	
Grand Total: $0.00	

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	The attendance rate will increase from 95.38% in 2011-12 to 96% in 2012-2013. The number of students who have 10 or more unexcused absences will decrease by 11% (5 students). The number of students who have 10 or more unexcused tardies will decrease by 9% (4 students).
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
95.38%	96%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
107	96
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
91	83

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	1.1 -Attendance committee needs to meet on a regular basis throughout the school year. -Need support in building and maintain the student database.	1.1 Tier 1 The school will establish an attendance committee comprised of Administrators, guidance counselors, teachers and other relevant personnel to review the school's attendance plan and discuss school wide interventions to address needs relevant to current attendance data. The attendance committee will also maintain a database of students with significant attendance problems and implement and monitor interventions to be documented on the attendance intervention	1.1 Attendance committee will keep a log and notes that will be reviewed by the Principal on a monthly basis and shared with faculty.	1.1 Attendance committee will monitor the attendance data from the targeted group of students.	1.1 Instructional Planning Tool Attendance/Tardy data Ed Connect

		form (SB 90710) The attendance committee meets every two weeks.			
2	1.2 -Need an Edline Attendance Waiver to increase the number of teachers posting on a weekly basis.	1.2 Tier 1 All teachers will post their attendance to EdLine at a minimum of once per week allowing parents to monitor attendance.	1.2 Assistant Principal/Team leaders/ will monitor Edline	1.2 Principal will use Edline reports to evaluate teachers adherence to policy	1.2 Edline Reports
3	1.3 There is no system to reinforce parents for facilitating improvement in attendance.	1.3 Tier 2 Beginning at the 5th unexcused absence, the Attendance Committee (which is a subgroup of the Leadership Team) collaborate to ensure that a letter is sent home to parents outlining the state statute that requires parents send students to school. If a student's attendance improves (no absences in a 20 day period) a positive letter is sent home to the parent regarding the increase in their child's attendance	1.3 Social Worker Guidance Counselor PSLT	1.3 The attendance committee (which is a subset of the leadership Team) will disaggregate attendance data for the "Tier 2" group along with the guidance counselor and maintain communication about these children.	1.3 Instructional Planning Tool Attendance/Tardy 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
EdLine	K-5	AP	School-wide	September and then an as needed basis	Random check of EdLine postings	AP

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			$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:	The number of students in-school suspensions will decrease by 10 %. The total number of students receiving in-school suspensions throughout the school year will decrease by 10%. The total number of out of school suspensions will decrease by 10%. The total number of students receiving suspension out of school throughout the school will decrease by 10%.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
1	1
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
1	1
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
22	20
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
16	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
	1.1 There needs to be common school-wide expectations and rules for appropriate classroom behavior.	1.1 -Providing teachers with resources for continued teaching and reinforcement of school	1.1 Who -PSLT Behavior Committee -Leadership Team	1.1 - PSLT /Behavior Committee will review data on Office Discipline Referrals ODRs and out of school suspensions.	1.1 UNTIE , EASI ODR and suspension data cross-referenced with mainframe

1		expectations and rules. -The data is shared with faculty at a monthly meeting, tracking the overall improvement of the faculty. -Where needed, administration conducts individual teacher walk-through data chats.	-Administration		discipline 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						

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:	Implements/expand project/problem-based learning in math, science and STEM.

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	Need common planning time for math, science, ELA and other STEM teachers.	- Explicit direction for STEM PLCs to be established. - Documentation of planning of unit and outcome of units in logs. - Increase effectiveness of lessons through lesson study and district metrics, etc.	PLC or grade level leaders	Administrative walk-throughs	Logging number of project-based learnign in math, science and STEM per nine week grading period. Share data with teachers.

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
Project-based learning	K-5	PLCs	Teachers in all subject areas	On-going	Administrator walk-throughs	Administration

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)

Health and Fitness Goal

Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Health and Fitness Goal Goal Health and Fitness Goal Goal #1:	During the 2012-2013 school year, the number of students scoring in the “Healthy Fitness Zone” (HFZ) on the Pacer for assessing aerobic capacity and cardiovascular health will increase from 90% on the Pretest to 99% on the Posttest. Increase the number of students scoring in the "Healthy Fitness Zone" (HFZ) by 10% on the PACER test for assessing aerobic capacity and cardiovascular health. Note: School will enter the data after the Pretest and Posttest.
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
School will enter the data after the Pretest and Posttest.	School will enter the data after the Pretest and Posttest.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of background knowledge and physical limitations.	Health and physical activity initiatives developed and implemented by the Principal’s designee.	Principal’s designee	Data on the number of students scoring in the Healthy Fitness Zone (HFZ)	PACER test component of the FITNESSGRAM PACER for assessing cardiovascular health

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 Health and Fitness Goal

Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading				$0.00
CELLA				$0.00
Mathematics	To increase teacher knowledge of math concepts and skills (common core)	Scholastic Math Solutions Training	Title I	$15,000.00
Science				$0.00
Writing				$0.00
Attendance				$0.00
Suspension				$0.00
				Subtotal: $15,000.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading				$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Mathematics	To increase student accountability talk and number talks.	Scholastic Math Solutions Training/ Coaching Cycle		$7,000.00
				Subtotal: $7,000.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
				Grand Total: $22,000.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

○ Priority	○ Focus	● Prevent	○ NA

Are you a reward school: ○ Yes ● No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/12/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

✓ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
Purchase DRA Kits: Grades Kindergarten - 1st (School-wide common assessment to accurately assess student progress) Purchase DRA Kits: Grades 2nd - 3rd (School-wide common assessment to accurately assess student progress) Purchase DRA Kits: Grades 4th - 5th (School-wide common assessment to accurately assess student progress)	$1,869.00

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

Temple Terrace Reads
Family Literacy Night
Book-O-Ween Story Book Parade
FCAT/SAT/ Common Core Parent Night
Family Math Night
Relay for Life
Service Learning Projects

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

Hillsborough School District
TEMPLE TERRACE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	71%	68%	90%	40%	269	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	55%	44%			99	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?	40% (NO)	52% (YES)			92	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					460	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Hillsborough School District
TEMPLE TERRACE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	81%	76%	84%	51%	292	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	74%	64%			138	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?	66% (YES)	78% (YES)			144	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					574	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested