FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: SUNSET PALMS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Palm Beach

Principal: Karen Riddle

SAC Chair: Tami Marcus

Superintendent: Mr. E. Wayne Gent

Date of School Board Approval: December 2012

Last Modified on: 11/5/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

School Grades Trend Data

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data

High School Feedback Report

K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Mrs. Karen Riddle	B.A. in Education with a major in Elementary Education with Honors, Florida Atlantic University Master of Science-Educational Leadership, Nova Southeastern	5	13	Principal of Sunset Palms 2011-2012 Grade: A (Reward School) Principal of Sunset Palms 2010-2011 Grade: A AYP: 97%(AYP was met in all categories except for Economically Disadvantaged in Reading) Principal of Sunset Palms 2009-2010 Grade: A AYP: 95% (AYP was met in all categories except for the Student with Disabilities in Reading and Math) Principal of Sunset Palms in 2008-2009 Grade: A. AYP: 100% met AYP in all sub-groups. Principal of Manatee Elementary School 2007-2008 Grade: A AYP: 95% (AYP was met in all categories except for the Students with Disabilities in

		University; Principal Certification- State of Florida			Reading and Math.) 2006-2007 Grade: A AYP: 100% met AYP in all sub-groups. 2005-2006 Grade: A AYP: 100% met AYP in all sub-groups. 2004-2005 Grade: A AYP: 100% met AYP in all sub-groups.
Assis Principal	Mr. Cory Zigler	B.A. in Psychology, University of South Florida Master of Science in Specific Learning Disabilities, Nova Southeastern Education Specialist in Educational Leadership, Nova Southeastern Certification in Educational Leadership, State of Florida ESOL endorsement	5	6	Assistant Principal of Sunset Palms 2011-2012 Grade: A (Reward School) Assistant Principal of Sunset Palms 2010-2011 Grade: A AYP: 97% (AYP was met in all categories except for Economically Disadvantaged Student with Disabilities in Reading) Assistant Principal of Sunset Palms 2009-2010 Grade: A AYP: 95% (AYP was met in all categories except for the Student with Disabilities in Reading and Math) AP of Sunset Palms Elementary 2008-2009 Grade: A. AYP: 100% met AYP in all sub-groups. AP of Manatee Elementary School 2008 Grade: A AYP: 95% (AYP was met in all categories except for the Students with Disabilities in Reading and Math.) ESE Coordinator, L.C. Swain Middle School 2006-2007 Grade: B Reading Mastery: 54% Math Mastery: 66% Science Mastery: 29% Writing Mastery: 90% AYP: 90%- Hispanic, ELL, Economically Disadvantaged and SWD did not meet AYP in Reading. ESE Coordinator, L.C. Swain Middle School 2005-2006 Grade: B Reading Mastery: 47% Math Mastery: 53% Writing Mastery: 85% AYP: 69%- Hispanic, Black, ELL, Economically Disadvantaged and SWD did not meet AYP in Reading and Math.

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.

	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification (s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
No data submitted					

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1. Regular meetings of new teachers with Principal and Assistant Principal	Principal and Assistant Principal	On-going	
2	2. Partnering new teachers with veteran staff	Assistant Principal	On-going	
3	3. District Job Fairs	Prinicpal	June 2013	
4	4. Soliciting referrals from current employees	Principal	On-going	
5	5. Beginning Teacher Assistance Program (BTAP)	Mentor Teachers	On-going	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

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

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
74	4.1%(3)	14.9%(11)	62.2%(46)	17.6%(13)	45.9%(34)	95.9%(71)	4.1%(3)	9.5%(7)	66.2%(49)

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
Christina Finnegan	Justin Gamelin	Mr. Gamelin is the fourth grade team leader.	Educator Support Program Beginning Teacher Assistance Program Peer mentoring
Laura Riedel	Michele Fullone	Mrs. Soffer is a fifth grade teacher on Ms. Riedel's team.	Educator Support Program Beginning Teacher Assistance Program Peer mentoring
Abbey Adair	Denise Martinez	Mrs. Martinez and Ms. Adair are co-teaching a second grade class.	Educator Support Program Beginning Teacher Assistance Program Peer mentoring

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI teacher will service selected struggling students in grades 4, 5 and 3.

Violence Prevention Programs

District wide implementation of Single School Culture as well as appreciation of Multicultural diversity.

Nutrition Programs

We will participate in district wide free breakfast program for all students.

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

Required instruction listed in Fla. Stat. 1003.42(2), as applicable to appropriate grade levels.

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Principal, Assistant Principal, ESE contact,school psychologist, speech/language pathologist, classroom teacher, MTSS/RtI/Inclusion Facilitator, and guidance counselor.

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 Team will meet regularly to review universal screening data, diagnostic data, and progress monitoring data. Based on this information, the team will identify the professional development activities needed to create effective learning environments. After determining that effective Tier-1 Core Instruction is in place, the team will identify students who are not meeting identified academic targets. The identified students will be referred to the school-based RtI Leadership Team.

The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team will use the Problem Solving Model to conduct all meetings. Based on data and discussion, the team will identify students who are in need of additional academic and/or behavioral support (supplemental or intensive; Tier 2 and/or Tier 3). An intervention plan will be developed (PBSCD Form 2284) which identifies a student's specific areas of deficiencies and appropriate research-based interventions to address these deficiencies. The team will ensure that the necessary resources are available and the intervention is implemented with fidelity. Each case will be assigned a case liaison to support the interventionist (e.g., teacher. MTSS/RtI/Inclusion Facilitator, guidance counselor) and report back on all data collected for further discussion at future meetings.

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?

Members of the school-based MTSS/RtI Leadership team will help develop the SY12 SIP. Utilizing the previous year's data, information on Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 targets will focus attention on the deficient areas and be discussed.

MTSS Implementation

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

Baseline data:

Florida Comprehensive Test (FCAT 2.0)
Curriculum Based Measurement
Florida Kindergarten Readiness Screener (FLKRS)
Progress Monitoring Reporting Network (PMRN)
Palm Beach County Fall Diagnostics
Palm Beach Writes
K-4 Literacy Assessment System
Diagnostic Assessment for Reading (DAR)
Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)
Office Discipline Referrals
Retentions
Absences

Midyear data:
Diagnostic Assessment for Reading (DAR)
CORE K-12
Palm Beach County Winter Diagnostics
Palm Beach Writes
Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN)
K-4 Literacy Assessment System

End of year data:
K-4 Literacy Assessment System
CORE K-12
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT 2.0)
FCAT Writes

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The ESE Contact and/or Guidance Counselor will provide in-service to the faculty on designated professional development

days (PDD). These in-service opportunities will include, but are not limited to, the following:

Problem Solving Model
Data-based decision-making to drive instruction
Progress Monitoring
Selection and availability of research-based interventions
Tools utilized to identify specific discrepancies in reading
Initial identification of struggling learners
MTSS/RtI procedures and paperwork

Individual professional development will be provided to classroom teachers as needed.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

1. Professional development will be provided to classroom teachers.
2. Each grade level will have a MTSS liaison to communicate and facilitate MTSS process.
3. District resources will be utilized.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Principal - Karen Riddle, Assistant Principal - Cory Zigler, SAI teacher - Elissa Levine, Grade Level Team Leaders - Nadia Infiesta (K); Cathy Peterson (1); Melissa Wampler (2); Jennifer Siemon (3); Justin Gamelin (4); Cristin Tabachnick (5), Sharon Miller - Fine Arts Team Leader, Lelis Rossique - ESE Team Leader

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

The LLT meets monthly to discuss literacy topics, concerns, and initiatives. The members are responsible for collecting and disseminating information to their team.

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

The major initiatives of the LLT this year will be ensuring consistency, fidelity, and accuracy of the literacy assessment system as well as writing conventions. Additionally, the fidelity of iii groups will be addressed, updated and monitored with concentration on learning gains and the Lowest 25%. Moreover, a Family Literacy Night presentation will be implemented in December 2012, and reading strategies will be shared school wide through the morning announcements.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

*High Schools Only

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

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:	35% of students will score at Achievement Level 3 in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27% (113)of students scored at Acievement Level 3 in Reading.	35% (125)of students will score at Acievement Level 3 in Reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Time and schedule constraints due to district and state mandates. 2. Lack of funding for tutorial. 3. Lack of staff willing to instruct tutorial.	1. Include higher order questions during instruction 2. Implement with fidelity the 90 minute literacy block 3. Reading Strategy activities to increase reading proficiency including: comprehension,vocabulary development, fluency, phonics and phonemic awareness. 4. Focusing on implementing reading strategies across all academic subject areas. 5. Increase parental awareness of effective reading strategies. 6. Incorporate reading strategies into morning announcements. 7. Reader's Workshop	Principal, Assistant Principal, RtI Facilitator, Literacy Leadership Team	1. Classroom walkthroughs 2. Meetings with grade level teams 3. Teacher/student data chats/reviews 4.Administration/teacher data chats/reviews 5. Family Literacy Night (December 2012)	1. Diagnostic data 2. K-4 Literacy Assessment System data 3. Classroom assessments 4. FCAT data 5. CORE K-12 data 6. SRI data 7. MTSS/RtI data

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	15% of students will score at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
1 out of 5 (20%) students scored at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.	15% of students will score at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Having only two ASD units at the school there are students at various ability and grade levels.	1. Implement PECS learning system. 2. Students are mainstreamed into regular education classes. 3. Differentiated instructional and therapeutic practices based on individual student needs.	Principal, Assistant Principal, ASD teachers, Speech/Language Pathologist, ESE Contact	1. Classroom walkthroughs 2. Meetings with grade level teams 3. Teacher/student data chats/reviews 4.Administration/teacher data chats/reviews 5. Family Literacy Night (December 2012)	1. FAA data 2. SLP data 3. Teacher anecdotal and records.

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:	51% of students will score at or above Achievement Level 4 and 5 in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
49% (208)of students achieved a level 4 or 5 in reading.	51% (223)of students will achieve a level 4 or 5 in reading.

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Time and schedule constraints due to district and state mandates. 2. Lack of funding for Enrichment Programs after school. 3. Complexity level of questions changes from grade to grade making it challenging to maintain a level 4 or 5.	1. Ability grouping for level 4 and 5 students 2. Enrichment classes 3. Focusing on implementing reading strategies across all academic subject areas. 4. Increase parental awareness of effective reading strategies. 5. Incorporate reading strategies into morning announcements. 6. Reader's Workshop	Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Leadership Team	1. Classroom walkthroughs 2. Teacher/student data chats/reviews 3.Administration/teacher data chats/reviews 4. Meeting with grade level teams 5. Family Literacy Night (December 2012)	1. Diagnostic tests 2. K-4 Literacy Assessment System data 3. Classroom assessments 4. FCAT data 5. CORE K-12 data 6. SRI data 7. MTSS/RtI data

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	85% of students will score at or above Level 7 in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
4 out of 5 (80%) of students scored at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading.	85% 85% of students will score at or above Level 7 in reading.
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Having only two ASD units at the school there are students at various ability and grade levels.	1. Implement PECS learning system. 2. Students are mainstreamed into regular education classes. 3. Differentiated instructional and therapeutic practices based on individual student needs.	Principal, Assistant Principal, ASD teachers, Speech/Language Pathologist, ESE Contact	1. Classroom walkthroughs 2. Meetings with grade level teams 3. Teacher/student data chats/reviews 4. Administration/teacher data chats/reviews 5. Family Literacy Night (December 2012)	1. FAA data 2. SLP data 3. Teacher anecdotal and records.

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:	80% of students will make Learning Gains in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
75% (174)of students demonstrated Learning Gains in Reading.	80% (190) of students will make Learning Gains in reading.

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Time and schedule constraints due to district and state mandates. 2. Lack of funding for Tutorial Programs 3. Complexity level of questions changes from grade to grade making it challenging to make a learning gain. 4. Focusing on implementing reading strategies across all academic subject areas.	1. Include higher order questions during instruction 2. Implement with fidelity the 90 minute literacy block 3. Reading Strategy activities to increase reading proficiency including: comprehension,vocabulary development, fluency, phonics and phonemic awareness. 4. Implement iii with fidelity focusing on specific targeted deficient areas. 5. RtI Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 interventions as determined by SBT. 6. Increase parental awareness of effective reading strategies. 7. Incorporate reading strategies into morning announcements. 8. Reader's Workshop	Principal, Assistant Principal, RtI Facilitator, Literacy Leadership Team	1. Classroom walkthroughs 2. Meetings with grade level teams 3. Teacher/student data chats/reviews 4. Administration/teacher data chats/reviews 5. Family Literacy Night (December 2012)	1. Diagnostic data 2. K-4 Literacy Assessment System data 3. Classroom assessments 4. FCAT data 5. CORE K-12 data 6. SRI data 7. MTSS/RtI data

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.	100% of students will make learning gains in reading.

Reading Goal #3b:	

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
4 out of 5 (80%) students made learning gains in reading.	100% of students will make learning gains in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Having only two ASD units at the school there are students at various ability and grade levels.	1. Implement PECS learning system. 2. Students are mainstreamed into regular education classes. 3. Differentiated instructional and therapeutic practices based	Principal, Assistant Principal, ASD teachers, Speech/Language Pathologist, ESE Contact	1. Classroom walkthroughs 2. Meetings with grade level teams 3. Teacher/student data chats/reviews 4. Administration/teacher data chats/reviews 5. Family Literacy Night (December 2012)	1. FAA data 2. SLP data 3. Teacher anecdotal and records.

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:	80% of students in Lowest 25% will make learning gains in reading.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
73% (165) of students in Lowest 25% made learning gains in reading.	80% (177) of students in Lowest 25% will make learning gains in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Time and schedule constraints due to district and state mandates. 2. Lack of funding for Tutorial Programs 3. Complexity level of questions changes from grade to grade making it challenging to make a learning gain. 4. The majority of students in Lowest 25% are Students with Disabilities.	1. Include higher order questions during instruction 2. Implement with fidelity the 90 minute literacy block 3. Reading Strategy activities to increase reading proficiency including: comprehension,vocabulary development, fluency, phonics and phonemic awareness. 4. Implement iii with fidelity focusing on specific targeted deficient areas. 5. RtI Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 interventions as determined by SBT. 6. Increase parental awareness of effective reading strategies.	Principal, Assistant Principal, RtI Facilitator, Literacy Leadership Team	1. Classroom walkthroughs 2. Meetings with grade level teams 3. Teacher/student data chats/reviews 4.Administration/teacher data chats/reviews 5. Family Literacy Night (December 2012)	1. Diagnostic data 2. K-4 Literacy Assessment System data 3. Classroom assessments 4. FCAT data 5. CORE K-12 data 6. SRI data

		7. Incorporate reading strategies into morning announcements. 8. Reader's Workshop			

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 #
	In six years our school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	76%	76%	78%	81%	83%	

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 following subgroups did not meet 2012 Reading Targets: Asian, Hispanic, ELL, Students with Disabilities, and Economically Disadvantaged. The following subgroup met 2012 Reading Targets: Black and White All subgroups will meet 2013 Targets.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
19% (40) White; 42% (11) Black; 32% (20) Hispanic; 19% (3) Asian; and American Indian 0% (0) did not make satisfactory progress in reading.	17% (35) White; 39% (10) Black; 26% (19) Hispanic; 15% (4) Asian; and American Indian 0% (0) will not make satisfactory progress in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Time and schedule constraints due to district and state mandates. 2. Lack of funding for Tutorial Programs 3. Complexity level of questions changes from grade to grade making it challenging to make a learning gain. 4. The majority of students in Lowest 25% are Students with Disabilities.	1. Include higher order questions during instruction 2. Implement with fidelity the 90 minute literacy block 3. Reading Strategy activities to increase reading proficiency including: comprehension,vocabulary development, fluency, phonics and phonemic awareness. 4. Implement iii with fidelity focusing on specific targeted deficient areas. 5. RtI Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 interventions as determined by SBT. 6. Increase parental awareness of effective reading strategies. 7. Incorporate reading strategies into morning announcements. 8. Reader's Workshop	Principal, Assistant Principal, RtI Facilitator, Literacy Leadership Team	1. Classroom walkthroughs 2. Meetings with grade level teams 3. Teacher/student data chats/reviews 4.Administration/teacher data chats/reviews 5. Family Literacy Night (December 2012)	1. Diagnostic data 2. K-4 Literacy Assessment System data 3. Classroom assessments 4. FCAT data 5. CORE K-12 data 6. SRI data

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	49% (9) of ELLs will not make satisfactory progress in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
73% (12) of ELLs did not make satisfactory progress in reading.	49% (9) of ELLs will not make satisfactory progress in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Time and schedule constraints due to district and state mandates. 2. Lack of funding for Tutorial Programs 3. Complexity level of questions changes from grade to grade making it challenging to make a learning gain. 4. ELL students make up part of Lowest 25% of students.	1. Include higher order questions during instruction 2. Implement with fidelity the 90 minute literacy block 3. Reading Strategy activities to increase reading proficiency including: comprehension,vocabulary development, fluency, phonics and phonemic awareness. 4. Implement iii with fidelity focusing on specific targeted deficient areas. 5. RtI Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 interventions as determined by SBT. 6. Increase parental awareness of effective reading strategies. 7. Incorporate reading strategies into morning announcements. 8. Reader's Workshop	Principal, Assistant Principal, RtI Facilitator, Literacy Leadership Team	1. Classroom walkthroughs 2. Meetings with grade level teams 3. Teacher/student data chats/reviews 4.Administration/teacher data chats/reviews 5. Family Literacy Night (December 2012)	1. Diagnostic data 2. K-4 Literacy Assessment System data 3. Classroom assessments 4. FCAT data 5. CORE K-12 data 6. SRI data

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	47% (33) Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
55% (38) Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	47% (33) Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Time and schedule constraints due to district and state mandates. 2. Lack of funding for Tutorial Programs 3. Complexity level of questions changes from grade to grade making it challenging to make a learning gain. 4. The majority of students in Lowest 25% are Students with Disabilities.	1. Include higher order questions during instruction 2. Implement with fidelity the 90 minute literacy block 3. Reading Strategy activities to increase reading proficiency including: comprehension,vocabulary development, fluency, phonics and phonemic awareness. 4. Implement iii with fidelity focusing on specific targeted deficient areas. 5. RtI Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 interventions as determined by SBT. 6. Increase parental awareness of effective reading strategies. 7. Incorporate reading strategies into morning announcements. 8. Reader's Workshop	Principal, RtI Facilitator, Literacy Leadership Team	1. Classroom walkthroughs 2. Meetings with grade level teams 3. Teacher/student data chats/reviews 4.Administration/teacher data chats/reviews 5. Family Literacy Night (December 2012)	1. Diagnostic data 2. K-4 Literacy Assessment System data 3. Classroom assessments 4. FCAT data 5. CORE K-12 data 6. SRI data

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	34% (31) of students Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
40% (35) of Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.	34% (31) of students Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1					
2	1. Time and schedule constraints due to district and state mandates. 2. Lack of funding for Tutorial Programs 3. Complexity level of questions changes from grade to grade making it challenging to make a learning gain. 4. Majority of students in Lowest 25% are Economically Disadvantaged.	1. Include higher order questions during instruction 2. Implement with fidelity the 90 minute literacy block 3. Reading Strategy activities to increase reading proficiency including: comprehension,vocabulary development, fluency, phonics and phonemic awareness. 4. Implement iii with fidelity focusing on specific targeted deficient areas. 5. RtI Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 interventions as determined by SBT.	Principal, RtI Facilitator, Literacy Leadership Team	1. Classroom walkthroughs 2. Meetings with grade level teams 3. Teacher/student data chats/reviews 4.Administration/teacher data chats/reviews 5. Family Literacy Night (December 2012	1. Diagnostic data 2. K-4 Literacy Assessment System data 3. Classroom assessments 4. FCAT data 5. CORE K-12 data 6. SRI data

		6. Increase parental awareness of effective reading strategies. 7. Incorporate reading strategies into morning announcements. 8. Reader's Workshop			

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
Reader's Workshop	3-5	School district facilitator/School Administration	3-5 Reading teachers	August 2012	1. Classroom walkthroughs 2. Data reviews	Principal and Assistant Principal
Fundations	Kindergarten	School district facilitator/School Administration	Kindergarten teachers	August 2012	1. Classroom walkthroughs 2. Data reviews	Principal and Assistant Principal
Common Core State Standards (CCSS)	K-2	School district facilitator/School Administration	K-2 teachers	On-going	1. Classroom walkthroughs 2. Data reviews	Principal and Assistant Principal

---

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reader's Workshop Units of Study	Reader's Workshop Units of Study	PTA	$2,100.00
Words Their Way	Vocabulary development	PTA	$500.00
			Subtotal: $2,600.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading A-Z	Guided reading books	PTA	$1,000.00
Book Flix/Tru Flix	eBooks	Media/Book Fair	$2,000.00
iPad applications	iPad applications	Media/Book Fair	$500.00
			Subtotal: $3,500.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reader's Workshop	Reader's Workshop Units of Study	School district	$0.00
Fundations	Fundations kits	School district	$0.00
CORE K-12 Assessment System	School district assessment system	School district	$0.00
Common Core State Standards (CCSS)	State/district CCSS information, trainings, and documents.	School district	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Service students in Lowest 25% through after school tutorial program.	Funding for tutorial program and materials.	School Improvement funds	$2,000.00

Provide SBT leadership which follows a structured problem solving student intervention process identifying and monitoring of academic, social, emotional, and behavioral weaknesses and challenges to increase student achievement.	School Base Team supplement.	School Improvement funds	$562.00
Incentive for students meeting proficiency and/or making learning gains on FCAT.	Funding for incentive program.	School Improvement funds	$600.00
		Subtotal: $3,162.00	
		Grand Total: $9,262.00	

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:	50% of students will score proficient in Listening/Speaking
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
37% (10) of students are proficient in Listening/Speaking.	

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Do not have an ESOL teacher or coordinator. 2. Parents of some students have limited English and are unable to assist their child.	1. Translate important documents into Spanish. 2. PLC conferences. 3. Peer mentoring. 4. CLF works with students and assist teachers.	CLF, Classroom teachers, and Assistant Principal	1. CELLA data 2. Diagnostic data 3. Palm Beach Writes 4. K-4 Literacy Assessment System 5. PLC conference notes 6. Parent/teacher conference notes 7. Teacher communication logs	1. CELLA 2. Diagnostics data 3. Palm Beach Writes data 4. K-4 Literacy Assessment System data
2					

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:	35% of students will score proficient in Reading.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	
22% (6) of students scored proficient in Reading.	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Do not have an ESOL teacher or coordinator. 2. Parents of some students have limited English and are unable to assist their child.	1. Translate important documents into Spanish. 2. PLC conferences 3. Peer mentoring 4. CLF works with students and assists tecahers.	CLF, Classroom teachers, and Assistant Principal	1. CELLA 2. Diagnostic data 3. Palm Beach Writes 4. K-4 Literacy Assessment System 5. PLC conference notes 6. Parent/teacher conference notes 7. Teacher communication logs	1. CELLA data 2. Diagnostic data 3. Palm Beach Writes data 4. K-4 Literacy Assessment System data

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	35% of students will score proficient in Writing.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:	
24% (7) of students scored proficient in Writing.	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Do not have ESOL teacher or coordinator. 2. Parents of some students have limited English and are unable to assist their child.	1. Translate important documents into Spanish. 2. PLC conferences. 3. Peer mentoring. 4. CLF works with students and assists teachers.	CLF, Classroom teachers, and Assistant Principal	1. CELLA 2. Diagnostic data 3. Palm Beach Writes 4. K-4 Literacy Assessment System 5. PLC conference notes 6. Parent/teacher conference notes 7. Teacher communication logs	1. CELLA data 2. Diagnostic data reviews and chats 3. Palm Beach Writes data 4. K-4 Literacy Assessment System data

CELLA Budget:

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

No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	36% (149) of students will score at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
34% (145) of students scored at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.	36% (149) of students will score at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Time constraints to organize centers and utilize multiple resources provided from math series. 2. Teaching excessive multiple strategies for the same concept. 3. Teachers feel pressured to complete all pages in textbook.	1. Teacher will model for understanding through the use of manipulatives. 2. Teacher will implement iii for small group instruction within fluid groups. 3. Teachers will utilize GO Math series to promote a deep understanding of concepts based on individual class needs. 4. Implement math centers daily. 5. Utilize Go Math! online resources.	Principal and Assistant Principal; Classroom teachers	1. Classroom walkthroughs 2. Data chats between student and teacher. 3. Data chats between teachers and administration. 4. Meeting with grade level teams 5. Math & Science Fair Family Night (January 2013)	1. Diagnostic tests 2. Classroom assessments 3. FCAT scores 4. CORE K-12 data

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	20% (1) of students will score at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2 out of 5 (40%) students scored at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.	20% (1) of students will score at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	1. Having only two ASD units at the school and there are students at various ability and grade	1. Implement PECS learning system. 2. Students are mainstreamed into regular	Principal, Assistant Principal, ASD teachers, Speech/Language	1. Classroom walkthroughs 2. Meeting with grade level teams	1. FAA data 2. SLP data 3. Teacher anecdotals and

1	levels.	education classes. 3. Differentiated insturctional and therapeutic practices based on individual student needs.	Pathologist, ESE Contact	3. Administration/teacher data chats/reviews 4. Math & Science Fair Family Night (January 2013)	records.

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:	43% (180) of studets will score at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41% (176) of students scored at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.	43% (180)of students will score at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in mathematics.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Time constraints to organize centers and utilize multiple resources provided from math series. 2. Teaching excessive mulitple strategies for the same concept. 3. Teachers feel pressured to complete all pages in textbook. 4. Lack of funding for Enrichment Programs 5. Complexity level of questions changes from grade to grade making it challenging to maintain a level 4 or 5.	1. Ability grouping for level 4 and 5 students 2. Enrichment classes 3. Teacher will model for understanding through the use of manipulatives. 4. Teacher will implement iii for small group instruction within fluid groups. 5. Teachers will utilize GO Math series to promote a deep understanding of concepts based on individual class needs. 6. Implement math centers daily. 7. Utilize Go Math! online resources.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Classroom teachers	1. Classroom walkthroughs 2. Teacher/student data chats/reviews 3. Administration/teacher data chats/reviews 4. Meeting with grade level teams 5. Math & Science Fair Family Night (January 2013)	1. Diagnostic tests 2. Classroom assessments 3. FCAT scores 4. CORE K-12 data

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	80% (4 out of 5) of students will score at or above Level 7 in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
3 out of 5 (60%) of students scored at or above Level 7 in mathematics.	80% (4 out of 5) of students will score at or above Level 7 in mathematics.

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

1	1. Having only two ASD units at the school and there are students at various ability and grade levels.	1. Implement PECS learning system. 2. Students are mainstreamed into regular education classes. 3. Differentiated instructional and therapeutic practices based on individual student needs.	Principal, Assistant Principal, ASD teachers, Speech/Language Pathologits, ESE Contact	1. Classroom walkthroughs 2. Meetings with grade level teams 3. Administration/teacher data chats/reviews 4. Math & Science Fair Family Night (January 2013)	1. FAA data 2. SLP data 3. Teacher anecdotals and records

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:	63% (153) of students will make learning gains in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
61% (148) of students made Learning Gains in mathematics.	63% (153) of stduents will make Learning Gains in mathematics.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td align="center">Anticipated Barrier</td><td align="center">Strategy</td><td align="center">Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td align="center">Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td align="center">Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>1. Time constraints to organize centers and utilize multiple resources provided from math series.
2. Teaching excessive mulitple strategies for the same concept.
3. Teachers feel pressured to complete all pages in textbook.</td><td>1. Teacher will model for understanding through the use of manipulatives.

2. Teacher will implement iii for small group instruction within fluid groups.
3. Teachers will utilize GO Math series to promote a deep understanding of concepts based on individual class needs.
4. Implement math centers daily.
5. Utilize Go Math! online resources.</td><td>Principal and Assistant Principal; Classroom teachers</td><td>1. Classroom walkthroughs
2. Data chats between student and teacher.
3. Data chats between teachers and administration.
4. Meeting with grade level teams
5. Math & Science Fair Family Night (January 2013)</td><td>1. Diagnostic tests

2. Classroom assessments
3. FCAT scores
4. CORE K-12 data</td></tr>
</table>

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:	60% (3 out of 5) of students will make learning gains in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2 out of 5 (40%) students made learning gains in mathematics.	60% (3 out of 5) of students will make learning gains in mathematics.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td align="center">Person or</td><td align="center">Process Used to</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Having only two ASD units at the school and there are students at various ability and grade levels.	1. Implement PECS learning system. 2. Students are mainstreamed into regular education classes. 3. Differentiated instructional and therapeutic practices based on individual student needs.	Principal, Assistant Principal, ASD teachers, Speech/Language Pathologist, ESE Contact	1. Classroom walkthroughs 2. Meetings with grade level teams 3. Administration/teacher data chats/reviews 4. Math & Science Fair Family Night (January 2013)	1. FAA data 2. SLP data 3. Teacher anecdotals and records

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:	55% of students in the Lowest 25% will make learning gains in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% of students in Lowest 25% made learning gains in mathematics.	55% of students in Lowest 25% will make learning gains in mathematics.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Time constraints to organize centers and utilize multiple resources provided from math series. 2. Teaching excessive mulitple strategies for the same concept. 3. Teachers feel pressured to complete all pages in textbook.	1. Teacher will model for understanding through the use of manipulatives. 2. Teacher will implement iii for small group instruction within fluid groups. 3. Teachers will utilize GO Math series to promote a deep understanding of concepts based on individual class needs. 4. Implement math centers daily. 5. Utilize Go Math! online resources.	Principal and Assistant Principal; Classroom teachers	1. Classroom walkthroughs 2. Data chats between student and teacher. 3. Data chats between teachers and administration. 4. Meeting with grade level teams 5. Math & Science Fair Family Night (January 2013)	1. Diagnostic tests 2. Classroom assessments 3. FCAT scores 4. CORE K-12 data

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 # In six years our school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. 5A :					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	76%	79%	81%	83%	85%	

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 following subgroups did not meet 2012 Reading Targets: Black, Hispanic, ELL, Students with Disabilities, and Economically Disadvantaged The following subgroup met 2012 Reading Targets: White All subgroups will meet 2013 Targets.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
18% (41) White; 51% (23) Black; 32% (30) Hispanic; 10% (2)Asian; and 0% (0) American Indian not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	17% (38) White; 28% (5) Black; 22% (23) Hispanic; 8% (1); 15% Asian (3) and 0% (0) American Indian will not make satisfactory progress in mathematics.

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement			

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Time constraints to organize centers and utilize multiple resources provided from math series. 2. Teaching excessive mulitple strategies for the same concept. 3. Teachers feel pressured to complete all pages in textbook.	1. Teacher will model for understanding through the use of manipulatives. 2. Teacher will implement iii for small group instruction within fluid groups. 3. Teachers will utilize GO Math series to promote a deep understanding of concepts based on individual class needs. 4. Implement math centers daily. 5. Utilize Go Math! online resources.	Principal and Assistant Principal; Classroom teachers	1. Classroom walkthroughs 2. Data chats between student and teacher. 3. Data chats between teachers and administration. 4. Meeting with grade level teams 5. Math & Science Fair Family Night (January 2013)	1. Diagnostic tests 2. Classroom assessments 3. FCAT scores 4. CORE K-12 data

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	30% (3) of English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
77% (9) of English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	30% (3) of English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement			

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Time constraints to organize centers and utilize multiple resources provided from math series. 2. Teaching excessive multiple strategies for the same concept. 3. Teachers feel pressured to complete all pages in textbook. 4. ELL students make up	1. Teacher will model for understanding through the use of manipulatives. 2. Teacher will implement iii for small group instruction within fluid groups. 3. Teachers will utilize GO Math series to promote a deep understanding of concepts based on	Principal and Assistant Principal; Classroom teachers	1. Classroom walkthroughs 2. Data chats between student and teacher. 3. Data chats between teachers and administration. 4. Meeting with grade level teams 5. Math & Science Fair Family Night (January 2013)	1. Diagnostic tests 2. Classroom assessments 3. FCAT scores 4. CORE K-12 data

part of Lowest 25%.	individual class needs. 4. Implement math centers daily. 5. Utilize Go Math! online resources.		

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:	35% (18) of Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
58% (39) of Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	35% (18) of Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Time constraints to organize centers and utilize multiple resources provided from math series. 2. Teaching excessive mulitple strategies for the same concept. 3. Teachers feel pressured to complete all pages in textbook. 4. Students with Disabilities make up a significant portion of Lowest 25%.	1. Teacher will model for understanding through the use of manipulatives. 2. Teacher will implement iii for small group instruction within fluid groups. 3. Teachers will utilize GO Math series to promote a deep understanding of concepts based on individual class needs. 4. Implement math centers daily. 5. Utilize Go Math! online resources.	Principal and Assistant Principal; Classroom teachers	1. Classroom walkthroughs 2. Data chats between student and teacher. 3. Data chats between teachers and administration. 4. Meeting with grade level teams 5. Math & Science Fair Family Night (January 2013)	1. Diagnostic tests 2. Classroom assessments 3. FCAT scores 4. CORE K-12 data

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

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:	25% (23)of Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
45% (40) of Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	25% (23)of Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	1. Time constraints to organize centers and utilize multiple resources provided from math series.	1. Teacher will model for understanding through the use of manipulatives. 2. Teacher will implement	Principal and Assistant Principal; Classroom teachers	1. Classroom walkthroughs 2. Data chats between student and teacher. 3. Data chats between	1. Diagnostic tests 2. Classroom assessments 3. FCAT scores

1	2. Teaching excessive multiple strategies for the same concept. 3. Teachers feel pressured to complete all pages in textbook. 4. Economically Disadvantaged students make up a portion of Lowest 25%.	iii for small group instruction within fluid groups. 3. Teachers will utilize GO Math series to promote a deep understanding of concepts based on individual class needs. 4. Implement math centers daily. 5. Utilize Go Math! online resources.		teachers and administration. 4. Meeting with grade level teams 5. Math & Science Fair Family Night (January 2013)	4. CORE K-12 data
2					
3					

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
Common Core State Standards (CCSS)	K-2	School district facilitator, School administration	K-2 Teachers	Ongoing	1. Classroom walkthorughs 2. Data reviews	Principal, Assistant Principal, and PD Contact

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
CORE K-12 Assessment system	School district assessment system	School district	$0.00
Common Core State Standards (CCSS)	State/district CCSS information, trainings, and documents.	School district	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Service students in Lowest 25% through after school tutorial program.	Funding for tutorial program and materials.	School Improvement Funds	$2,000.00
Incentive program for students meeting proficiency and/or making learning gain on FCAT.	Fundng for incentive program.	PTA	$1,000.00
			Subtotal: $3,000.00
			Grand Total: $3,000.00

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:	55% of students will score at Achievement Level 3 in science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
48% (63) of students scored at Achievement Level 3	55% (85) of students will score at Achievement Level 3

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Time and schedule constraints due to district and state mandates, and supplemental instruction. 2. Teacher adjustment to new textbook series (2-5). 3. Grade 5 teachers exposure to new standards.	1. Utilize hands-on experiments weekly. 2. Attend professional development training offered by school district. 3. Utilize online resources available through series.	Principal and Assistant Principal; Classroom teacher	1. Science teachers will demonstrate lab experiments on a weekly basis and require students to record findings in science journals.	1. Improvement on fall/winter diagnostics. 2. FCAT scores 3. CORE K-12 data

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b:	0% of students will score a Level 4, 5, and 6 in science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0 out of 2 students scored a Level 4, 5, and 6 in science.	0% of students will score a Level 4, 5, and 6 in science.

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. Having only two ASD units at the school and there are students at various ability and grade levels.	1. Implement PECS learning system. 2. Students are mainstreamed into regular education classes. 3. Differentiated	Principal, Assistant Principal, ASD teachers, Speech/Language Pathologist, ESE Contact	1. Classroom walkthroughs 2. Meetings with grade level teams 3. Teacher/student data chats/reviews 4.	1. FAA data 2. SLP data 3. Teacher anecdotal and records.

| | | instructional and therapeutic practices based on individual student needs. | | Administration/teacher data chats/reviews 5. Math & Science Fair Family Night (January 2013) | |

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:	31% of students will score at or above achievement level 4 and 5 in science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28% (37) of students scored at or above achievement level 4 and 5 in science.	31% (43)of students will score at or above achievement level 4 and 5 in science.

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. Time and schedule constraints due to district and state mandates, and supplemental instruction. 2. Teacher adjustment to new textbook series (2-5). 3. Grade 5 teachers exposure to new standards.	1. Utilize hands-on experiments weekly. 2. Attend professional development training offered by school district. 3. Utilize online resources available through series.	Principal and Assistant Principal; Classroom teacher	1. Science teachers will demonstrate lab experiments on a weekly basis and require students to record findings in science journals.	1. Improvement on fall/winter diagnostics. 2. FCAT scores 3. CORE K-12 data

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:	100% of students will score at or above Level 7 in science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2 out of 2 students will score at or above Level 7 in science.	100% of students will score at or above Level 7 in science.

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. Having only two ASD units at the school and there are students at various ability and grade levels.	1. Implement PECS learning system. 2. Students are mainstreamed into regular education classes. 3. Differentiated instructional and	Principal, Assistant Principal, ASD teachers, Speech/Language Pathologist, ESE Contact	1. Classroom walkthroughs 2. Meetings with grade level teams 3. Teacher/student data chats/reviews 4. Administration/teacher	1. FAA data 2. SLP data 3. Teacher anecdotal and records.

| | | therapeutic practices based on individual student needs. | | data chats/reviews 5. Math & Science Family Night (January 2013) | |

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core State Standards (CCSS)	K-2	School district facilitator/School Administration	K-2 teachers	Ongoing	1. Classroom walkthroughs 2. Data reviews	Principal, Assistant Principal, and PD Contact
Effective implementation of higher order thinking skills through science concepts and hands-on experiments.	K-5	Science teachers; Professional Development Contact	School-wide	Ongoing	Modeling of lessons and classroom walkthroughs.	Principal and Assistant Principal

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Hands-on learning experiments	Lab materials	Student donations ($20 per student)	$2,800.00
			Subtotal: $2,800.00
			Grand Total: $2,800.00

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:	94% of students will score at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
92% (129) of students scored at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.	94% (141) of students will score at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Time and schedule constraints due to district and state mandates. 2. Limited conference time with students. 3. Adjusting to new FCAT Writes scoring rubric.	1. Lucy Calkins Writer's Workshop 2. Training and implementation of Lucy Calkins Writer's Workshop 3. Use of anchor charts during instruction. 4. Individual weekly conferences with students.	Principal, Assistant Principal, and Classroom teacher	1. Student writing samples will be maintained in student folders. 2. Conference notes will be used for documentation. 3. Classroom walkthroughs 4. Data chats between student and teacher. 5. Data chats between teachers and administration. 6. Meeting with grade level teams	1. Palm Beach Writes 2. Classroom writing assessments/samples 3. FCAT Writes

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	100% of students will score at 4 or higher in writing.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2 out of 2 students scored at 4 or higher in writing.	100% of students will score at 4 or higher in writing.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Having only two ASD units at the school and there are students at various ability and grade levels.	1. Implement PECS learning system. 2. Students are mainstreamed into regular education classes. 3. Differentiated instructional and	Principal, Assistant Principal, ASD tecahers, Speech/language Pathologist, ESE Contact	1. Classroom walkthorughs 2. Meeting with grade level teams 3. Teacher/student data chats/reviews 4. Administration/teacher	1. FAA data 2. SLP data 3. Teacher anecdotals and records

| | therapeutic practices based on individual student needs. | | data chats/reviews 5. Family Literacy Night (December 2012) | |

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
Lucy Calkins Writer's Workshop	K-4	School District of Palm Beach County trainers	K-4 teachers	Ongoing	1. Monitor student writing journals 2. Weekly student conferences 3. Data reviews	Principal and Assistant Principal
Common Core State Standards (CCSS)	K-2	School district facilitator; School administration	K-2 teachers	Ongoing	1. Classroom walkthroughs 2. Data reviews	Principal, Assistant Principal, and PD Contact

---

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Incentive for students meeting proficiency on FCAT Writes	Funding for incentive program	School Improvement funds	$300.00
Services students scoring below proficiency based on data from Palm Beach Writes for tutorial.	Funding for tutorial program	School Improvement funds	$1,000.00
			Subtotal: $1,300.00
			Grand Total: $1,300.00

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 2013 expected Attendance Rate is 80% (800).
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
The 2012 Attendance Rate was 78% (773).	The 2013 expected Attendance Rate will be 80% (800).
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
The 2012 number of students with Excessive Absences was 223 students.	The 2013 number of students with Excessive Absences will be 190 students.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
The 2012 number of students with excessive tardies was 161 students.	The 2013 number of students with Excessive Tardies will be 120 students.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Tardies-We are a large school with approximately 1,000 students. Most of the 1,000 students are parent drop-off. 2. Absences- Parents take students out of school for family vacations.	1. Tardies-Allow students to be dropped off at school 35 minutes prior to the official start time rather than the district mandated 30 minutes prior to the official start time of school. 2. Absences-Teachers will stress the importance of attending school each school day because absences impact student achievement.	Attendance Coordinator (Guidance Counselor) and Attendance Clerk	Monitor attendance data	Attendance data
2					

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
Attendance policies and procedures	K-5	Attendance Clerk	School-wide	October 2013	Attendance rosters	Attendance Coordinator

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Teachers are trained on district and school attendance procedures and policies.	School district parent handbook and school parent handbook.	School district	$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:	Decrease In-School and Out-of-School Suspensions by 2 students.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
5 (0.5%) In-School Suspensions	3 (0.3%) In-School Suspensions
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
5 In-School Suspensions	3 In-School Suspensions
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
8 (0.8%) Out-of-School Suspensions	2 (0.2%) Out-of-School Suspensions
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School

	3 Out-of-School Suspensions	2 Out-of-School Suspensions

	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. Lack of parental support.	1. Implement Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support program. 2. CHAMPs 3. School Based Teams	Principal, Assistant Principal, and Guidance Counselor	1. Schoolwide Positive Behavior Support meetings 2. Classroom walkthroughs	1. Monitoring of 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
Discipline policies and procedures	K-5	Assistant Principal	School-wide	August 2012	1. Discipline reports (TERMS/EDW) 2. Classroom referrals	Principal and Assistant Principal
School-wide Positive Behavior Support (SwPBS)	K-5	SwPBS team	School-wide	Ongoing	1. SwPBS monthly meetings. 2. School-wide implementation of Guidelines for Success (4 B's) and song.	SwPBS Team

Suspension Budget:

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	100% participation rate for parent involvement.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
95% (912) participation rate for parent involvement.	100% (1,000) participation rate for 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
1	Parents personal scheduling conflicts such as employment.	Offer a variety of parent night activities such as Curriculum Night, Family Literacy Night, Meet the Teacher, Math & Science Fair Night, ESOL PLC meetings, FCAT Parent Night, PTA activities, PTA Carnival	1.Classroom teachers 2. Volunteer Coordinator	1. Sign-in sheets. 2. Volunteer hours. 3. Five Star Award binder	1. Parent attendance sign-in sheets. 2. Five Star Award binder

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
PTA Volunteers	K-5	1. PTA President 2. Volunteer Coordinator	School-wide	August 2012	1. Collection of sign-in sheets. 2. Monitor Five Star binder.	Principal, Assistant Principal, and Volunteer Coordinator

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00

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

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

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Reader's Workshop Units of Study	Reader's Workshop Units of Study	PTA	$2,100.00
Reading	Words Their Way	Vocabulary development	PTA	$500.00
				Subtotal: $2,600.00

Technology

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Reading A-Z	Guided reading books	PTA	$1,000.00
Reading	Book Flix/Tru Flix	eBooks	Media/Book Fair	$2,000.00
Reading	iPad applications	iPad applications	Media/Book Fair	$500.00
				Subtotal: $3,500.00

Professional Development

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Reader's Workshop	Reader's Workshop Units of Study	School district	$0.00
Reading	Fundations	Fundations kits	School district	$0.00
Reading	CORE K-12 Assessment System	School district assessment system	School district	$0.00
Reading	Common Core State Standards (CCSS)	State/district CCSS information, trainings, and documents.	School district	$0.00
Mathematics	CORE K-12 Assessment system	School district assessment system	School district	$0.00
Mathematics	Common Core State Standards (CCSS)	State/district CCSS information, trainings, and documents.	School district	$0.00
Attendance	Teachers are trained on district and school attendance procedures and policies.	School district parent handbook and school parent handbook.	School district	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00

Other

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Service students in Lowest 25% through after school tutorial program.	Funding for tutorial program and materials.	School Improvement funds	$2,000.00
Reading	Provide SBT leadership which follows a structured problem solving student intervention process identifying and monitoring of academic, social, emotional, and behavioral weaknesses and challenges to increase student achievement.	School Base Team supplement.	School Improvement funds	$562.00
Reading	Incentive for students meeting proficiency and/or making learning gains on FCAT.	Funding for incentive program.	School Improvement funds	$600.00
Mathematics	Service students in Lowest 25% through after school tutorial program.	Funding for tutorial program and materials.	School Improvement Funds	$2,000.00
Mathematics	Incentive program for students meeting proficiency and/or making learning gain on FCAT.	Fundng for incentive program.	PTA	$1,000.00

			Student donations ($20 per student)	$2,800.00
Science	Hands-on learning experiments	Lab materials		
Writing	Incentive for students meeting proficiency on FCAT Writes	Funding for incentive program	School Improvement funds	$300.00
Writing	Services students scoring below proficiency based on data from Palm Beach Writes for tutorial.	Funding for tutorial program	School Improvement funds	$1,000.00
			Subtotal: $10,262.00	
			Grand Total: $16,362.00	

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

jn Priority	jn Focus	jn Prevent	jn NA

Are you a reward school: jn Yes jn No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 8/25/2012)

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
1. Funding for after school tutorial program. 2. Funding for student performance incentive program. 3. School Base Team coordinator supplement.	$6,462.00

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

Submit recommendations for the 2012-2013 School Improvement Plan.
Provide topics of interest at meetings.

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Palm Beach School District SUNSET PALMS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	89%	90%	91%	76%	346	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	70%	69%			139	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?	59% (YES)	72% (YES)			131	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					616	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Palm Beach School District SUNSET PALMS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	88%	91%	92%	74%	345	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	71%	65%			136	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	54% (YES)	64% (YES)			118	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					599	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested