FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: JENSEN BEACH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Martin

Principal: Donald Merritt

SAC Chair: Pam Aursland/Elizabeth Jekanowski

Superintendent: Nancy Kline

Date of School Board Approval: November 20, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/16/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Donald Merritt	B.S in Elementary Education M.S. in Educational Leadership	112	22	2011 A AYP No 72% and 73% SWD in reading and math; 69% ED in math; 78% total students in math. 2010 A AYP Yes 2009 B AYP Yes 2008 A AYP Yes 2007 A AYP Yes

		Principal Certification			2006 A AYP Yes 2005 A AYP Yes 2004 A AYP Yes 2003 A AYP Yes 2002 A 2001 A 2000 A 1999 A
Assis Principal	Janice Mills	B.S. in Graphic Design Certification in Art K-12 and Elementary Education K-6 Principal Certification	4	9	2011 A AYP No 72% and 73% SWD in reading and math; 69% ED in math; 78% total students in math. 2010 A AYP Yes 2009 B AYP Yes 2008 A AYP Yes 2007 A AYP Yes 2006 A AYP Yes 2005 A AYP Yes 2004 A AYP Yes 2003 A AYP Yes 2002 A 2001 A 2000 A 1999 A

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide assessment performance (Percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading Coach	Lauren Gifford	B.A. M.S. in Education ESOL Endorsement Reading Endorsement Family Consumer Sciences	3	3	2011 A AYP No 72% and 73% SWD in reading and math; 69% ED in math; 78% total students in math. 2010 A AYP Yes 2009 B AYP Yes 2008 A AYP Yes 2007 A AYP Yes 2006 A AYP Yes 2005 A AYP Yes 2004 A AYP Yes 2003 A AYP Yes 2002 A 2001 A 2000 A 1999 A
RtI Coach	Adele Catapano	B.A. in Elementary Education	2	2	2011 A AYP No 72% and 73% SWD in reading and math; 69% ED in math; 78% total students in math. 2010 A AYP Yes 2009 B AYP Yes 2008 A AYP Yes 2007 A AYP Yes 2006 A AYP Yes 2005 A AYP Yes 2004 A AYP Yes 2003 A AYP Yes 2002 A 2001 A 2000 A 1999 A

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	Determine job openings, review resumes of applicants who are highly qualified, experienced teachers.	Donald Merritt Principal	July 2012	
2	Review applications received by the district and forward them to principals.	Gail Williams Personnel Director	Ongoing	
3	Offer a mentor for support to all new teachers.	Janice Mills Assistant Principal	Ongoing	
4	Post continuing education courses by local higher education institutions.	Janice Mills Assistant Principal	Ongoing	
5	Provide on-going staff development to all teachers to maintain and enhance status of highly qualified teachers.	Don Merritt Principal Janice Mills Assistant Principal Lauren Gifford Reading Coach	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
None	None

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
45	8.9%(4)	28.9%(13)	51.1%(23)	11.1%(5)	31.1%(14)	100.0% (45)	6.7%(3)	6.7%(3)	48.9% (22)

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
Pamela Aursland	Daniela Graf	Educational Leadership condidate	IEP development, Pinnacle, PMRN, Performance Matters.
Michelle Gaucher	James Monds	ASD Team	IEP development, Pinnacle, PMRN, Performance Matters.
Pamela Aursland	Christine Claunch	Educational Leadership condidate	IEP development, Pinnacle, PMRN, Performance Matters.

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

> Janice Mills - Assistant Principal
> Adele Catapano - RtI Coach
> Marta Carlson - Guidance Counselor
> Lauren Gifford - Reading Coach
> Robb Drellich - School Psychologist
> Joanne Sweazey, Program Specialist
> Elizabeth Jekanowski, Music Teacher

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 school-based MTSS Leadership functions by conducting weekly meetings to monitor and reflect on strategies being implemented. Strategies ranging from full staff implementation down to individual student academic behavioral needs are discussed.

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

> The role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team is to ensure the fidelity of teacher/student interventions' implementation.

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.

> * RtI:B
> Academic/behavioral teacher implementation logs.
> *Pinnacle
> *County benchmarks
> *F.A.I.R.
> *FCAT

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Staff development at pre-planning along with weekly, year-long team meetings to follow up and support teacher understanding and needs.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Staff training is on-going at monthly staff meetings.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Donald Merritt - Principal
Janice Mills - Assistant Principal
Lauren Gifford - Reading Coach
Marta Carlson - Guidance Counselor
Cherie Baumgartner - Media Specialist
Jill Boudreau, Kindergarten Teacher
Michelle Wallace, First Grade Teacher
Tina Engel, Second Grade Teacher
Cristy Barco, Third Grade Teacher
Debra Schneider, Fourth Grade Teacher
Corinne Dictor, Fifth Grade Teacher
Erica Paul, ESE Teacher
Patty Schiavone - ESE Teacher

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

The Literacy Leadership Team, LLT, meets twice a month to work on strategies, processes, and professional development K-5.

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

The LLT will continue to support balanced literacy initiatives, while analyzing student literacy data to align curriculum with identified needs. The team will continue working on building a resource room by adding quality leveled texts.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. **Reading Goal #1a:**	The percent of students in FCAT Level 1 and 2 will decrease by 5%. The percent of students in FCAT levels 4 and 5 will increase by 5% from 37% to 42%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
Grade 3: 29%, 85 students Grade 4: 20%, 99 students Grade 5: 30%, 81 students	Grade 3: 34%, 71 students Grade 4: 25%, 86 students Grade 5: 35%, 96 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	Lack of prerequisite skill aquisition.	Analysis of assessments to determine skill needs.	Classroom teachers.	Data analysis.	Performance Matters, Progress Monitoring assessments.
2	Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts- staff development to unwrap standards and place initial focus on text complexity.	Use Professional Learning Communities to create investigation, knowledge, and comfort level to implement skills using text complexity.	Classroom teachers, reading coach, Literacy Leadership Team, administration.	Classroom walk through discussions focusing on Domain 1, design questions 2, 3 and 4.	FAIR assessments, Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessments, Reading records
3	Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts- staff development to unwrap standards and place initial focus on text complexity.	Classroom teachers, reading coach, Literacy Leadership Team, administration.	Classroom teachers, reading coach, Literacy Leadership Team, administration.	Classroom walk through discussions focusing on Domain 1, design questions 2, 3 and 4.	FAIR assessments, Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessments, Reading records
4	Lack of consistent training and teacher time with reading coach to plan,	Build rotating schedule for reading coach for class observations and	Reading coach, classroom teachers, administration.	LLT feedback, MTSS feedback, team meeting action plans, lesson plans.	FAIR assessments, Fountas and Pinnell

	model and receive feedback prior to demonstrating in the classroom.	feedback planning times to build CCSS standards into lesson development and implementation.			Benchmark Assessments, Reading records.
5	Model and teach the steps to become strategic and reflective readers.	Provide staff with CC information on previewing the reading for content, scope and organization of material and fostering students to become reflective readers.	Classroom teachers, reading coach, administration.	MTSS and LLT feedback, classroom walk throughs.	FAIR assessments, Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessments, Reading records.
6	Daily instructional schedule.	Develop a school-wide schedule to maximize the use of support facilitation during core instructional periods. Develop a school-wide schedule that provides intervention time at each grade level.	Administration, classroom teachers.	Informal and formal observations, intervention logs, lesson plans, course master.	Benchmark assessments, FCAT Reading.
7	Lack of engaging instructional technology.	Teachers will provide instruction using on-line textbooks. Teachers will provide access codes for parental support of the instructional program for on-line textbooks.	Classroom teachers.	On-line progress-monitoring.	Benchmark assessments, FCAT Reading.

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:**	The percent of students scoring in Alternate Assessment levels 4, 5 and 6 in reading is 64%. (7 of 11)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
Grade 3 = 100% scored level 9. Grade 4 = 1 student scored level 9; 1 student scored level 8;and 1 student scored level 3.	All students will move up at least one level from 2012.

Grade 5 = 1 student scored level 8 and 3 students scored 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	Students scoring level 3 are in the intensive ASD class working with access points.	The reading coach and program specialist will meet the teachers to insure programs to benefit academic achievement are in place and will monitor student progress.	Reading coach, ASD program sepcialist.	MTSS, ASD Team meetings.	Access point curriculum feedback.
2	Introducing text complexity to ASD students.	Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts- staff development to unwrap standards and place initial focus on text complexity.	Classroom teachers, reading coach, Literacy Leadership Team, administration.	Classroom walk through discussions focusing on Domain 1, design questions 2, 3 and 4.	FAIR assessments, Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessments, Reading 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:	The percent of students in FCAT Level 1, 2, and 3 will decrease by 5%. The percent of students in FCAT levels 4 and 5 will increase by 5% from 37% to 42%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
Grade 3: 44%, 85 students. Grade 4: 41%, 99 students. Grade 5: 27%, 81 students.	Grade 3: 49%. Grade 4: 46%. Grade 5: 32%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Common Core State Standards for	Plan staff development	Classroom teachers,	Classroom walk through discussions	FAIR assessments,

	English Language Arts- staff development to unwrap standards and place initial focus on text complexity.	activities centered around CCSS ELA standards and researching text complexity as it spirals from K to 5.	reading coach, Literacy Leadership Team, administration.	focusing on Domain 1, design questions 2, 3 and 4.	Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessments, Reading records.
2	Lack of engaging instructional technology.	Teachers will provide instruction using on-line textbooks. Teachers will provide access codes for parental support of the instructional program for on-line textbooks.	Teachers.	On-line progress-monitoring.	Benchmark assessments, FCAT Reading.
3	Decline in reading scores from 4th to 5th grades.	Provide professional development for 5th grade teachers to insure the balanced literacy model is being implemented with fidelity.	Reading coach, administration, classroom teachers.	Classroom walk through discussions focusing on Domain 1, design questions 2, 3 and 4.	Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessments, Reading 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:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. **Reading Goal #2b:**	In grades 3, 4 and 5, 64% of alternate assessment students scored at or above Level 7.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
Grade 3: Four student s scored Level 9. Grade 4: One student scored Level 8 and one Level 9. Grade 5: One student scored in Level 8.	100% of all alternate assessment students will score at or above level 7.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts- staff development to unwrap standards and place initial	Plan staff development activities centered around CCSS ELA standards and researching text	Classroom teachers, reading coach, Literacy Leadership Team, administration.	Classroom walk through discussions focusing on Domain 1, design questions 2, 3 and 4.	FAIR assessments, Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessments, Reading records.

	focus on text complexity.	complexity as it spirals from K to 5.		
2	4 of 5 students in intensive ASD class scored level 3 on alternate assessment	IEP teams will meet to review goals and objectives for intensive ASD students to insure rigor of academic progress can be achieved.	IEP Team, ASD program specialist, administration, reading coach.	Data team meetings, conference notes, reading records.	Informal and formal assessments, F.A.I.R., IEP review recommendations.

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:	The percent of students scoring learning gains will increase to 76%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
71% of students achieved learning gains in reading on FCAT 2012.	76% of students will achieve learning gains in reading on FCAT 2013.

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	Limited time for team planning, grade level articulation with support facilitators and reading / RtI coach / LLI teachers.	Provide time opportunities for teachers to cross articulate with reading coach, RtI coach, and LLI teachers.	Assistant Principal Reading coach RtI coach	Discussions held at data team meetings. Discussions held at grade level team meetings.	Data analysis, formal and informal assessments, anecdotal records, Performance Matters.
2	Daily instructional schedule.	Develop a school-wide schedule that blocks intervention time and support facilitation.	Administration, teachers.	Informal and formal observations, intervention logs, lesson plans, course master.	Benchmark assessments, FCAT Reading.
3	Lack of support for AYP sub-groups.	Continue school-wide support facilitation model developed in conjunction with Florida Inclusion Network.	Administration, classroom and ESE teachers.	Informal and formal observations, intervention logs, lesson plans, IEPs, course master.	Benchmark assessments, FCAT Reading.
4	Ample resources to address reading deficiencies.	Promote and utilize the FCRR resource materials.	Reading coach, teachers, reading coordinator.	Informal and formal observations, intervention logs,	Benchmark assessments, FCAT Reading.

| | | | | lesson plans, IEPs, course master. | |

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

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

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	Increase the percentage of learning gains of those students in the Lowest 25% in reading to 74%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
69% of students in the lowest 25th percentile made learning gains in reading.	74% of students in the lowest 25th percentile 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 | Limited time for team planning/ grade level articulation with support facilitators and reading / RtI coach / LLI teachers. | Provide time opportunities for teachers to cross articulate with reading coach, RtI coach, and LLI teachers. | Assistant Principal Reading coach RtI coach. | Discussions held at data team meetings.

Discussions held at grade level team meetings. | Data analysis, formal and informal assessments, anecdotal records, Performance Matters. |

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal # 5A : In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50% (4% per year).					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	76%	78%	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 reading.

Reading Goal #5B:	Increase the percentage of African-American students, Students with disabilities and economically disadvantaged students making Annual Measurable Objectives in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
African-American students = 66% Students with disabilities = 58% Economically disadvantaged students = 68%	African-American students = 76% Students with disabilities = 76% Economically disadvantaged students = 76%

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	Proficiency data for subgroup populations.	Involve subgroup students into Leveled Literacy Intervention.

Bring students to MTSS discussions. | Teachers, LLI tutors

MTSS team | Data analysis, progress reports, benchmark scores. | CELLA results, Benchmark scores, reading records. |

3	Students in multiple subgroups need additional time to learn material.	Involve students into LLI and remedial groups.	Teachers, LLI tutors, MTSS team	Data analysis, progress reports,pinnacle, benchmark scores.	CELLA results, Benchmark scores, reading 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 subgroup:

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	71% of students scored below proficiency on FCAT Reading 2012.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
5 of 7 ELL students, 71% performed below proficient levels on FCAT Reading 2012	100% of ELL student will score in the proficient range of FCAT Reading 2013.

<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 with ELL ed. para is limited since she must address all grade levels.	Devise optimum schedule for addressing class visits to best accommodate need of ELL students.	ELL Ed. Para.	Progress monitoring at interim and report card time.	Teachers, ELL Ed. Para.
2	Lack of available materials to use in classrooms for ELL students.	Seeks best instructional materials to address needs of ELL students.	Administration, teachers, ELL Ed. Para.	Progress monitoring in Pinnacle for achievement.	Teachers, ELL Ed. Para.

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:	Increase the percentage of students with disabilities making Annual Measurable Objectives in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
58% making target AMO.	76% making target AMO.

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	Learning curve for students with disabilities is slower process.	Schedule all students with disabilities into classes where support facilitator is assigned. Continue differentiated instruction at appropriate instructional levels.	RtI team, support facilitator, administration, mainstream consultant.	Data analysis at RtI and data team meetings, Pinnacle, anecdotal records of support facilitator and basic ed. teachers.	Formal and informal assessments, Pinnacle, IEP objectives.
2	Intensive instruction at appropriate levels is needed.	Use resource room strategy based upon need of student for increased intensive instruction.	Formal and informal assessments, Pinnacle, IEP objectives.	Data analysis at RtI and data team meetings, Pinnacle, Anecdotal records of support facilitator and basic ed. teachers.	Formal and informal assessments, Pinnacle, IEP objectives.

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:**	Increase the percentage of economically disadvantaged students making Annual Measurable Objectives in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
68% made target AMO.	76% will make target AMO.

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	Average daily /on-time attendance.	Provide Bring It 180 Attendance Program to parents, monitor excessive attendance	Principal, guidance counselor, teachers.	Monitoring of attendance data.	TERMS print outs, Pinnacle.

		patterns, contact parents whose students show excessive attendance issues.			
2	Lack of engaging instructional technology. Teachers will provide instruction using on-line textbooks.	Teachers will provide access codes for parental support of the instructional program for on-line textbooks.	Teachers.	On-line progress-monitoring.	Benchmark assessments, FCAT Reading.
3	Daily instructional schedule.	Develop a school-wide schedule that blocks intervention time and support facilitation.	Administration, teachers.	Informal and formal observations, intervention logs, lesson plans, course master.	Benchmark assessments, FCAT Reading.

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
PLG on Common Core State Standards.	PK-5.	Leadership Team.	School-wide.	Third Tuesday of each month.	Team bands meet each month to unwrap standards and project plans for classroom strategies.	Leadership Team.
Create rotating schedule for reading coach to visit classroom, provide feedback and meet monthly to strategize.	PK-5	Reading coach.	School-wide	Fourth Wednesday of each month.	Reading records review.	Reading coach, administration.

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	**Description of Resources**	**Funding Source**	**Available Amount**
None			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	**Description of Resources**	**Funding Source**	**Available Amount**
None			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	**Description of Resources**	**Funding Source**	**Available Amount**
None			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	**Description of Resources**	**Funding Source**	**Available Amount**
None			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $0.00

*End of **Reading** Goals*

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. **CELLA Goal #1:**	The percent of students scoring level 3 or higher will increase from 28% to 70%.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
2 Grade 3 students: Levels 2, 3. 3 Grade 4 students: Levels 1, 2, 3. 2 Grade 5 students: Levels 1, 2.	
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	Use of materials.	Continue use of Destination Reading Program during arrival and intervention time in classrooms.	ELL assistant, classroom teacher.	Progress monitoring using Destination Reading Program, ELL reports by ELL assistant, Pinnacle.	MTSS data discussions, Pinnacle, Benchmark assessments.
2	Time to work collectively with speaking and listening skills.	Create and implement a scheudle for use in computer lab.	ELL assistant, computer assistant.	Progress monitoring using Destination Reading Program, ELL reports by ELL assistant, Pinnacle	MTSS data discussions, Pinnacle, Benchmark assessments.

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

2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:	

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

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

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

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

CELLA Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
None			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
None			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
None			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
None			$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $0.00

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	The percent of students scoring in levels 3-5 on FCAT Math will increase to 80%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
51%	80%

<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	Lack of prerequisite skill aquisition.	Analysis of assessments to determine skill needs.	Classroom teachers.	Data analysis.	Performance Matters, Progress Monitoring assessments.
2	Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts- staff development to unwrap standards and place initial focus on text complexity.	Use Professional Learning Communities to create investigation, knowledge, and comfort level to implement skills using text complexity.	Classroom teachers, reading coach, Literacy Leadership Team, administration.	Classroom walk through discussions focusing on Domain 1, design questions 2, 3 and 4.	FAIR assessments, Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessments, Reading records
3	Daily instructional schedule.	Develop a school-wide schedule that blocks intervention time and support facilitation.	Teachers, administration, math coordinator.	Informal and formal observations, intervention logs, lesson plans, course master.	Benchmark assessments, FCAT Math.
4	Lack of engaging instructional technology.	V-Math Live will be used with at-risk students during arrival and intervention times.	Teachers, administration.	Classroom walk-thoughs,MTSS meetings, on-line progress-monitoring.	Benchmark assessments, FCAT Math.
5	Opportunity to learn multiple teaching strategies.	All grade levels will use Touch Math strategies.	Teachers, SIP Math team, administration.	Team meetings, data team meetings, informal and formal observations.	Pinnacle, performance matters, benchmark tests.

6	Opportunity to utilize multiple teaching strategies.	Hold grade level meetings to create lessons utilizing alternative teaching strategies (peer teaching, student discovery).	Teachers	Team meetings, data team meetings, informal and formal observations.	Pinnacle, performance matters, benchmark tests.
7	Lack of student mastery of basic math facts.	Grades 2-5 will use the 15 in 45 facts drills for addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division, daily...grade level appropriate.	Teachers.	Timed test results.	Progress Monitoring, Pinnacle, benchmark assessments.

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. **Mathematics Goal #1b:**	Students will increase scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 by one level on Florida Alternate Assessment 2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
1 third grade student scored Level 6. 1 fourth grade student scored Level 3. 2 fifth grade students scores levels 2 and 4 respectively.	All students scoring below level 7 will increase by one level.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	**Strategy**	**Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring**	**Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy**	**Evaluation Tool**
1	lack of engaging instructional technology.	Students will have access to V-Math Live for intervention and independent practice.	Teachers.	IEP review.	Pinnacle.

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. **Mathematics Goal #2a:**	The percent of students scoring in Levels 4 and 5 on FCAT Math will increase from 57% (51) to 83% (96).

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In third grade, 9% (8)of 84 students scored in Levels 4,5. In fourth grade, 23% (23) of 99 students scored in Levels 4,5. In fifth grade, 25% (20)of 81 students scored in Levels 4,5.	83% (96)of students will score in Levels 4,5 on FCAT Math 2013.

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of knowledge of FCAT test item specifications.	On-going inservice teachers on test item specifications.	Administration, teachers	Informal and formal observations, intervention logs, lesson plans, in-service logs.	Benchmark assessments, FCAT Math.
2	Lack of higher order thinking skills .	Organizing students to interact with new knowledge through differentiated instruction, chunking content, students reflecting on instruction, students track learning progress.	Teachers, math coordinator, administration	Lesson plans, informal and formal observations, data team meetings.	Performance Matters, Pinnacle, benchmark testing.
3	Lack of hands-on application of real world problem solving.	Incorporate higher complexity hands-on activities that utilize 21st century technology skills.	Administration, teachers.	Informal and formal observations, intervention logs, lesson plans, in-service logs.	Performance Matters, benchmark assessments, FCAT Math.
4	Lack of engaging instructional technology.	Teachers will use V-Math Live during intervention periods.	Administration, teachers.	Informal and formal observations, intervention logs, lesson plans, in-service logs.	Benchmark assessments, FCAT Math.
5	Opportunity to learn multiple teaching strategies.	Teachers in grade K-2 will use Debbie Diller Math Centers.	Teachers, Math SIP team, administration.	Team meetings, data team meetings, informal and formal observations.	Pinnacle, performance matters, benchmark tests.
6	Opportunity to utilize multiple teaching strategies.	All math teachers will use Touch Math strategies.	Teachers, administration.	Team meetings, data team meetings, informal and formal observations.	Pinnacle, performance matters, benchmark tests.
7	Lack of student knoweldge of basic math facts.	All grades 2-4 will use 15 in 45 Math fact drills for addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division, as grade level appropriate.	Teachers	Timed tests.	Pinnacle, benchmark assessments.

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	Students will increae each by one level on Florida Alternate Assessment 2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
60% (6) students scored above Level 7 on Florida Alternate Assessement.	70% (7) will score obove level 7 on Flordia alternate Assessment 2013.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	**Strategy**	**Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring**	**Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy**	**Evaluation Tool**
1	Lack of engaging instructional technology.	Students will acccess and use V-Math Live for intervention and independent enrichment.	Teachers.	IEP review.	Pinnacle.
2	Opportunity to utilize multiple teaching strategies.	Students will use Touch math Math Strategies.	Teachers, administration.	Progress monitoring, IEP review, classroom walkthroughs.	Pinnacle, Performance Matters.

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:	The percent of students showing learning gains on FCAT Math will increase by 5% to 71% (183 students).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
64% (180)of students made learning gains in Math.	71% (183)will make learning gains in Math on FCAT 2013.
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of support for AYP sub-groups.	Continue school-wide support facilitation model developed in conjunction with Florida Inclusion Network.	Administration, teachers.	Informal and formal observations, intervention logs, lesson plans, IEPs, course master.	Benchmark testing, informal and formal observations, FCAT Math, Performance Matters.
2	Daily instructional schedule.	Develop a school-wide schedule that blocks intervention time and support facilitation.	Administration, teachers.	Lesson plans, FCAT Explorer, computer lab activities, teacher observation.	Benchmark testing, informal and formal observations, FCAT Math, Performance Matters.
3	Opportunity to learn multiple teaching strategies.	Conduct professional development with math coordinator.	Teachers, math coordinator.	Team meetings, data team meetings, informal and formal observations.	Pinnacle, performance matters, benchmark tests.
4	Opportunity to utilize multiple teaching strategies.	Hold grade level meetings to create lessons utilizing alternative teaching strategies (peer teaching, student discovery).	Teachers	Team meetings, data team meetings, informal and formal observations.	Pinnacle, performance matters, benchmark tests.
5	Limited time for team planning, grade level articulation with support facilitators.	Provide time opportunities for teachers to cross articulate.	Administration, teachers.	Lesson plans, FCAT Explorer, computer lab activities, teacher observation.	Benchmark testing, informal and formal observations, FCAT Explorer.
6	Ample resources to address math deficiencies.	Teachers will share materials to address skill areas.	Teachers	Lesson plans, intervention logs.	Pinnacle, benchmark testing.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. **Mathematics Goal #3b:**	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. **Mathematics Goal #4:**	The percent of students scoring in the lowest quartile on FCAT Math will increase by 7% (180 students) to 70%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
64% (180) of students in the lower quartile made learning gains in math in 2012.	70% (182) of students in the lower quartile will make learning gains in math 2013.

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	Opportunity to utilize multiple teaching strategies.	Hold grade level meetings to create lessons utilizing alternative teaching strategies (peer teaching, student discovery).	Teachers	Team meetings, data team meetings, informal and formal observations.	Pinnacle, performance matters, benchmark tests.
2	Need for increased staff support for remedial math instruction.	Schedule related arts teachers with free time to work with remedial math students in grades 3-5.	Classroom teachers, related arts teachers.	Lesson plans, FCAT Explorer, computer lab activities, teacher observation.	Benchmark testing, informal and formal observations, FCAT Explorer.
3	Lack of instructional time.	Provide intensive support to all students with concentration in deficit areas by building up	Teachers, Administration.	Collaborative planning, grade level articulation.	Lesson plans, RtI data, IEP objectives, benchmark testing, formal and informal assessments.

		intervention time in each grade level.			
4	Opportunity to learn multiple teaching strategies.	Conduct professional development with math coordinator.	Teachers, math coordinator.	Team meetings, data team meetings, informal and formal observations.	Pinnacle, performance matters, benchmark tests.
5	Large number of students receive minimal support from home with math practice.	Teachers will provide access codes for parental support of the math program for on-line textbooks.	Teachers	On-line progress monitoring.	Benchmark assessments, Pinnacle, FCAT Math.

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Elementary School Mathematics Goal # 5A :
	In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50% (4% per year).

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	51%	68%	71%	74%	77%	

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:**	Increase the percentage of African-American students, Students with disabilities and economically disadvantaged students making Annual Measurable Objectives in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
42% of African-American students met target AMO. 61% of students with disabilities met target AMO. 50(of economically disadvantaged students met target AMO.	64% of African-American students will meet target AMO. 64% of students with disabilities will meet target AMO. 64% of economically disadvantaged students will meet target AMO.

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	Behavior/student motivation.	Continue school-wide PBIS incentives.	All staff.	SWIS tracking reports.	FCAT 2013.
2	Lack of parental support at home.	Provide literacy and math workshops focusing on strategies and skills to use at home.	All staff.	Paretn sign-in sheets and evaluation forms.	FCAT 2013.
3	Proficiency data for subgroup populations.	Involve subgroup populations into V-Math Live intervention.	Teachers, MTSS team.	Data analysis, progress reports, pinnacle, benchmark scores.	Data analysis, progress reports, pinnacle, benchmark scores.

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	Increase teh percentage of students with disabilities making Annual Measurable Objective in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**

Students with disabilities = 61% making target AMO.		Students with disabilities - 64% making target AMO.

	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	Schedules for resource groups and mainstream students.	Review IEP goals and objectives to determine appropriate student placements. Provide student support by resource teachers or support facilitators.	Teachers, support facilitators	Lesson plans, RtI data, IEP objectives.	Benchmark testing, informal and formal assessments.
2	Learning curve for students with disabilities is slower process. Schedule all students with disabilities into classes where support facilitator is assigned.	Continue differentiated instruction at appropriate instructional levels.	RtI team, support facilitator, administration, mainstream consultant.	Data analysis at RtI and data team meetings, Pinnacle, Anecdotal records of support facilitator and teachers.	Formal and informal assessments, Pinnacle, IEP objectives.
3	Articulation between ESE and basic teachers.	Schedule weekly meetings with ESE support facilitators and basic ed. teachers to plan and evaluate success of students.	Classroom teachers, support facilitators.	Pinnacle gradebook, data logs, conference notes.	Benchmark testing, informal and formal assessments.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. **Mathematics Goal #5E:**	Increase the percantage of economically disadvantaged students making Annual Measurable Objective.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
Economically disadvantaged students = 50% making target AMO.	Economically disadvantaged students = 64% making target AMO.

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
1	Regular student attendance.	Using Bring It 180 Program, keep parents informed on importance of regular and on-time school attendance. Monitor attendance patterns of all students.	Principal, guidance counselor, teachers.	Daily and weekly attendance reports. Teacher conference summaries.	Interim reports and report cards.
2	Lack of engaging instructional technology. Teachers will provide instruction using on-line textbooks.	Teachers will provide access codes for parental support of the instructional program for on-line textbooks.	Teachers	On-line progress-monitoring.	Benchmark assessments, FCAT Math.
3	Math manipulatives.	Provide training to teachers on the use of math manipulatives.	Math coordinator, administration.	RtI / data team meetings, math logs, informal and formal assessments.	Benchmark assessments, Pinnacle.
4	Data interpretation.	Continue in-service opportunities with math coordinator using Performance Matters.	Math coordinator.	RtI / data team meetings, grade level meetings, SIP team meetings.	Benchmark assessments, Pinnacle.

*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

| PLG on Common Core State Standards; unwrapping standards; incorporating standards into lesson plans. | PK-5 | Leadership Team | School-wide | Third Tuesday of each month. | Team action plans submitted to administration. | Leadership Team |
| Teacher workshop on imprelemtation and use of V-Math Live Program. | K-5 | SIP Math chair; SIP Math team. | K-5 | Grade level meetings each month. | Monitor V-Math Live reports | SIP Math team, administration. |

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	**Description of Resources**	**Funding Source**	**Available Amount**
Use of Touch Math in all grade level math classes.	Manipulatives.	SIP	$1,000.00
			Subtotal: $1,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	**Description of Resources**	**Funding Source**	**Available Amount**
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	**Description of Resources**	**Funding Source**	**Available Amount**
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	**Description of Resources**	**Funding Source**	**Available Amount**
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $1,000.00

*End of **Mathematics** Goals*

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	The percent of students scoring in level 3 on FCAT Science will increase by to 77%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
50% (80)of students scored Level 3 or higher on FCAT Science 2012.	77% (96)of studentrs will score Level 3 or higher on FCAT Science 2013.

<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	Lack of prerequisite skill aquisition.	Analysis of assessments to determine skill needs.	Classroom teachers.	Data analysis.	Performance Matters, Progress Monitoring assessments.
2	Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts-staff development to unwrap standards and place initial focus on text complexity.	Use Professional Learning Communities to create investigation, knowledge, and comfort level to implement skills using text complexity.	Classroom teachers, reading coach, Literacy Leadership Team, administration.	Classroom walk through discussions focusing on Domain 1, design questions 2, 3 and 4.	FAIR assessments, Fountas and Pinnell Benchmark Assessments, Reading records
3	Lack of instructional time.	Incorporate science into Language Arts/Writing/Reading instructional time.	Teachers, related arts teachers, computer assistant.	Weekly team meetings, data team meetings, informal and formal observations	Pinnacle, Performance Matters.
4	Expertise in cognitive complexity.	Implement the use of science notebooks for every grade level to increase higher level thinking skills.	Administration, teachers.	Notebook review.	Pinnacle, Performance Matters, benchmark testing.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. **Science Goal #1b:**	All students in the Florida Alternate Assessment program will score level 4 or higher in 2013.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
1 student scored level 8 on Florida Alternate Assessment 2012.	All students will score Level 4 or higher on Florida Alternate Assessment 2013.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of instructional time.	Intervention times will be created for students and teacher in the science lab.	teacher, science lab teacher.	lab results, informal assessments.	Florida Alternate Assessment 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:	The percent of students scoring in levels 4 and 5 on FCAT Science will increase by 5% (251 students) to 34%.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
58%% (8 students) scored level 4 or higher on FCAT Science 2012.	63%% of students will score level 4 or higher on FCAT Science 2013.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of materials for teachers of sciences.	Incorporate AIMS materials and other hands-on activities focusing on science scope and sequence from district.	Administration, teachers.	Review of student science notebooks checking for comprehension of science concepts.	Benchmark tests.

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:	The number of students in Florida Alternate Assessment will increase.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
1 student scored Level 8 on Florida Alternate Assessment 2012.	All students taking Florida Alternate Assessment in Science will increase to proficiency.

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	**Strategy**	**Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring**	**Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy**	**Evaluation Tool**
1	Lack of instructional time.	Intervention times will be scheduled for students and teacher in the science lab.	teacher, science teacher.	Lab results, informal assessments.	Florida Alternate Assessment 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
Continue workshops conducted by Michelle Miller for incorporating Common Core State Standards into writing program.	K-5	Michelle Miller, Consultant.	school-wide	Quarterly.	Monitoring student writing.	Teachers, SIP Writing team.

Science Budget:

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

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

Technology

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

Professional Development

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

Other

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

*End of **Science** Goals*

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. **Writing Goal #1a:**	The percent of students scoring proficiently on FCAT Writing will increase to 85%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
81% (59) students scored Level 3.5 or higher on FCAT Writes 2012. 42% (40 students) scored level 4.0 or higher on FCAT 2012.	85% of students will score Level 3.5 or higher and 47% of students will score level 4.0 or higher on FCAT Writes 2013.
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

			for Monitoring		
1	Grade level articulation.	Implement a system of cross grade buddy classes for writing, display exemplary student work, use uniform grading rubric.	Teachers.	Monthly writing prompts.	Data disaggregation at SIP team meetings, lesson plans.
2	Professional development opportunities.	Schedule professional development achievement on quarterly basis for all staff.	Administration, writing consultant.	Monthly writing prompts.	Data disaggregation at SIP team meetings.
3	Student attendance.	Track student attendance with appropriate parent notifications.	Administration, guidance counselor.	Weekly attendance forecasts.	Attendance reports.
4	Lack of materials.	Implement common core state standards devoted to language conventions.	Teachers.	Monthly writing prompts.	Data disaggregation at SIP meetings.

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:**	All students taking Florida Alternate Assessment will score at Level 4 or higher in Writing.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
2 of 3 students scored above Level 4 on Florida Alternate Assessment 2012.	All students taking Florida Alternate Assessment will score at Level 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	Lack of engaging writing opportunities.	Students will participate in monthly Author's Breakfast program.	Teacher	Monitoring written products.	Written products.

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
Continue writing training using Michelle Miller.	All grades.	Michelle Miller, Consultant.	All teachers.	Staff developmentTuesdays.	Cross-grade level articiulation and sharing of writng work.	All.

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	**Description of Resources**	**Funding Source**	**Available Amount**
Use of monthly writing prompts for Author's Breakfast.	Teacher-created prompts from past FCAT Writes.	None.	$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**
Use of PTA funds for writing consultant.	Use of study materials.	PTA	$1,000.00
		Subtotal: $1,000.00	

Other			
Strategy	**Description of Resources**	**Funding Source**	**Available Amount**
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
		Subtotal: $0.00	
		Grand Total: $1,000.00	

*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:	7% students (41 students)were absent >18 days days or more during the 2011-2012 school year.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	**2013 Expected Attendance Rate:**
7% (41 students) were absent >18 days during the 2012-2013 school year.	The number of students absent >18 days will decrease by 5%.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	**2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)**
39	37
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	**2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)**
25	15

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	Awareness of importance of daily and on-time attendance.	Use school website, school newsletter, weekly Alert Now calls to increase parental awareness.	Principal	Weekly attendance forecasts.	TERMS and Pinnacle reports.
2	Parental awareness of their students' attendance patterns.	Letters of excessive tardiness and absences will be sent home each interim and report card period. Parent conferences will be held to increase parental awareness.	Principal, guidance counselor.	Weekly attendance forecasts.	TERMS and Pinnacle reports.
3	Out-of-zone attendance.	When determined necessary, attendance officer will verify residences of families.	Principal, attendance officer	Home visit.	Results of home visit.
4	Student awareness of attendance concerns.	Quarterly student assemblies honoring students	Principal, teachers.	Attendance data.	TERMS, Pinnacle.

5	Chronic illness.	with perfect attendance.			
		Implement a hygiene program.	Administration, public health nurse.	Weekly attendance logs, clinic logs.	TERMS

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
Bring It 180 Attendance Program.	PK-5.	Principal, SIP Parent Involvement Team.	School-wide.	Quarterly at staff meetings.	Weekly attendance reports.	Principal, SIP Parent Involvement Team.
Continue weekly attendance forecasts to parents.	PK-5	Principal.	School-wide.	Weekly.	Weekly attendance reports.	Principal, SIP Parent Involvement Team.

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
Continue Michelle Miller Writing Workshops	As provided at workshops.	PTA	$2,000.00
			Subtotal: $2,000.00
Other			

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $2,000.00

*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:**	Maintain or decrease the rate of in-school and out of school suspensions.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	**2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions**
5%	0%
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	**2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School**
5%	0%
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	**2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions**
11(1%)	4
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	**2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School**
11 (1%)	4

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	Student incentives to promote acceptable behavior.	Provide Viking Vouchers daily to promote positive	PBS team, teachers	Conduct data	Percentage of students

2	Parent awareness of student conduct.	behavior, Schedule quarterly incentive events for students with little to no conduct referrals.			attending incentives.
		Through use of agenda planners and daily work performance sheets, parents will be notified of student conduct.	Teachers	Conduct referrals	Data-base reporting tool
3	School Choice students with prior unsuccessful behavior interventions.	Refer students to RtI, develop behavior plans, monitor through check-in/check-out system.	Teachers, RtI team, guidance counselor.	Check-in/check out data.	teachers, guidance counselor.

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

			Subtotal: $0.00

Professional Development

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

Other

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

*End of **Suspension** Goal(s)*

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement **Parent Involvement Goal #1:** **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	Increase the percentage of parental involvement during the 2011-2012 school year to 92%.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	**2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:**
89% parents (491 students represented)	92% parents (517 students represented)

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	Parent involvement opportunities.	Open House, Boo Hoo Breakfast, Curriculum Nights, Volunteer Orientations, Mom's Workshops, Boosterthon, Field Day, SAC, PTA, RotaKids helpers, Band helpers, Chorus helpers,	Administration, Volunteer coordinator PTA, SAC, Extended Day.	Raptor data-base, attendance logs.	Climate survey.

2	Volunteer opportunities.	Lunchroom Moms and Dads, media helpers, Banking Day helpers. Implementation of the above as part of the criteria for Golden School Award.	Administration, volunteer coordinator, PTA, SAC.	Attendance logs, Raptor.	Golden School Award.
3	Poor on-time and daily attendance by students.	Send home weekly forecast letters to parents on excessive attendance patterns. Follow up on habitual excessive attendace patterns exhibited by some students by conducting parent conferences and/or verifying family's proof of residency.	Principal	Excessive attendance reports.	Pinnacle and TERMS data bases for attendance.
4	Lack of student motivation to maintain daily and on-time attendance.	Offer incentives from PBIS program rewarding students for daily and on-time attendance patterns each school quarter.	PBIS Team, administration, teachers.	Attendance reports.	Pinnacle and TERMS data bases.

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

Hold Curriculum Nights each start of the school year to involve parents in the education of their students.	PK-5.	Teacher teams.	School-wide.	September.	Parent/Teacher conferences.	Teachers.
Scheduling parent workshops throughout the year on topics of interest to parents.	PK-5	Teacher Teams, administration.	School-wide	Quarterly.	Monitoring.	School climate surveys.

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	None			$0.00
CELLA	None			$0.00
Mathematics	Use of Touch Math in all grade level math classes.	Manipulatives.	SIP	$1,000.00
Writing	Use of monthly writing prompts for Author's Breakfast.	Teacher-created prompts from past FCAT Writes.	None.	$0.00
				Subtotal: $1,000.00

Technology

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	None			$0.00
CELLA	None			$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00

Professional Development

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	None			$0.00
CELLA	None			$0.00
Writing	Use of PTA funds for writing consultant.	Use of study materials.	PTA	$1,000.00
Attendance	Continue Michelle Miller Writing Workshops	As provided at workshops.	PTA	$2,000.00
				Subtotal: $3,000.00

Other

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	None			$0.00
CELLA	None			$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
				Grand Total: $4,000.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

○ Priority   ○ Focus   ○ Prevent   ◉ NA

Are you a reward school: ○Yes ○No

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

No Attachment

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

☒ **No. Disagree with the above statement.**

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

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

SAC will be addressing School Climate surveys from 2011-2012.

SAC will be addressing safety issues raised across school campus.

SAC will be working with plans for School Recognition funding.

AYP DATA

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2011-2012
Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2010-2011
Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2009-2010

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Martin School District
JENSEN BEACH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	90%	80%	95%	78%	343	**Writing and Science:** Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	74%	66%			140	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?	74% (YES)	63% (YES)			137	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					620	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Martin School District
JENSEN BEACH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	89%	86%	96%	64%	335	**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	75%	67%			142	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?	67% (YES)	74% (YES)			141	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					618	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested