FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: P. M. WELLS CHARTER ACADEMY

District Name: Osceola

Principal: Bonnie Brett

SAC Chair: Jennifer Ranck

Superintendent: Melba Luciano

Date of School Board Approval: October 10, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/3/2012



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 | Bonnie Brett | Bachelor of Science Physical Education Master of Science in Educational Leadership. Certified in HE and PE Education PK - 12, Educational Leadership PK - | 1 | 6 | Ms. Brett has been an Administrator in "A" schools in all of her 4 years as an Administrator. |

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 | Jennifer Trent | MA Reading, Certified Reading grades K - 12, Elementary Education grades 1 - 6, English For Speakers Of Other Languages (ESOL) Endorsement, Specific Learning Disabilities grades K - 12 | 3 | 7 | School Grade 2011-2012: B Meeting High Standards in Reading 54% Meeting High Standards in Math 46% Meeting High Standards in Writing 78% Meeting High Standards in Science 38% Making Learning Gains in Reading 69% Making Learning Gains in Math 66% Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Reading 68% Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Math 68% School Grade 2010-2011: B Meeting High Standards in Reading 54% Meeting High Standards in Writing 74% Meeting High Standards in Writing 74% Meeting High Standards in Reading 71% Making Learning Gains in Reading 7176 Making Learning Gains in Math 69% Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Reading 68% Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Reading 68% Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains in Math 70% AYP Reading- Hispanic and Econ. Disadvantaged made AYP. ELL did not make AYP. AYP Math- Hispanic made AYP. Econ. Disadvantaged and ELL did not make AYP. |

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

| | Description of Strategy | Person Responsible | Projected Completion Date | Not Applicable (If not, please explain why) |
|---|--|---|---------------------------------|--|
| 1 | Advertise and interview all certified/ highly qualified candidates to fill positions | Admin. team | July / 2012 | |
| 2 | Research Based Professional Development | Bonnie Brett, Philip Yost, Maritza Rodriguez | May / 2012 | |
| 3 | 3. Performance Evaluations | Bonnie Brett, Philip Yost, Maritza Rodriguez | June / 2012 | |
| 4 | 4. Merit Pay for Performance | Bonnie Brett | August / 2012 | |
| 5 | 5. Mentors for New Teachers | Maritza Rodriguez | Year Round | |
| 6 | New Teacher Induction Program | Bonnie Brett and Maritza Rodriguez | August / 2012 | |

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

| Number of staff and paraprofessional | Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| No data submitted | |

Staff Demographics

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

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

| Total Number of Instructional Staff | % of First-Year Teachers | | % of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience | % of Teachers with Advanced Degrees | % Highly Effective Teachers | % Reading Endorsed Teachers | | % ESOL Endorsed Teachers |
|--|--------------------------------|-----------|---|--|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|--------------------------------|
| 50 | 8.0%(4) | 50.0%(25) | 36.0%(18) | 4.0%(2) | 20.0%(10) | 100.0%(50) | 10.0%(5) | 2.0%(1) | 36.0%(18) |

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 |
|------------------------------------|----------------------|---|--|
| Blakely Booth/Kari Armesto | Virginia Claytor | TLC Coordinator/Teacher – Elementary Education Background | New Teacher Induction Program throughout the year. |
| Blakely Booth/Nicole Bearfield | Tracy Granata | TLC Coordinator/Teacher – Middle Education Background | New Teacher Induction Program throughout the year. |
| Blakely Booth/Jennifer Flores | Oscar Hernandez | TLC Coordinator/Teacher – Middle Education Background | New Teacher Induction Program throughout the year. |
| Blakely Booth/Sheryl Wesselhoft | Jessica Rafidi | TLC Coordinator/Teacher – Middle Education Background | New Teacher Induction Program throughout the year |
| Blakely Booth/Andrea Morgan | Erin Lieber | TLC Coordinator/Teacher – Elementary Education Background | New Teacher Induction Program throughout the year |
| Blakely Booth/Shawn Crary | Manal Sohel | TLC Coordinator/Teacher – Middle Education Background | New Teacher Induction Program throughout the year |
| Blakely Booth/Natalie Trinidad | Garcia, Eileen | TLC Coordinator/Teacher – Elementary Education Background | New Teacher Induction Program throughout the year. |
| Blakely Booth | Kim Cove | TLC Coordinator/Teacher – Elementary Education Background | New Teacher Induction Program throughout the year. |
| Blakely Booth/Christie Miller | Rafaelina Mercado | TLC Coordinator/Teacher – Elementary Education Background | New Teacher Induction Program throughout the year. |
| Blakely Booth/Leroy Smith | Amanda Small | TLC Coordinator/Teacher – Elementary Education Background | New Teacher Induction Program throughout the year. |
| Blakely Booth/Marcia Nelson | Casie Dwyer | TLC Coordinator/Teacher – Elementary Education Background | New Teacher Induction Program throughout the year. |
| Blakely Booth/Doris Pagan | Julio Tejada | TLC Coordinator/Teacher – Elementary Education Background | New Teacher Induction Program throughout the year. |

| Blakely Booth/Jennifer Ranck | Joy Hunte | Coordinator/Teacher – Elementary Education Background | New Teacher Induction Program throughout the year. |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------|---|--|
| Blakely Booth/Sandra Vazquez | Yasenia Herrera | TLC Coordinator/Teacher – Elementary Education Background | New Teacher Induction Program throughout the year. |
| Blakely Booth/Lizbeth Vazquez | Kathy Brock | TLC Coordinator/Teacher – Middle Education Background | New Teacher Induction Program throughout the year. |
| Blakely Booth/Sylvia Rodriguez | Yazdel Villanueva | TLC Coordinator/Teacher – Middle Education Background | New Teacher Induction Program throughout the year. |
| Blakely Booth/Brian Edwards | Amanda Fernandez | TLC Coordinator/Teacher – Music Education Background | New Teacher Induction Program throughout the year. |
| Blakely Booth/Collette Purcell | Sharon Brinson | TLC Coordinator/Teacher – Computer Education Background | New Teacher Induction Program throughout the year. |
| Blakely Booth/Doris Pagan | Juan Smaine | TLC Coordinator/Teacher – Elementary Education Background | New Teacher Induction Program throughout the year. |

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Parents will be notified of Title 1 and our services in an understandable and uniform format and translated into a language the parents can understand. The policy will be made available to the local community and updated periodically to meet the changing needs of parents and the school.

The Title 1 Community Involvement Specialist will hold monthly parent education workshops to provide resources to parents to support learning at home.

Parent Education – Parent education night is for every grade level. Parents and students are provided with a demonstration on how they can use their computers for at home academic enhancement. The teachers walk the students through a minipractice lesson on the computers, covering the math, reading and science resources. Families who do not have computers at home are encouraged to use the school computers for FCAT practice, Signing into SIS, and completing homework assignments.

Science Nights – We invited the Orlando Science Museum to P. M. Wells Charter Academy. Everyone, from child to parents can participate in a science experiments, night plays, and a world of scientific discovery activities. Science stations will be set up all around the courtyard of hands-on activities and teacher demonstrations.

FCAT Nights – an engaging night in which parents are provided information on FCAT structure, content segments, mini assessments, other help tips and resources.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

NA

Title I, Part D

NA

| NA | |
|---|----------------|
| tle III | |
| NA | |
| tle X- Homeless | |
| We are sending out the Domicile forms to all families at our school. Once that information is gathered, we will put those families in contact with the resources available to them through Osceola County. | |
| upplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) | |
| Supplemental Academic Instruction occurs at P. M. Wells Charter Academy in a variety of formats. They are as follows: 1. Elementary Students are assessed weekly to determine progress in the classrooms. Intensive Reading and Math tead will push in for small group instruction to focus on each child's learning challenges in all content groups. 2. Middle School Reading and Math Intensive Classes: Students, who scored a Level 1 on the previous FCAT Test, are plan either Reading or Math intensive classes. 3. Middle School Reading and Math Advance Classes: Students, who scored a Level 4/5 on the previous FCAT Test, are plan Reading and Math Advance classes. Advance classes offer a rigorous and challenging curriculum in four core subject and they also offer students an opportunity to obtain high school credits. | aced olaced |
| olence Prevention Programs | |
| PMWCA follows the Osceola Student Code of Conduct / Discipline Matrix to insure a violence free school environment. In coalition with the Osceola County Stop Bullying Now Anti-Bullying Policy we enforce a zero tolerance for bullying. Student Taking Responsibility for Important Values of Excellence (S. T. R. I. V. E.) is a character education program we implement oromote a culture of high moral character, performance, and citizenship. STRIVE provides Professional Development, classroom /school wide/ community activities, character examples, and field trips designed to promote positive character development. | ts ed to |
| utrition Programs | |
| PMWCA participates in the federally funded free and reduced meals program which meets national, state, and district nutritional standards. Parents can apply for the meal program online or by paper application through the district. Our Tit status has provided our students Universal Breakfast. This program gives every student, regardless of whether or not the qualify for a free or reduced lunch, a free breakfast daily. | |
| pusing Programs | |
| NA | |
| ead Start | |
| NA | |
| dult Education | |
| NA | |
| areer and Technical Education | |
| Career Education is taught through our Social Studies classes. | |
| bb Training | |
| NA | |
| ther | |

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team-

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

RtI team consists of the following educators:

Bonnie Brett (Principal)

Philip Yost (Administrator)

Kathy McKeon (RtI Coach)
Kathy McKeon (Student Services Coordinator)
Yazdek Villanueva (ESOL)
Jennifer Trent (Reading Coach)
Patricia Lamasney (School Psychologist)
Lead Teachers K-8

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?

As students enroll their records are reviewed by the Registrar and Rtl Coach. Each student is placed in the appropriate Rtl tier based on this review. If additional information is needed from the previous school a member of the team makes the contact to get the information. Two to three times a year, data such as FCAT, FAIR, SAT 10, benchmarks are analyzed to determine the school needs. The Rtl team meets every 4 weeks to continue to monitor the needs of the students and teachers in the Rtl process, and measure student achievement to ensure success. At the end of the year a final review is put in place to help identify possible needs for the following year.

Principal- Monitors the RtI process to ensure the implementation of the program and it's alignment to meeting the needs of all students in accordance with the SIP plan.

Administrator- Oversees the RtI process to ensure adherence to the guidelines and procedures. Participates in the parent meetings and implements school-based plans/activities based on data to maximize the success of classroom implementation.

Rtl Coach- Monitor the Rtl process, providing classroom teacher support, and assuring the Rtl process is completed with fidelity. Provides the teacher with training on curriculum and assessment resources. Organize baseline data and provide it to teachers. Participates in the parent meetings and facilitate school-based plans/activities based on data to maximize the success of classroom implementation.

ESE Teachers – Works collaboratively with the teacher in our inclusion model. They may go into a co-teach situation of support for Tier 3 students.

ESOL teacher- Works collaboratively with the teacher in our inclusion model. They may go into a co-teach situation of support for Tier 3 students.

Reading Coach –Serve as the liaison between the school and district academic personnel. She will assist with the FAIR testing process for early detection of students below grade level.

School Psychologist- Serve as an expert on district requirements for RtI.

Lead Teachers - Represent their specific grade levels and determine needs for is instructional purposes. Instructs students in the core curriculum for Tier 1 & 2. Collaborate with academic RtI team for extra assistance.

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?

RtI process is a part of the total educational program. Development of the SIP was heavily interwoven with the provisions created for the RtI process. Programs, curriculum and resources are allocated to meet the needs of the students in all tiers of the RtI process alongside the other students' needs being addressed. Ensure that the staff has the support necessary to successfully attain what they're being asked to accomplish.

The steps in the RtI problem solving process used to develop and implement the SIP in the following manner:

- 1. Analyze the data and define areas of weakness and strength by grade level, ESOL students, ESE students, individual students, subject area, and content segments.
- 2. Determine factors impacting student academic achievement.
- 3. Develop an intervention plan to address the goals, and methods for measuring and monitoring student academic performance.
- 4. Consistently re-evaluate the plan to determine the change in student needs and the effective implantation of strategies.

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:

- Benchmark Testing (3 times a year)
- FAIR (3 times a year)
- · Study Island and Timez/Division Attack
- · Writing Prompts (given monthly),
- FCAT Mini Assessments & FCAT are used for Reading, Mathematics, & Science

Behavior:

- · Behavior Intervention Plan is used to monitor and track undesired behaviors.
- SIS / Terms
- Functional Behavioral Assessment and the Behavior Intervention Plan FBA-BIP

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional Development is provided on RtI during our new teacher / returning teacher in-service training. We will continue to provide training throughout the year on implementing services. The faculty is encouraged to also take any RtI professional development courses through Osceola County.

| ı | Describe the plan to support MTSS. |
|---|------------------------------------|
| ı | |
| ı | |
| ı | |

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

-School-Based Literacy Leadership Team-

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

The school-based Literacy Leadership Team will consist of: Principal, Dean, CRT, the Reading Coach, K - 8th grade team leads, the middle school reading teachers and the librarian. Principal- Oversee the alignment of literacy programs to the school improvement plan.

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

The team meets once a month. The roles/functions of the team are to:

The school-based Literacy Leadership Team will consist of: Principal, Dean, CRT, the Reading Coach, K - 8th grade team lead, the middle school reading teachers and the librarian.

Principal- Oversee the alignment of literacy programs to the school improvement plan.

Dean/CRT- Monitor the fidelity of lesson plans and instructional strategies in classroom provides teachers with professional resources and professional development. Define procedures and processes with weekly meetings with Team Leads and grade level teachers.

Reading Coach- Provide support in the implementation of data driven reading instruction, and programs that have research based validity.

Team Leads- Responsible to relay information on strategies and programs that will reinforce reading in their different grade levels. Support content area teachers in the use of reading strategies in their curriculum and implementation of best reading practices in the classroom.

ESE specialist- Support teachers in effective modifications in reading for the 504 and IEP students.

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

The goal to increase student's reading fluency, comprehension and enjoyment as measured by FAIR tests, CSUSA benchmark tests and the FCAT will be achieved by implementing these initiatives: 1)CSUSA Reading Challenge, 2)Student progress on Study Island and FCAT Explorer, 3)Track student progress on CSUSA benchmark test, 4)Implement Book Mark Buddies for struggling readers, 5) Engaging Middle School students in book studies through their reading classes, 6) Provide intensive reading classes to all level 1 students in grades 6-8, 7)Book-It.

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.

Kindergarten Round Up is a program for preschool students and parents to be introduce to the kindergarten program at our school for the following year. Parents are introduced to our teachers, curriculum, resources, and strategies for preparing their child for kindergarten. Kindergarten Readiness Screening is completed on each child. Data on each student is used for class placement and individualizing student needs and used by teacher to drive instruction and design a plan to meet student needs.

Prior to the first day of school Kindergarten parents and students were invited to Open House. Parents were given a tour of the school, met their child's teacher, reviewed the student's daily routine, classroom resources, curriculum, grading, homework policy, teacher communication, and Student Information System (SIS).

Throughout the year parents and students will receive opportunities to participate in school activities that enhance the education and success of our students. Student achievement will be tracked using data obtained on individual student assessments collected from FAIR testing, Benchmark testing, SAT 10, and classroom assessments. This information will be shared with students and parents to set student goals and parent involvement.

*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.

Professional Development is provided to our teachers of research based, data driven instructional strategies to improve literacy. Teachers receive strategic data chats to review tracked student data. Weekly walk-throughs are performed by administrators and reviewed for teachers to ensure school wide implementation.

*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 <u>High School Feedback Report</u>

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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:

Reading Goal # 1a:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

54% (323) of students overall attained proficiency on the reading FCAT in 2012.

60% (323) of students will obtain reading proficiency on the FCAT in 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 | Differentiating instruction for students on various levels of academic achievement. | Elementary Students are assessed weekly to determine progress in these classrooms. Teachers will provide differentiated centers and small group instruction by grouping students based on academic ability. Middle School students, who scored a Level 1 on the previous FCAT Test, are placed in either Reading intensive classes where Tier III curriculum is utilized to assist the student with support. These students are also enrolled in an on grade level class. This in turn increases their Reading Studies form 42/55 minutes to 84/110 minutes daily. Middle School Students, who scored a Level 4/5 on the previous FCAT Test, are placed Advance Reading classes. Advance classes offer a rigorous and challenging curriculum in the four core subject areas. | | Teachers and students will track their progress on all assessments. Teachers/grade level teams will analyze data and differentiate instruction to accommodate students' needs. Students will set achievement goals on SIS though their PLPs and data chats. | Benchmark tests, Study Island, Accelerated Reader, Running Recorder, Student Portfolios, and teacher 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 reading.

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

| Reading Goal #1b: | | | | | |
|------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|------------|--|-----------------|
| 2012 Current Level of P | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to I | | | ncrease St | udent Achievement | |
| for | | | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | No Data Submitted | | | | |

| | No Data Submitted | | | | | | | |
|-------|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | |
| | on the analysis of studen provement for the following | t achievement data, and reg group: | eference to "Guiding | Questions", identify and o | define areas in need | | | |
| Level | CAT 2.0: Students scorin 4 in reading. ing Goal #2a: | ng at or above Achievem | Reading goal fo | Reading goal for student achieving above proficiency rate of a level 4 or 5, for the 2013 year, is 32%(191). | | | | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perforn | nance: | 2013 Expected | Level of Performance: | | | | |
| | 27% (161) of students overall attained above Reading proficiency on the FCAT in 2012. 32% (191) of students will obtain above Reading proficiency on the FCAT in 2013. | | | | | | | |
| | Pr | oblem-Solving Process t | to Increase Studer | nt Achievement | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | | |
| 1 | Academic content is always above ability level, yet has attainable success criteria defined. | Provide continuously throughout the year, challenging and engaging coursework. Provide opportunities for query and real-life problem solving. | Reading Coach, | Walkthroughs & Teacher Observation of student motivation and success. Students will set achievement goals on SIS though their PLPs and data chats. | Study Island, Accelerated Reader, Running Recorder, Student Portfolios and teacher assessments | | | |
| 2 | challenges. Higher Level Blooms Taxonomy strategy use School-wide incentive | | Reading Coach, | Teachers and students will track their progress on all assessments. Teachers/grade level teams will analyze data and adjust instruction to accommodate students' needs. Students will set | Benchmark tests, Study Island, Accelerated Reader, Running Recorder, Student Portfolios and teacher 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:

achievement goals on SIS though their PLPs and data chats.

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment:

Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in

| reading. | | | | | | |
|---|--------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------------------|--|
| Reading Goal #2b: | | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of | Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | for | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| | | No Data S | Submitted | | <u>'</u> | |
| Based on the analysis of improvement for the f | | t data, and refer | ence to "G | uiding Questions", ident | tify and define areas in need | |

| 1 | d on the analysis of studer provement for the following | | eference to "Guiding | g Questions", identify and | define areas in need | |
|------|--|---|--|---|--|--|
| gain | FCAT 2.0: Percentage of s s in reading. ding Goal #3a: | tudents making learning | | r student making Learning | Gains is 72% (431). | |
| 2012 | 2 Current Level of Perforr | mance: | 2013 Expected | d Level of Performance: | | |
| 72% | (431) of students making I | earning gains in 2012. | 72% (431) of s | 72% (431) of students will be making learning gains in 2013 | | |
| | Pı | roblem-Solving Process t | to Increase Studer | nt Achievement | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| 1 | Student motivation to perform higher academically. | Create an individual plan with each student based on their own data. Professional Development on strategies to engage readers. Students will be provided a variety of reading materials to keep them engaged. | | Teachers and students will track their progress on all assessments. Teachers/grade level teams will analyze data and differentiate instruction to accommodate students' needs. | Benchmark tests, Study Island, Accelerated Reader, Running Recorder, Student Portfolios and teacher 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: | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| 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. The Reading goal for Lowest 25% making Learning Gains, for the 2013 year, is 71% (425). Reading Goal #4: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: 68% (407) of students in Lowest 25% overall making learning 71% (425) of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in gains in Reading on the FCAT in 2012. Reading on the FCAT in 2013. Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier Strategy **Evaluation Tool** Responsible for Effectiveness of Monitoring Strategy Below grade level skills Small group instruction Admin. team, CRT, Intensive Teachers and Benchmark tests. such as vocabulary, focused on individual Reading Coach, students will track their Study Island, comprehension, or student weaknesses and Intensive teachers progress on all Accelerated decoding. differentiatedinstruction. Reader, Running assessments. Recorder, mini Intensive Reading assessments, teachers will push in and Student Portfolios pull identified lower 25% and teacher for small group assessments instruction focused on each child's learning challenges and Reading strategies.

| 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: | | | | | |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

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.

On the 2012-2013 FCAT Reading 60%(359) of all Hispanics students will make proficiency in and meet AYP.

Reading Goal #5B:

| | | | I | | | |
|------|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| 2012 | Current Level of Perforr | mance: | 2013 Expected | d Level of Performance: | | |
| 1 | (371) of all Hispanics studing and meet AYP. | ents made proficiency in | , , | 60%(359)of all Hispanics students will make proficiency in Reading and met AYP. | | |
| | Pr | oblem-Solving Process | to Increase Studer | nt Achievement | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| 1 | Low parent involvement. | Events to attract parent to school centered on aspects of their culture. Communication sent to parents translated in English, Spanish, and Creole. Translator list of people who can translate meetings and documents for teachers. | Admin. team, CRT, classroom teachers, After Care Supervisor, Technology teacher | Translated documents Parent teacher conference notes | Parent satisfaction surveys. Volunteer logs | |

Providing bilingual information to parents at all school-wide academic events in English, Spanish, and/or Creole.

| | on the analysis of studen provement for the following | | efere | ence to "Guiding | Questions", identify and o | define areas in need | |
|---|--|---|----------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C: | | | | 45% (392) of all ELL students will be proficient on Reading FCAT 2013 and make AYP. | | | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perform | nance: | | 2013 Expected | Level of Performance: | | |
| 43% (375)of all ELL students made proficiency in Reading FCAT 2011 but did not meet AYP. | | | | 45% (392) of all ELL students will make proficiency in Reading and obtain AYP. | | | |
| | Pr | oblem-Solving Process t | to I r | ncrease Studer | nt Achievement | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | | Person or Position esponsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| 1 | Parent support in Reading at home due to the language barrier. | Silent Reading time during school hours. Students will be offered tutoring in Aftercare and after school tutoring program. Bookmark Buddies will provide Reading assistance during the day. Parent University providing after-hours help | Rea class tea Car | min. team, CRT, ading Coach, ssroom ichers, After re Supervisor | Teachers and students will track their progress on all assessments. Teachers/grade level teams will analyze data and adjust instruction to accommodate students' needs. Students will set achievement goals on SIS though their PLPs and data chats. | Benchmark tests, Study Island, Accelerated Reader, Running Recorder, Student Portfolios and teacher assessments | |

| | | for parent in need of strategies to help their child academically. | | | |
|---|---|---|-------------------|---------------------|---|
| 2 | We have over 130 students in school with our mobility ranumber changes throughtout the ye | and with the ELL students in one on one or small groups in the classroom. | team and teachers | throughout the year | Cella testing Benchmark testing, FCAT Explorer, Study Island 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 subgroup: 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Student with Disabilities will make AYP in reading in the 12-13 FCAT test. Reading Goal #5D: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: On the 10-11 test there was an NA in the meeting AYP area All of our SWD students will meet AYP in FCAT reading.in 12in reading Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier Strategy **Evaluation Tool** Responsible for Effectiveness of Monitoring Strategy Having student come to ESE staff will work with Classroom teachers Tracking student Benchmark tests, us from other areas they the students in class and ESE staff progress by teachers, FCAT Explorer, may not have the prior will work with the ESE staff and the Study Island and knowledge and therefore classroom teacher to student. Annual IEP teacher tests. we will have to fill in the modify the curriculum to reviews meet the students needs. Have 15 min. of silent reading each day.

| December the small rain of church as his course | | anana ka IIC. dalima | Occasional identificand | J. 6: | |
|--|---|--|----------------------------|----------------------|--|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement of improvement for the following subgroup: | nt data, and refe | erence to "Guiding | Questions", identify and d | define areas in need | |
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged student satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E: | 65%(292) of all Economically Disadvantaged students will proficient on the Reading FCAT 2012 and made AYP in Reading. | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | | |
| 62%(278) of all Economically Disadvantaged proficient on the Reading FCAT 2011 and markeading. | | 65% (292) of all Economically Disadvantaged students will be proficient and make AYP in Reading. | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | | Person or | Process Used to | | |

| | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---------------------|--|---|---|--|
| 1 | S | | opportunities to help at school. Parenting assistance through student services. Provide | classroom teachers, After Care Supervisor, Technology teacher | Observation of student motivation and success. Students will set achievement goals on SIS though their PLPs and data chats. | Benchmark tests, Study Island, Accelerated Reader, Running Recorder, Student Portfolios and teacher assessments |

| | | providing technology training and parent access to SIS after- school. | | | |
|---|--|---|------------|---------------------------|--|
| 2 | students on free/reduced lunch and these are our most mobile students who come to us with | Placing all in level 1&2 reading students in remedial classes and having the teachers work with them in small groups to fill their learning gaps. Have 15 min.of silent reading each day. | ESOL staff | teachers, staff using the | Benchmark tests, FCAT Explorer, study island |

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 | | | | | | | |

Reading Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Mate | erial(s) | | |
|--|--------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Tracking student achievement to differentiate instruction. | benchmark tests | As provided by CSUSA | \$8,000.00 |
| Research based instructional materials | Imagine It Consumables | FTE Funds | \$24,658.84 |
| research based instructional materials | Imagine It Textbooks | FTE Funds | \$3,594.45 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$36,253.29 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| use technology to enhance learning opportunities | Study Island | FTE funds | \$7,293.75 |
| use technology to enhance learning opportunities | Triumph learning | FTE Funds | \$3,320.85 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$10,614.60 |
| 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: \$46,867.89 |

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 Engli | sh and understand s | spoken English at | grade le | vel in a manner simila | r to non-ELL students. |
|--------------------------|------------------------|--|-------------|--|------------------------|
| 1. Students scoring p | roficient in listenir | ng/speaking. | | | |
| CELLA Goal #1: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Percent | of Students Profic | cient in listening | /speaki | ing: | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solvin | g Process to Inc | crease S | Student Achievement | t |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person Positio Respor for Monito | n nsible | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | | No Data Su | | 1 | |
| | | | | | |
| Students read in Englis | h at grade level text | in a manner simi | ilar to no | on-ELL students. | |
| 2. Students scoring p | | | | | |
| CELLA Goal #2: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Percent | of Students Profic | cient in reading: | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solvin | g Process to Inc | crease S | Student Achievement | t |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person Positio Respor for Monito | nsible | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | | No Data Su | bmitted | | |
| | | | | | |
| Students write in Englis | sh at grade level in a | manner similar t | o non-E | LL students. | |
| 3. Students scoring p | roficient in writing | | | | |
| CELLA Goal #3: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Percent | of Students Profic | ient in writing: | | | |

| | Problem-Solving Proce | ess to Increase S | 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 Progra | (5),a.ca.(5) | | Available |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| 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 Developm | ent | | |
| 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)).

| | | the number of students the pure tachievement data, and re | | | define areas in need |
|---------|---|---|--|---|---|
| 1a. Fo | crovement for the following CAT2.0: Students scoring ematics. ematics Goal #1a: | g group: g at Achievement Level (| On the 2013 FC | CAT test in math, 53% (31 3 or higher in Math | 7) of the students |
| IVIALIT | ematics Goal # ra. | | | | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perforn | nance: | 2013 Expected | d Level of Performance: | |
| 46%(| 275)of the students were a | at level 3 or higher in Math | 53%(317)of the or higher. | e students who take the te | est will be at level 3 |
| | Pr | oblem-Solving Process t | to Increase Studer | nt Achievement | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Differentiating instruction for students on various levels of academic achievement. | Elementary Students are assessed weekly to determine progress in these classrooms. Teachers will provide differentiated centers and small group instruction by grouping students based on academic ability. Intensive Math teachers will push in for small group instruction is utilized to focus on each child's learning challenges in content groups. Middle School students, who scored a Level 1 on the previous FCAT Test, are placed in either Math intensive classes where Tier III curriculum is utilized to assist the student with support. These students are also enrolled in an on grade level class. This in turn increases their Reading Studies form 42/55 minutes to 84/110 minutes daily. | Admin. team, CRT, classroom teachers. | | Benchmark tests, Study Island, Timez / Division Attack, Student Portfolios and teacher assessments. |
| 2 | Low exposure to Science concepts, terms and real life experience. | | classroom teachers. Science Coordinators & CRT | Walk-throughs, Teachers and students will track their progress on all mini assessments. Teachers/grade level teams will analyze data and differentiate instruction to accommodate students' needs. Students will set achievement goals on SIS though their PLPs | Benchmark tests, Study Island, FCAT mini assessments, Student Portfolios and teacher assessments. |

| | | | | and data chats. | |
|---|------------------------|----------------------------|-------------|---|--|
| 3 | students who enroll at | Envision, is introduced to | Admin. team | Monitoring of benchmark tests and other programs used to practice math skills and tracking student progress on these. | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|---|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------|
| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. | | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #1b: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Po | erformance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proce | ss to L | ncrease St | udent Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a: | On the 2013 FCAT 32% (191)students with level 4 or 5 will maintain or increase their level. | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| 17% (101) of the students achieving above proficiency scored a level 4 or 5 on the Math FCAT | 32% (191)of the students achieving above proficiency will score a level 4 or 5 on the Math FCAT | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |

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 | | Provide continuously throughout the year, challenging and engaging coursework. Provide opportunities for query and real-life problem solving. | classroom teachers | Observation of student motivation and success. Students will set | Benchmark tests, Study Island, Timez / Division Attack, Student Portfolios and teacher assessments |
| 2 | Opportunity to explore Scientific theory and practical application. | Middle school Students performing at a level 4 and 5 were placed in a Advance Science class | classroom teachers | Observation of student motivation and success. | Benchmark test, mini FCAT assessments, and FCAT. |

| | with more opportu for experiments ar cooperative learni | nd | | achievement goa SIS though their and data chats. | |
|--|---|---------------------|--------------------------------------|--|------------------------------|
| | | a, and refe | rence to "G | uiding Questions", ident | tify and define areas in nee |
| of improvement for the 1 2b. Florida Alternate A Students scoring at or mathematics. | | vel 7 in | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #2k |): | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Pr | rocess to | ncrease S | tudent Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Posi Resi for | on or tion ponsible itoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | | |
| | f student achievement data | | | | |

| 1 | on the analysis of student provement for the following | | l refer | rence to "Guiding | Questions", identify and | define areas in need |
|--|---|----------|--|--------------------------------------|--|----------------------|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. | | | On the 2012-2013 FCAT 69% (413) of the students will show learning gains | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #3a: | | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| On the 2011-2012 66% (395)of the students showed learning gains in math. | | | | On the 2013-20' learning gains in | | lents will show |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | R | Person or Position | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of | Evaluation Tool |

| ш | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| | | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | m ac ur M | nath components to chieve full nderstanding of higher lath Concepts and ractical application. | world examples by | Classroom teachers | will track their progress on all assessments. Teachers/grade level teams will analyze data | Benchmark tests, Study Island, Timez / Division Attack, Student Portfolios and teacher assessments |
| 2 | of di ga Al fro | f our students it will be | We will use the new math program, Envision and monitor student progress | Classroom teachers Admin. Team | Use of benchmark test and the other tutorial programs and track progress | Benchmark tests, and the other programs used to monitor student progress. |

| background knowle | edge. | | | | | |
|---|--------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|--|
| | • | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of of improvement for the for | | nt data, and refe | rence to "G | uiding Questions", iden | tify and define areas in ne | |
| 3b. Florida Alternate A Percentage of students mathematics. | | Gains in | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #3b: | | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solv | ing Process to I | ncrease S | tudent Achievement | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Posi Resp for | on or tion ponsible itoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| | | No Data | Submitted | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of | | nt data, and refe | rence to "G | uiding Questions", iden | tify and define areas in ne | |

| 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: | On the 2013 FCAT test 76% (113) of the students in the lowest 25% will show learning gains in math. | | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | | | | |
| 2012 FCAT 46% (68) showed proficient in math. | On the 2013 FCAT 76% (113) of the lowest 25% will show learning gains in math | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

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 need remediation below grade level in content areas to meet the grade level concepts. | | classroom teachers | Walk-throughs & Teacher Observation of student motivation and success. Students will set achievement goals on SIS though their PLPs and data chats. | Benchmark tests, Study Island, Timez / Division Attack, Student Portfolios and teacher assessments |
| 2 | We have a high mobility rate with students coming to us from all | Use the new Envision math program and place all level 1 students in | | Monitor progress through benchmark tests. | Benchmark test and other evaluative tools |

| | learning gaps | | | | | | | | teacher. |
|---|---|--------|---------------------------|--|-----------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|---|----------------------|
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Based | on Ambitious but Ad | chieva | ible Annual | | | | | Reading and Math Pe | erformance Target |
| 5A. Ar | nbitious but Achieva | ble Ar | nnual | Elementary Sc | chool | l Mathematics Go | oal # | | _ |
| | rable Objectives (AM will reduce their acl | | | | | | | | _ |
| by 509 | | | 9-1- | 5A : | | | | | ▼ |
| Baseline data 2011-2012 2012-2013 2013-2014 | | | | 4 | 2014-201 | 5 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | |
| | | | | | | | \neg | | |
| | , | | | , | | , | | , | , |
| | on the analysis of s rovement for the foll | | | ent data, and re | efere | ence to "Guiding | Ques | tions", identify and | define areas in need |
| | udent subgroups b | - | _ | | | | | | |
| | nic, Asian, America actory progress in | | | naking | | | | AT Math 55%(280) | |
| | | | | | | will be proficien | t and | met AYP on FCAT M | ath 2011. |
| Matrie | ematics Goal #5B: | | | | | | | | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Pe | erforr | mance: | | | 2013 Expected | l Leve | el of Performance: | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | 274) Hispanic studen AT Math 2011. | nts in | were profici | ent and met A\ | ΥP | 55%(280) Hispa on FCAT Math 2 | | udents will be profic | cient and met AYP |
| | | Pr | roblem-Sol | ving Process t | to I r | ncrease Studer | nt Ach | ievement | |
| | Anticipated Barrier Strategy | | | | Re | Position | | rocess Used to Determine ffectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | Low parent involven | nent. | Increase p | arental | Adr | min. team, CRT, | Trans | lated documents | Parent satisfaction |
| | | | participatio Mathemati | | | ssroom chers, After | Paren | nt teacher | surveys. |
| | | | meetings bincentives | y offering | Car | e Supervisor, | conference notes | | Volunteer logs |
| 4 | | | activities for | or the family | Technology teacher | | | | |
| 1 | | | to take par | | | | | | |
| | | | all school-vevents in E | n to parents at wide academic English, | | | | | |
| | Many of our Hispani | С | 1 | nd/or Creole. e the new math | Cla | ssroom teachers | Track | ing student | Benchmark test |
| | students come with limited prior knowled | | program ai | nd have our | | d ESOL staff | progr | ess by ent,ESOL staff and | and tests provided |
| 2 | convert the Math sy | /stem | | work with the | | | teach | | by new math program. |
| | used in their counrt the US. | y to | | | | | | | |
| | | | 1 | | | | | | |
| | on the analysis of s rovement for the foll | | | ent data, and re | efere | ence to "Guiding | Ques | tions", identify and | define areas in need |
| | nglish Language Le | | | t making | | | | | |
| satisf | actory progress in | math | nematics. | | | ELL sudents will | l meet | AYP in Math for the | e FCAT 2013. |
| Mathe | ematics Goal #5C: | | | | | | | | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Pe | erforr | mance: | | | 2013 Expected | d Leve | el of Performance: | |
| | | | | | | i e | | | |

used by the

over and who hav

intensive math

| 49% | of | the | ELL | student | didn't | meet | AYP | in | Math | for | the | FCAT | _ |
|------|----|-----|-----|---------|--------|------|-----|----|------|-----|-----|------|----|
| 2011 | | | | | | | | | | | | | Ιc |

ELL sudents will meet AYP in Math for the 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 | with a different currency from their country, the metric system, vocabulary presented to them in word problems are challenging and leave | Identify key terms to solve the problems. ESOL teachers will teach | Admin. team, CRT, Reading Coach, classroom teachers, After Care Supervisor | Walkthroughs & Teacher Observation of student motivation and success. Students will set achievement goals on SIS though their PLPs and data chats. | Benchmark tests, Study Island, Timez / Division Attack, Student Portfolios and teacher 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: 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. On the 2013 FCAT the SWD students with show AYP in math Mathematics Goal #5D: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: There was not enough data for the 2012 FCAT test for SWD The SWD students will show AYP on the 2013 Fcat test Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier **Evaluation Tool** Strategy Effectiveness of Responsible for Monitoring Strategy Adequate use of support | ESE teachers working in Classroom teachers Studendts and teachers Benchmark tests and ESE teachers and other data and small group the classroom with monitoring progress instruction during their teacher modifiying gathering tools curriculum. Level 1 time of support.

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:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Economically Disadvantaged students did not meet AYP in Math for the FCAT 2012.

Economically Disadvantaged students will meet AYP in Math for the FCAT 2013.

students in intensive classes for math

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 | Socioeconomic Factors | opportunities to help at school. Parenting assistance through student services. Provide | classroom teachers, After Care Supervisor, | Observation of student motivation and success. Students will set | Benchmark tests, Study Island, Timez / Division Attack, Student Portfolios and teacher assessments |

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine **Anticipated Barrier** Strategy **Evaluation Tool** Effectiveness of Responsible for Monitoring Strategy Differentiating instruction Elementary Students are Admin. team, CRT, Teachers and students Benchmark tests, for students on various assessed weekly to classroom will track their progress Study Island, levels of academic Timez / Division determine progress in teachers. on all assessments. achievement. these classrooms. Attack, Student Teachers will provide Teachers/grade level Portfolios and teams will analyze data differentiated centers teacher and small group and differentiate assessments. instruction by grouping instruction to accommodate students' students based on academic ability. needs. Intensive Math teachers will push in for small Students will set group instruction is achievement goals on utilized to focus on each SIS though their PLPs child's learning challenges and data chats. in content groups. Middle School students, who scored a Level 1 on the previous FCAT Test, are placed in either Math intensive classes where Tier III curriculum is utilized to assist the student with support. These students are also

| level class. This in turn increases their Reading Studies form 42/55 minutes to 84/110 minutes daily. |
|---|
|---|

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier Responsible Strategy **Evaluation Tool** Effectiveness of Strategy Monitoring No Data Submitted

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier Strategy **Evaluation Tool** Responsible for Effectiveness of Monitoring Strategy Academic content is Provide continuously Admin. team, CRT, Walkthroughs & Teacher Benchmark tests, classroom teachers Observation of student Study Island, always above ability throughout the year, level, yet has attainable challenging and engaging motivation and success. Timez / Division success criteria defined. coursework. Students will set Attack, Student achievement goals on Portfolios and Provide opportunities for SIS though their PLPs teacher query and real-life and data chats. assessments problem solving.

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.

| Math | ematics Goal #2b: | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|---|---------|---|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|---|------------------|--|--|
| 2012 | Current Level of P | erforr | nance: | | 2013 Ехре | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Pr | oblem-Solving Process | s to I | Increase St | uder | nt Achievement | | | |
| Antio | Anticipated Barrier Strategy Posit Resp for | | son or tion ponsible itoring | Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | | luation Tool | | | | |
| | | • | No I | Data | Submitted | | | • | | |
| of im 3a. F gains | provement for the fo | llowing | t achievement data, and group: tudents making learnir | | rence to "Gu | ıiding | Questions", identify | and o | define areas in nee | |
| | Current Level of P | erforr | nance: | | 2013 Expe | ectec | d Level of Performa | nce: | | |
| | Anticipated Bar | | oblem-Solving Process Strategy | | Person or Position Responsible | r for | Process Used t Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | | Evaluation Too | |
| 1 | Students are missir math components to achieve full understanding of hit Math Concepts and practical application | gher | Provide concrete real world examples by infusing literacy into the mathematics instructionablock. Student math journals and word walls will be utilized in tandem with manipulatives to achieve understanding. | Re Cla | Monitoring Admin. team, CR Reading Coach, Classroom teache | | Teachers and studer will track their progron all assessments. Teachers/grade lever teams will analyze drand differentiate instruction to accommodate studeneeds. | ess el ata | Benchmark tests, Study Island, Timez / Division Attack, Student Portfolios and teacher assessments | |
| of im | d on the analysis of sprovement for the following | llowing | | refe | rence to "Gu | ıiding | Questions", identify | and (| define areas in nee | |
| Perce math | entage of students nematics. | | ng Learning Gains in | | | | | | | |
| | ematics Goal #3b: | | | | | | | | | |
| 2012 | Current Level of P | erforr | nance: | | 2013 Expe | ected | d Level of Performa | nce: | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |

| 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 | | | | | | | | |

| | on the analysis of studen or overment for the following | t achievement data, and reg group: | efere | ence to "Guiding | Questions", identify and c | lefine areas in need |
|------|--|--|-------|---|--|--|
| | AT 2.0: Percentage of stong learning gains in mat | | | | | |
| Math | ematics Goal #4: | | | | | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perform | nance: | | 2013 Expected | Level of Performance: | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Pr | oblem-Solving Process t | o I r | ncrease Studen | t Achievement | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Re | Person or Position esponsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Students need remediation below grade level in content areas to meet the grade level concepts. | Students will be given opportunities to develop understanding and inquiry activities to maintain or increase understanding of skills through hands on experiences with grade level appropriate number concepts and apply learning to solve real-life problems. Timez / Division Attack are Gaming software which remediates basic multiplication and division concepts. | clas | ssroom teachers | motivation and success. Students will set | Benchmark tests, Study Island, Timez / Division Attack, Student Portfolios and teacher assessments |

| Based on Amb | ased on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-----------------|---------------------|----------------|-----------|-----------|--|--|--|--|--|
| 5A. Ambitious Measurable Ob school will red by 50%. | jectives (AMO | s). In six year | Middle School Mathe | ematics Goal # | | <u> </u> | | | | | |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |

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.

| | ematics Goal #5B: | | | | | | | |
|------|--------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2012 | Current Level of Perform | nance: | 2013 Expected | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | Pr | oblem-Solving Process t | to Increase Studer | nt Achievement | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | | |
| 1 | Low parent involvement. | Increase parental participation in Mathematics support meetings by offering incentives and fun activities for the family to take part in. Providing bilingual information to parents at all school-wide academic events in English, | Admin. team, CRT, classroom teachers, After Care Supervisor, Technology teacher | Translated documents Parent teacher conference notes | Parent satisfaction surveys. Volunteer logs | | | |

| | 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: | | | | | | | | |
|------|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | nglish Language Learner factory progress in math | _ | | | | | | | |
| Math | ematics Goal #5C: | | | | | | | | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perform | nance: | 2013 Expected | d Level of Performance: | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | Pr | oblem-Solving Process t | to Increase Studer | nt Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | | | |
| 1 | from their country, the metric system, vocabulary presented to them in word problems are challenging and leave | Students are taught Math concepts with the use of manipulatives, making connections to real life situations, Identify key terms to solve the problems. ESOL teachers will teach Math words with operations in their native language. Pairing ELLs with another student. | Admin. team, CRT, Reading Coach, classroom teachers, After Care Supervisor | Walkthroughs & Teacher Observation of student motivation and success. Students will set achievement goals on SIS though their PLPs and data chats. | Benchmark tests, Study Island, Timez / Division Attack, Student Portfolios and teacher 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:

| Math | Mathematics Goal #5D: | | | | | | | | |
|--------|---|--------|---|---|--|--|---|--|-----------------------|
| 2012 | Current Level of P | erforr | nance: | 2 | 2013 Expe | ected | d Level of Performar | nce: | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Pr | oblem-Solving Process | to I n | crease St | uder | nt Achievement | | |
| Antic | Anticipated Barrier Strategy Pos for | | or | tion Process Used to | | uation Tool | | | |
| | | | No D | ata Su | ubmitted | | | | |
| | on the analysis of sprovement for the fo | | t achievement data, and r g subgroup: | referei | nce to "Gu | iding | g Questions", identify | and o | define areas in need |
| satisi | conomically Disado factory progress ir ematics Goal #5E: | | ged students not makinç nematics. | g | | | | | |
| 2012 | Current Level of P | erforr | nance: | 2 | 2013 Expe | ected | d Level of Performar | nce: | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Pr | oblem-Solving Process | to I n | crease St | uder | nt Achievement | | |
| | Anticipated Bar | rier | Strategy | Res | Person or Position sponsible Monitoring | for | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness o Strategy | | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | opportunities to help at classification continuities to help at school. Parenting teasistance through casting the student services. Provide Teasis and the services are student services. | | class teac Care | sroom hers, Afte Supervisc anology | r | Walkthroughs & Teac Observation of stude motivation and succe Students will set achievement goals o SIS though their PLP and data chats. | ent ess. n | Benchmark tests, Study Island, Timez / Division Attack, Student Portfolios and teacher assessments | |
| | | | Parent University providing technology training and parent access to SIS after- school. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | End of Mi | ddle S | chool Mathematics Goa |

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

satisfactory progress in mathematics.

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

1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra.

Algebra Goal #1:

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

| | | Problem-So | Iving Process | s to I r | ncrease St | udent Ach | ievement | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------|--|----------------|---|------------------|-----------|------------------|
| Anticipated E | 3arrier | Strategy | | Perso Positi Respo for Monit | ion onsible | Process L Determin Effectiver Strategy | е | Evalua | tion Tool |
| | | | ' | | Submitted | | | ' | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Based on the a of improvemer | | tudent achievem lowing group: | ent data, and | refere | ence to "Gu | liding Ques | tions", identify | and def | ine areas in nee |
| 2. Students s and 5 in Algel | _ | r above Achiev | ement Levels | s 4 | | | | | |
| Algebra Goal | #2: | | | | | | | | |
| 2012 Current | Level of Pe | erformance: | | 2013 Expe | ected Leve | el of Performa | nce: | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Problem-So | Iving Process | s to I r | ncrease St | udent Ach | ievement | | |
| Anticipated E | 3arrier | Strategy | | Perso Positi Respo for Monit | ion onsible | Process U Determin Effectiver Strategy | е | Evalua | tion Tool |
| | | | ' | | Submitted | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Based on Amb | itious but A | chievable Annual | Measurable C | Objecti | ves (AMOs) |), AMO-2, F | Reading and Ma | ath Perfo | rmance Target |
| 3A. Ambitious | but Achieva | ble Annual | Algebra Goal | # | | | | | |
| Measurable Ob | jectives (AN | MOs). In six year hievement gap | 3A : | | | | | | <u> </u> |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-201 | 2 2012-2013 | 2013-20 |)14 | 2014 | -2015 | 2015-2016 | 5 | 2016-2017 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | tudent achievem | | refere | ence to "Gu | uiding Ques | tions", identify | and def | ine areas in nee |
| 3B. Student s | ubgroups l an, America | by ethnicity (Wi an Indian) not r | nite, Black, | | | | | | |
| Algebra Goal | #3B: | | | | | | | | |
| 2012 Current | Level of Pa | erformance: | | | 2013 Evn | ected Leve | el of Performa | nce. | |

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

| | Problem-Solving Proce | ss to I | ncrease St | udent Achievement | |
|---|---|----------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Posit Resp for | on or tion ponsible toring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | No | | Submitted | | |
| | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of s of improvement for the fol | student achievement data, an lowing subgroup: | ıd refer | ence to "Gu | uiding Questions", identify | and define areas in need |
| 3C. English Language Le satisfactory progress in | earners (ELL) not making Algebra. | | | | |
| Algebra Goal #3C: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Pe | erformance: | | 2013 Ехре | ected Level of Performa | ance: |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proce | ss to I | ncrease St | udent Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | for | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | No | | Submitted | | |
| | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of s of improvement for the fol | student achievement data, an lowing subgroup: | ıd refer | ence to "Gu | uiding Questions", identify | and define areas in need |
| · · | ilities (SWD) not making | | | | |
| Algebra Goal #3D: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Pe | erformance: | | 2013 Expe | ected Level of Performa | ance: |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proce | ss to I | ncrease St | udent Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Posit Resp for | on or tion oonsible toring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | • | | | • | • |

| | following subgroup: | | Terrice to e | Guiding Questions", ide | ntify and define areas in |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|--|---------------------------|
| 3E. Economically Disa satisfactory progress | | not making | | | |
| Algebra Goal #3E: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of | f Performance: | | 2013 Exp | pected Level of Perfo | rmance: |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solvi | ng Process to I | ncrease S | Student Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Posi Resp for | on or tion oonsible itoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | | No Data | Submitted | | |
| | | | | | End of Algebra EO |
| Geometry End-of- | | | | 700((25)) | |
| * When using percentage: Based on the analysis of improved of improved of improved of improved on the analysis of improved of improved on the analysis of improved of improved on the analysis of imp | | nt data, and refe | | | |
| un need of improvemen | | | | | |
| Students scoring a Geometry. | | | | | |
| 1. Students scoring a | | | | | |
| 1. Students scoring a Geometry. | | 20 | 13 Expect | ted Level of Performa | ince: |
| 1. Students scoring a Geometry. Geometry Goal #1: | | 20 | 13 Expect | ed Level of Performa | ince: |
| Students scoring a Geometry. Geometry Goal #1: | | | | | ince: |

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

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels
4 and 5 in Geometry.

Geometry Goal #2:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

No Data Submitted

| | | Problem | n-Solving Proces | s to I | ncrease S | tudent | t Achievement | | |
|--|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------|--------------------|---------|------------------|
| Anticipated Barri | er | Strategy | | Posi Resp for Moni | on or tion ponsible itoring | Deter | iveness of | Evalu | uation Tool |
| | | | INO | Data | Submitted | | | | |
| Based on Ambitiou Target | s but | Achievable | e Annual Measurab | ole Ob | jectives (A | MOs), | AMO-2, Reading a | and Ma | ath Performance |
| 3A. Ambitious but Annual Measurable (AMOs). In six year reduce their achiev 50%. | Obje r scho | ctives ol will | Geometry Goal # | | | | | | A |
| Baseline data 2011-2012 | 201 | 12-2013 | 2013-2014 | | 2014-20 | 15 | 2015-2016 | | 2016-2017 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Based on the analy in need of improve | | | | and r | reference to | o "Guid | ing Questions", ic | dentify | and define areas |
| 3B. Student subg Hispanic, Asian, <i>F</i> satisfactory prog | Ameri | can India | n) not making | k, | | | | | |
| Geometry Goal # | 3B: | | | | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Lev | el of | Performai | nce: | | 2013 Exp | ected | Level of Perforn | nance | : |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Problem | n-Solving Proces | s to I | ncrease S | tudent | : Achievement | | |
| Anticipated Barri | er | Strategy | | Posi Resp for | on or tion oonsible itoring | Deter | iveness of | Evalı | uation Tool |
| | | | No | Data | Submitted | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Based on the analy in need of improve | | | | and r | eference to | o "Guid | ing Questions", ic | dentify | and define areas |
| 3C. English Langu satisfactory prog | _ | | _ | 9 | | | | | |
| Geometry Goal # | 3C: | | | | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Lev | el of | Performaı | nce: | | 2013 Ехр | ected | Level of Perforn | nance | : |

| I | | | l . | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------------|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Pr | rocess to I | ncrease S | Student Achievement | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Posi Parrier Strategy Resp for | | on or tion ponsible toring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| | | No Data | Submitted | | | | |
| Rasad on the analysis of | f student achievement | data and r | oforonce t | o "Guiding Questions" | identify and define areas | | |
| in need of improvement | | | T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T | o dululing Questions , | dentity and define areas | | |
| 3D. Students with Disa satisfactory progress Geometry Goal #3D: | | aking | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of | Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Pr | rocess to I | ncrease S | Student Achievement | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Posi | Determine Effectiveness of | | Evaluation Tool | | |
| | | No Data | Submitted | | | | |
| | | | eference to | o "Guiding Questions", | identify and define areas | | |
| in need of improvement 3E. Economically Disa making satisfactory p Geometry Goal #3E: | dvantaged students | not | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of | Performance: | | 2013 Exp | pected Level of Perfo | rmance: | | |
| | | | | | | | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

No Data Submitted

Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy

Evaluation Tool Strategy

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 | | | | | | | |

Mathematics Budget:

| - | | | Available |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| New math curriculum | Envision math | FTE funds | \$2,631.55 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$2,631.55 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Math | Triumphs Learning | FTE funds | \$3,320.84 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$3,320.84 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$5,952.39 |

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: | On the 2012-2013 48% (54) of the 5th grade students and 38% (38)of the 8th grade students will be proficient. | | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | | | | |
| 38% (43) of the 5th grade students and 34% (34) of the 8th grade students were proficient on the 2011 FCAT Science. | 48% (54) of the 5th grade students and 38% (38)of the 8th grade students will be proficient on the 2012 FCAT 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 | Low exposure to Science concepts, terms and real life experience. | participate in weekly scientific lab experiments. | CRT | Teachers and students will track their progress on all mini assessments. | FCAT mini assessments, Student Portfolios and teacher | | | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------|--|--|--|
| 1b. Florida Alternate | Assessment: | | | | | | | |
| Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. | | | | | | | | |
| Science Goal #1b: | | | | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Resnonsible | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | | |
| No Data Submitted | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |

| | d on the analysis of stud in need of improvement | | | Guiding Questions", ide | ntify and define | | | |
|--|---|------------------------|--|---|------------------|--|--|--|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a: | | | | On the 2012-2013 FCAT test 42% of our 5 & 8 grade students will be above proficiency in Science. | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | | |
| 8th g | (49) of the 5th grade st rade students will be ab FCAT Science. | * * | the 8th grade s | 48% (49) of the 5th grade students and 38% (31) of the 8th grade students will be above proficiency on the 2012 FCAT Science. | | | | |
| | Prob | lem-Solving Process to | o Increase Studer | nt Achievement | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of | Evaluation Tool | | | |

| | | | Monitoring | Strategy | |
|---|--|---|----------------------------|---|---|
| 1 | Scientific theory and practical application. | Middle school Students performing at a level 4 and 5 were placed in a Advance Science class with more opportunities for experiments and cooperative learning. | CRT, classroom teachers | Teacher Observation of student motivation | Benchmark test, mini FCAT assessments, and FCAT. |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------|--|
| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Process | s to I | ncrease S | tudent Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier Strategy Position Responds | | on or tion oonsible toring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| | No Data Submitted | | | | |

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

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

Science Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount | | | |
| Science Fusion | 5th Grade new textbooks | School Budget | \$8,338.50 | | | |
| Science Fusion | 8th grade new textbooks | School Budget | \$13,063.99 | | | |
| Science Lab | Material | School Budget | \$6,100.00 | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: \$27,502.49 | | | |

| Technology | | | |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Developm | nent | | |
| 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: \$27,502.49 |

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

| | ed of improvement for the | | | namig Queenene / naenim | y and demie areas | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 3.0 aı | CAT 2.0: Students scor nd higher in writing. ng Goal #1a: | ing at Achievement Le | 75% (67) of th 8th grade stud | 75% (67) of the 4th grade students and 85% (85) of the 8th grade students were proficient on the 2012 FCAT Writes and make AYP. | | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perfo | rmance: | 2013 Expecte | d Level of Performance | e: | |
| 73% (65) of the 4th grade students and 80% (80) of the 8th grade students were proficient on the 2011 FCAT Writes. | | | | 75% (67) of the 4th grade students and 85% (85) of the 8th grade students were proficient on the 2012 FCAT Writes. | | |
| | Prol | olem-Solving Process t | o Increase Stude | ent Achievement | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| 1 | Continuity of the writing process building across grade levels | School-wide writing prompts. Professional Development training on grading student writing prompts across all grade levels | Classroom teachers, writing/ Language Arts teachers | Tracking progress of students writing performance. Grading to meet the new FCAT standards in writing. | Results on the 2012 FCAT test, Writing prompt, and classroom assignments. | |
| 2 | Student motivation | Journalism class for middle school students publishes a Student generated newspaper and distributes it to the student population. | Classroom teachers, writing/ Language Arts teachers. | Tracking progress of students writing performance. Grading to meet the new FCAT standards in writing. | Results on the 2012 FCAT test, Writing prompt, and classroom assignments. | |

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

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.

Writing Goal #1b:

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------|
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving | g Process to I | ncrease S | Student Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Posit Resp for | on or tion oonsible toring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | | |

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g., PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow- up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|
| | | N | lo Data Submitte | d | | |

Writing Budget:

| Evidence-based Progra | am(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 Developm | nent | | |
| 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 |

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

| * When using percentages | s, include the number o | of students the | percentage | represents (e.g., 70% (3 | 5)). |
|--|-------------------------|---------------------|--------------------------------------|--|---------------------------|
| Based on the analysis of in need of improvement | | | reference t | o "Guiding Questions", | identify and define areas |
| 1. Students scoring a | t Achievement Leve | el 3 in Civics. | | | |
| Civics Goal #1: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of | | 2013 Exp | pected Level of Perfor | mance: | |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving | Process to I | ncrease S | Student Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Posi Resp for | on or tion ponsible itoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | | No Data | Submitted | | |
| Rased on the analysis of | of student achieveme | ent data and r | reference t | o "Guiding Questions" | identify and define areas |
| in need of improvement | | | | O duraning educations , | identify and define areas |
| Students scoring a and 5 in Civics. | t or above Achieve | ment Levels | | | |
| Civics Goal #2: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of | Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving | Process to I | ncrease S | Student Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Posi | on or tion oonsible | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of | Evaluation Tool |

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

Monitoring

No Data Submitted

Strategy

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g., PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow- up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | N | lo Data Submitted | t | | |

Civics Budget:

| 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 Developm | nent | | |
| 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 Civics Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

| Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| Attendance Attendance Goal #1: | In the 2012-2013 school year the attendance rate will be 95% plus. | | | |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: | | | |
| The 2012 attendance rate was between 95%-100% due to the difficulty of transfer of attendance between SIS and Terms | The expected attendance rate will be 96% | | | |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | | | |
| In 2012 the excessive absence rate was in access of | The number of excessive absence will | | | |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | | | |

| high ı | Excessive tardies in 2010 was 60-85 students due to the high number of car riders and late buses. Close to 85% of our students are car or bus riders. By working with parents and bus service the number will cut in half. | | | | | |
|--------|---|---|--|--|----------------------------------|--|
| | 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 notification of children are tardy and work closely with transportation to get buses here on time | Principal | Monitor student with poor attendance and excessively tardy | Monthly reports from the county. | |

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

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

Attendance Budget:

| Stratogy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available |
|------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy | | | 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 Developme | ent | | |
| 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 |

Suspension Goal(s)

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

| | d on the analysis of susp provement: | ension data, and referen | ce to "Guiding Que | estions", identify and defi | ne areas in need | |
|--------------|---|---|--|---|-------------------|--|
| 1. Su | spension | | The second 6 | H | | |
| Susp | ension Goal #1: | | 95-96%. | ttendance in 2011-12 scl | nool year will be | |
| 2012 | ! Total Number of In-Sc | hool Suspensions | 2013 Expecte | ed Number of In-Schoo | l Suspensions | |
| None | . We do not do in-school | suspension. | None. We do r | None. We do not do in-school suspension. | | |
| 2012 | ? Total Number of Stude | ents Suspended I n-Sch | 2013 Expecte School | ed Number of Students | Suspended In- | |
| NA | | | NA | NA | | |
| 2012 | Number of Out-of-Sch | ool Suspensions | 2013 Expecte Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | | |
| In 20 | 11 we had 85 out-of-sch | ool suspensions | In 2013 we wi | In 2013 we will have 40 or less out-of-school suspensions | | |
| 2012 Scho | ? Total Number of Stude ol | ents Suspended Out-of | - 2013 Expecte of-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School | | |
| | 111 we had a total of 50 ore times | students suspended for c | | For the 2013 school year we will have 30 students suspended one or more times | | |
| | Pro | blem-Solving Process t | to Increase Stude | ent Achievement | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| 1 | Student behavior | Institute the STRIVE program and graduated discipline techniques in the classroom. Implement CHAMPS school-wide | Classroom teachers and Admin. Team | Monthly monitoring of suspensions. | Monthly report | |

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 | 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 Progra | am(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 Developm | nent | | |
| 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. Pa | 1. Parent Involvement | | | | | |
| Pare | Parent Involvement Goal #1: | | | | | |
| *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated. | | | Parents will do during the year | 10 hour of volunteer se r | rvice per child | |
| 2012 | 2 Current Level of Parer | nt Involvement: | 2013 Expecte | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: | | |
| parents did 10 hours of volunteer service per child. | | | Parents will do year. | Parents will do 10 hours of volunteer service during the year. | | |
| | Pro | blem-Solving Process t | to Increase Stude | ent Achievement | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| 1 | Some parents can not do the volunteer hours during the school day. | Volunteer hours will be awarded for attending PTO/SAC meeting and chaperoning duties for other school related activities. | Classroom teachers and Principal | Logging of volunteer hours in SIS | Number of hours recorded by the end of the year. | |

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

| 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 Developm | nent | | |
| 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 o | f school data, identify and de | efine areas in ne | ed 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 | | |

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 Progra | am(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 Developm | nent | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

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

| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Responsible | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
|---------------------|----------|-------------|--|-----------------|--|--|
| No Data Submitted | | | | | | |

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

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

CTE Budget:

| | | | Available |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | 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 Developn | nent | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | · | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

| Evidence-based Pro | ogram(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---------------------|--|-----------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Tracking student achievement to differentiate instruction. | benchmark tests | As provided by CSUSA | \$8,000.00 |
| Reading | Research based instructional materials | Imagine It Consumables | FTE Funds | \$24,658.84 |
| Reading | research based instructional materials | Imagine It Textbooks | FTE Funds | \$3,594.45 |
| Mathematics | New math curriculum | Envision math | FTE funds | \$2,631.55 |
| Science | Science Fusion | 5th Grade new textbooks | School Budget | \$8,338.50 |
| Science | Science Fusion | 8th grade new textbooks | School Budget | \$13,063.99 |
| Science | Science Lab | Material | School Budget | \$6,100.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$66,387.33 |
| Technology | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | use technology to enhance learning opportunities | Study Island | FTE funds | \$7,293.75 |
| Reading | use technology to enhance learning opportunities | Triumph learning | FTE Funds | \$3,320.85 |
| Mathematics | Math | Triumphs Learning | FTE funds | \$3,320.84 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$13,935.44 |
| Professional Develo | opment | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | | Grand Total: \$80,322.77 |

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

| jn Priority | jn Focus | jn Prevent | j n NA |
|-------------|----------|------------|---------------|
| | | | |

Are you a reward school: jm Yes jm 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.

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

| Projected use of SAC Funds | Amount |
|----------------------------|--------|
| | \$0.00 |

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

This is a re-organization year for PMWCA SAC. Our previous year did not leave a legacy for us to follow. With that said, we will use this year to establish a great SAC and PTC.

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

| Osceola School Distric P. M. WELLS CHARTER 2010-2011 | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|---------|-----|---------------------------|---|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 71% | 61% | 74% | 39% | 245 | 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% | 69% | | | 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? | 68% (YES) | 70% (YES) | | | | 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 | | | | | 523 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | В | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |

| Osceola School Distric P. M. WELLS CHARTER 2009-2010 | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------------|---|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 64% | 56% | 80% | 40% | 240 | 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 | 67% | 69% | | | 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? | 64% (YES) | 72% (YES) | | | | 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 | | | | | 512 | |
| Percent Tested = 99% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | В | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |