# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
## 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: ETHEL F. BECKFORD/RICHMOND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Dade

Principal: Jacqua Little

SAC Chair: Alma Humphrey

Superintendent: Alberto Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 10/12/2012

# PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

## STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

## ADMINISTRATORS

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

| Position | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | # of Years at Current School | # of Years as an Administrator | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Principal | Jacqua Little | Bachelors in Business Education Masters in Exceptional Student Education Educational Leadership | 2 | 8 | '12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grades D C A A A AYP N N N N N High Standards Rdg 34% 65% 63% 68% 66% High Standards Math 29% 63% 67% 63% 61% Lrng Gains-Rdg 60% 57% 63% 39% 63% Lrng Gains-Math 50% 44% 68% 69% 70% Gains-Rdg-25% 64% 50% 59% 74% 68% Gains-Math-25% 55% 58% 59% 64% 72% |
| Assis Principal | Mayra Ventura | Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education Masters of Science in Reading Education Doctoral Degree in Educational Leadership | 1 | 4 | '12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grades F B A A N/A AYP N N N N High Standards Rdg 25% 53% 68% 67% High Standards Math 22% 57% 68% 66% Lrng Gains-Rdg 55% 62% 66% 69% Lrng Gains-Math 47% 69% 63% 68% Gains-Rdg-25% 56% 68% 59% 71% Gains-Math-25% 55% 71% 78% 67% |

| | | | | | Certification in ESOL | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

## 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 | Helen Gordon | Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education<br><br>Master of Science in Reading<br><br>Specialist Degree in Educational Leadership<br><br>ESOL Endorsement | 1 | 1 | '12 '11 '10 '09 '08<br>School Grades C B C D C<br>AYP N N N N N<br>High Standards Rdg 43% 56% 54% 48% 43%<br>High Standards Mth 54% 66% 65% 47% 55%<br>Lrng Gains-Rdg 66% 61% 60% 56% 53%<br>Lrng Gains-Math 70% 66% 69% 51% 72%<br>Gains-Rdg-25% 68% 66% 60% 60% 55%<br>Gains-Math-25% 73% 73% 67% 66% 87% |
| Mathematics | Patricio Villoria | Bachelor of Arts in Elementary Education & Psychology<br><br>Master of Science in Educational Leadership<br><br>ESOL Endorsement | 1 | 1 | '12 '11 '10 '09 '08<br>School Grades C C A A B<br>AYP N N N N N<br>High Standards Rdg 44% 63% 68% 67% 63%<br>High Standards Mth 45% 69% 68% 66% 60%<br>Lrng Gains Rdg 70% 59% 66% 69% 66%<br>Lrng Gains Mth 63% 57% 63% 68% 65%<br>Gains-Rdg-25% 77% 56% 59% 71% 68%<br>Gains-Math-25% 66% 59% 78% 67% 78% |
| Science | Milagro Ruiz | Bachelor of Arts Elementary Ed. | 2 | 2 | '12 '11 '10 '09 '08<br>School Grades D C N/A C C<br>AYP N N N N N<br>High Standards Rdg 34% 57% 61% 63% 63%<br>High Standards Mth 29% 55% 61% 57% 52%<br>Lrng Gains-Rdg 60% 62% 67% 32% 65%<br>Lrng Gains-Math 50% 56% 69% 50% 61%<br>Gains-Rdg-25% 64% 53% 17% 61% 68%<br>Gains-Math-25% 55% 50% 17% 47% 76% |

## 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 | Meet regularly with HQT to solicit feedback on curriculum issues | Principal | August 20, 2012 to June 6, 2013 | |
| 2 | Provide professional development activities | PD Liaison | August 20, 2012 to June 6, 2013 | |
| 3 | HQT provide individualized mentoring | Assistant Principal | August 20, 2012 to June 6, 2013 | |
| 4 | Maintain communication with M-DCPS recruitment center and Fairs | Principal | August 20, 2012 to June 6, 2013 | |

## Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

| Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective. | Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective |
|---|---|
| None | Not applicable |

## Staff Demographics

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

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

| Total Number of Instructional Staff | % of First-Year Teachers | % of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience | % of Teachers with Advanced Degrees | % Highly Effective Teachers | % Reading Endorsed Teachers | % National Board Certified Teachers | % ESOL Endorsed Teachers |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 24 | 0.0%(0) | 12.5%(3) | 54.2%(13) | 29.2%(7) | 50.0%(12) | 62.5%(15) | 4.2%(1) | 12.5%(3) | 62.5%(15) |

## 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 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Not applicable | Not Applicable | Not applicable | Not applicable |

# ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

## Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Services are provided for students at Ethel F. Richmond Elementary to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted during the day and/or after school tutorial programs. The district coordinates with Title II and Title III in ensuring staff development needs are provided. Curriculum coaches develop, lead and evaluate school core content standards/programs; identify and analyze existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. They identify systemic patterns of student needs while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidenced based intervention strategies; assist with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk"; assist in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participate in the design and delivery of professional development and provide support for assessment and implementation monitoring. Other components that are integrated into the school-wide program include Supplemental Educational Services (SES) from parent selected providers; and special support services to special needs populations such as homeless where families of students have been displaced and neglected and delinquent students.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

N/A

Title I, Part D

N/A

### Title II

The District uses supplemental funds for improving basic education as follows:
• Training to certify qualified mentors for the New Teacher (MINT) Program
• Training for add-on endorsement programs, such as Reading, Gifted, ESOL
• Training and substitute release time for Professional Development Liaisons (PDL) at each school focusing on Professional Learning Community (PLC) development and facilitation, as well as Lesson Study Group implementation and protocol.

### Title III

Title III funds are used to supplement and enhance the programs for English Language Learners (ELL).

### Title X- Homeless

Ethel F. Beckford/Richmond Elementary School provides services through Title X to our students identified as homeless.

### Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

This school will receive Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) as part of its Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) allocation.

### Violence Prevention Programs

N/A

### Nutrition Programs

Nutrition Programs
1) Ethel F. Beckford/Richmond Elementary School adheres to and implements the nutrition requirements stated in the District Wellness Policy.
2) Nutrition education, as per state statute, is taught through physical education.
3) The School Food Service Program, school breakfast, school lunch, and after care snacks, follows the Healthy Food and Beverage Guidelines as adopted in the District's Wellness Policy.
4) Through participation in the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program, students will receive snacks of fresh fruits and/or vegetables on a regular basis.

### Housing Programs

N/A

### Head Start

N/A

### Adult Education

N/A

### Career and Technical Education

N/A

### Job Training

N/A

### Other



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

### School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The MTSS Leadership Team is comprised of the following members: Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, Mathematics Coach, Science Coach, School Counselor, SPED teacher, School Psychologist, School Social Worker and District RtI Liaison.

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

The MTSS Leadership Team meets biweekly to disaggregate data and provide information for differentiated instruction with fidelity. During these meetings, specific students and their academic and/or emotional/behavioral needs are discussed. These meetings allow for the team to help in the determination of a student would benefit from going through the RtI process. This Leadership team also reviews FAIR data and links to instructional decisions are discussed; reviews progress monitoring data to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks or are at high risk of not achieving academically. Based on the information discussed during these meetings, the team identifies professional development resources. This team will collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make informed decisions and practice new processes and skills.

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?

1. The Leadership Team will monitor and adjust the school's academic and behavioral goals through data gathering and data analysis.
2. The Leadership Team will monitor the fidelity of the delivery of instruction and intervention.
3. The Leadership Team will provide levels of support and interventions to students based on data.

## 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.

Academic Achievement Data – Tier 1
2012 FCAT Scores
Edusoft Reports - District Baseline Assessments
2012 FCAT Writing Scores
STAR Reading

Academic Achievement Data – Tier 2
Edusoft Reports - District Interim Assessments (Fall-Winter)
PMRN Reports - Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR) AP 2 & 3
Successmaker Reports
Monhtly Writing Assessment Scores
Voyager Reading Benchmark Assessments
Accelertaed Reader Reports
Riverdeep

Behavior Management Data Tier 1
Student Case Management Referral Report
End of Year 2012 Suspensions/Expulsion Report
Attendance Report

Behavior Management Data Tier2
Positive Behavior Support (PBS) Logs
Functional Assessment of Behavior/Behavior Intervention Plan Anecdotals/Charts

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

All current staff have been trained on the implementation of the MTSS/RtI process.
Any new faculty members will receive training during the 2012-2013 school year.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

### School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

> The Literacy Leadership Team consists of the following staff members: Mercedes Herold, SPED teacher, Helen Gordon, Reading Coach, Patrick Villoria, Mathematics Coach, Milagro Ruiz, Science Coach, Cindy Hernandez, Media Specialist, Jacqua Little, Principal and Mayra Ventura, Assistant Principal.

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

> The Literacy Leadership Team meets monthly to solicit input from members as pertains to their area of expertise. The group analyzes data from various assessments to determine interventions needed. Throughout the school year, the group will monitor progress of student achievement and review which strategies are successful and which need adjustment and make changes as needed.

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

> The Literacy Leadership Team will continue to focus on increasing student achievement through classroom walkthroughs, modeling lessons, analyzing data and use of technology in the classroom and computer labs. Center activities and reading resources will be provided to enable teachers to address individual student needs.

## Public School Choice

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

## *Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

> Staff and students from outside prekindergarten programs visit our campus to observe kindergarten classrooms. Transition to kindergarten meetings are held to review registration procedures, attendance policy and skills used in kindergarten. Parents and younger siblings have the opportunity to visit a kindergarten classroom and receive information regarding the kindergarten curriculum, expectations and the Florida Readiness Screener (FLKRS). Meetings are conducted by kindergarten and prekindergarten teachers. Parents are given the opportunity to ask questions and address concerns regarding the upcoming school year.

## *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.

> N/A

## *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?

> N/A

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?

> N/A

## 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>

N/A

# PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

## Reading Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #1a: | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment indicate that 18% of the students scored at achievement Level 3.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 3 student proficiency to 32%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 18% (20) | 29% (32) |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 1a.1.<br>An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 2 Reading Application.<br><br>Students lack the necessary strategies to make them active readers and critical thinkers when interacting with text. | 1a.1.<br>Teachers will provide instruction using the CIS Model for Comprehension as well as the Gradual Release model during Explicit Instruction in order to foster higher levels of thinking while interacting with text. | 1a.1.<br>Administrators, Reading Coach Literacy Leadership Team | 1a.1.<br>Monitor on-going classroom assessments to ensure students are making sufficient progress to meet school-wide goals.<br><br>Monitor the use of the Reading Notebooks/Journals<br><br>The MTSS/RtI Team will review data Tri-weekly and make recommendation based on needs assessment.<br><br>Classroom Observations /Walkthroughs and review of student work folders<br><br>Coaching Logs | 1a.1.<br>Formative:<br>Baseline Assessment<br><br>Interim Assessment<br><br>Bi-Weekly Benchmark Mini Assessments<br><br>Summative:<br>2013 FCAT Assessment |
| 2 | 1a.2.<br>An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading test was Reporting Category 3 Literary Analysis.<br><br>Students lack the strategies necessary to interpret elements of story structure, use text features, and understand the use of figurative language. | 1a.2.<br>Teachers will implement active CRISS reading strategies such as Think-Aloud, QAR's, Reciprocal Teaching, and the CIS Model to help students develop skills necessary when analyzing text. | 1a.2.<br>Administrators, Reading Coach Literacy Leadership Team | 1a.2.<br>Classroom Observations /Walkthroughs and review of student work folders<br><br>Lesson Plan Reviews<br><br>Common Planning Agendas<br><br>Coaching Logs<br><br>Monitor on-going classroom assessments to ensure students are making sufficient progress to meet school-wide goals. | 1a.2.<br>Formative:<br>Baseline Assessment<br><br>Interim Assessment<br><br>Bi-Weekly Benchmark Mini Assessments<br><br>Summative:<br>2013 FCAT Assessment |

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

of improvement for the following group:

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

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

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

| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a: | The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment indicate that 13% of the students achieved Level 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 4 and 5 student proficiency to 17%. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 13% (14) | 17% (19) |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading test was Reporting Category 4 Informational Text. Students lack the skills to interpret graphical information, as well as the ability to determine reliability and validity across texts. | 2a.1. Teachers will use grade-level appropriate texts as well as how-to articles, brochures, fliers and other real-world documents to identify text features. Students will be guided through the use of student accountable talk, collaborative strategies, and project based learning on how to recognize and determine the characteristics of reliable and valid information. Teachers will motivate students to become more independent readers through the use of Accelerated Reader (AR) | 2a.1. Administrators, Reading Coach and Literacy Leadership Team | 2a.1. Monitor ongoing classroom assessments focusing on students' knowledge of author's purpose and perspective. Monitor Accelerated Reader data. The MTSS/RtI Team will review data and make recommendations based on needs assessment. Invention groups will be revised according to data analysis. Classroom Walkthroughs Coaching Logs | 2a.1. Formative: Baseline Assessment Interim Assessment Bi-Weekly Benchmark Mini Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessment |

| | | Program. | | | |
| | | Support teachers in the development of meaningful rigorous lessons through the implementation of Lesson Study. | | | |

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

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

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

| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| <div align="center" colspan="5">No Data Submitted</div> | | | | |

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

| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a: | The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 60% of the students made learning gains in reading. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase students making learning gains to 70%. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 60% (37) | 70% (43) |

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

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 3a.1. An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 3: Literary Analysis. Students lack skills and strategies on how to identify and explain the use of descriptive, | 3a.1. Administer the Voyager Placement test, and the Initial Placement test for Success Maker, in order to provide appropriate intervention for students before, during or after school. Increase the opportunity to work on teaching | 3a.1. Administrators, Reading Coach and Literacy Leadership Team | 3a.1. Monitor on-going classroom assessments to ensure students are making sufficient progress to meet school-wide goals. Review SuccessMaker reports to ensure students are making adequate progress | 3a.1. Formative: Baseline Assessment Interim Assessment Bi-Weekly Benchmark Mini Assessments Summative: |

| idiomatic, and figurative language to describe people, feelings, and objects. | students how authors use figurative language such as similes, metaphors, and personification through differentiated instruction. | | The MTSS/RtI Team will review data, make recommendation based on needs assessment.<br><br>Classroom observations & walkthroughs<br><br>Conduct Teacher/Admin Data Chats | 2013 FCAT Assessment |
|---|---|---|---|---|

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.<br><br>Reading Goal #3b: | |
|---|---|
| **2012 Current Level of Performance:** | **2013 Expected Level of Performance:** |
| | |

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

| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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.<br><br>Reading Goal #4: | The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate 64% of the lowest 25% made learning gains.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase students making learning gains to 74%. |
|---|---|
| **2012 Current Level of Performance:** | **2013 Expected Level of Performance:** |
| 64% (N<30) | 74% (N<30) |

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

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 4a.1.<br>The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 2, Reading Application.<br><br>Students continue to | 4a.1.<br>A structured remediation program will provide students with Small Group Differentiated Instruction through Voyager (30 minutes daily). | 4a.1.<br>Administrators, Reading Coach and Literacy Leadership Team | 4a.1.<br>Monitor student performance for the lower performing students on FAIR and administer mini assessments in order to adjust curriculum target to dictate instructional needs. | 4a.1.<br>Formative : FAIR Assessment<br><br>Baseline Assessment<br><br>Interim Assessment |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | struggle when identifying Author's Purpose in text and how Author's Perspective influences text and recognizing themes or topics across a variety of fiction or nonfiction texts. | | | Monitor student performance through data chats.<br><br>The MTSS/RtI Team will review data, make recommendation based on needs assessment.<br><br>Classroom walkthroughs | Bi-Weekly Benchmark Mini Assessments<br><br>V-Port OPM<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessment |

---

**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 # <br> Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50% <br><br> 5A : |
|---|---|

| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 41% of students | 47% of students | 52% of student | 57% of student | 63% of student | |

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.<br><br>Reading Goal #5B: | The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate 31% of the student s in the Black, subgroup made satisfactory progress in reading.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percent of students making adequate progress to 40% |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Black: 31% (28) | Black:40% (36) |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 5B.1.<br><br>Black: As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test, the Black subgroup did not meet the AMO 2 Target. The area of deficiency on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 4 – Informational Text/Research Process. Students demonstrate a lack of ability in critical thinking skills that are essential in locating, interpreting and organizing information and in determining validity and reliability of information within and across text. | 5B.1.<br><br>Through Lesson Study, teachers will use the CIS Model along with the Gradual Release Method to guide students in locating and verifying details, critically analyzing text, and synthesizing details to draw correct conclusions. Teachers should emphasize instruction that helps students build stronger arguments to support their answers. | 5B.1.<br><br>Administrators, Reading Coach and Literacy Leadership Team | 5B.1.<br><br>Monitor on-going classroom assessments to ensure students are making sufficient progress to meet school-wide goals.<br><br>Tri-Weekly Data Chats<br><br>The MTSS/RtI Team will review data, make recommendation based on needs assessment.<br><br>Classroom walkthroughs | 5B.1.<br><br>Formative: Baseline Assessment<br><br>Interim Assessment<br><br>Bi-Weekly Benchmark Mini Assessments<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessment |

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

| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C: | N/A |
|---|---|
| **2012 Current Level of Performance:** | **2013 Expected Level of Performance:** |
| N/A | N/A |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

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

| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D: | N/A |
|---|---|
| **2012 Current Level of Performance:** | **2013 Expected Level of Performance:** |
| N/A | N/A |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

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

| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E: | The results of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test indicate 34% of Economically Disadvantaged students made satisfactory progress in reading. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making satisfactory progress to 46%. |
|---|---|
| **2012 Current Level of Performance:** | **2013 Expected Level of Performance:** |
| 34% (37) | 46% (50) |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |
|---|

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 5E.1. As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT Reading Test, the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup did not meet the AMO 2 Target. The area of deficiency on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 4 – Informational Text/Research Process.<br><br>Students demonstrate a lack of ability in critical thinking skills that are essential in locating, interpreting and organizing information and in determining validity and reliability of information within and across text | 5E.1. Emphasize instruction of Text Complexity to help students build stronger arguments and understand shades of meaning. Use reciprocal teaching to guide students when exploring nuances in text. More practice should be provided with method development and understanding the term supporting details through question and answer relationship (QAR). | 5E.1. Administrators, Reading Coach and Literacy Leadership Team | 5E.1. Monitor on-going classroom assessments to ensure students are making sufficient progress to meet school-wide goals.<br><br>Conduct Teacher/Admin Data Chats<br><br>The MTSS/RtI Team will review data, make recommendation based on needs assessment.<br><br>Classroom walkthroughs | 5E.1. Formative: Baseline Assessment<br><br>Interim Assessment<br><br>Bi-Weekly Benchmark Mini Assessments<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessment |

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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Rigor and Relevance | K-5th | Reading Coach and Curriculum Leaders | Language Arts/Reading Teachers | August 2012 | Student Work/ Classroom Walkthroughs | Reading Coach Principal Assistant Principal |
| Common Core & NGSSS | K-5th | Reading Coach | Language Arts/Reading Teachers | September 2012 | Student Work/ Classroom Walkthroughs | Reading Coach Principal Assistant Principal |
| Gradual Release Explicit Instruction | K-5th | Reading Coach | Gr 3 – 5 Language Arts/Reading Teachers | October 2012 | Student Work/ Classroom Walkthroughs | Reading Coach Principal Assistant Principal |
| CRISS | K – 5th | CRISS Certified Trainer | Language Arts/Reading Teachers | TBD | Student Work/ Classroom Walkthroughs | Reading Coach Principal Assistant Principal |
| Lesson Study | K-5th | Reading Coach | Gr 3 – 5 Language Arts/Reading Teachers | January 2013 | Student Work/ Classroom Walkthroughs | Reading Coach Principal Assistant Principal |
| Text Complexity & CIS Model | K-5th | Reading Coach | Language Arts/Reading Teachers | November 2012 | Student Work/ Classroom Walkthroughs | Reading Coach Principal Assistant Principal |

Reading Budget:

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

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|---|---|---|---|
| Utilize Time for Kids Magazine in grades 3-5 to locate, interpret and analyze information through the use of graphics, charts, illustrations, diagrams and other text features. | Time for Kids Magazine: Grades 3-5. | Title I | $1,500.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $1,500.00 |

**Technology**

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|---|---|---|---|
| Incorporate the use of research based software focusing on the reading benchmarks. | Reading A-Z | Title I | $60.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $60.00 |

**Professional Development**

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|---|---|---|---|
| CRISS Level I Training ( New Teachers) | Per participant fee $50.00 for training manual and E-newsletter subscription | Title I | $200.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $200.00 |

**Other**

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|---|---|---|---|
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: $1,760.00 |

*End of Reading Goals*

# Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

| Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | |
|---|---|
| 1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.<br><br>CELLA Goal #1: | The results of the 2012 CELLA indicate that 59% of the ELL students scored proficiency on the Listening/Speaking portion.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the proficiency by 6 percentage points to 65%. |

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:

59% (13)

| | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 1.1 ELL students do not have a strong foundation in the English language in order to be able to improve their oral skills. ELL students need time to acclimate to their surroundings. Their parents lack fluency in | 1.1 Teachers will use the Think Aloud method coupled with the use of diagrams/illustrations and the Language Experience Approach. | 1.1 Administrators Reading Coach Literacy Leadership Team | Monitor on-going classroom assessments to ensure students are making sufficient progress..<br><br>Monitor the use of word banks and vocabulary notebook.<br>1.1<br>The MTSS/RtI Team will | 1.1. Formative: Classroom Assessments FAIR Assessments<br><br>Interim Assessments<br><br>Summative: 2013 CELLA |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| the English language to fully assist the students in the acquisition of the English language. | | | review data Tri-weekly and make recommendation based on needs assessment.<br><br>Classroom walkthroughs | |

| Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | |
|---|---|
| 2. Students scoring proficient in reading.<br><br>CELLA Goal #2: | CELLA Goal #2:<br>The results of the 2012 CELLA indicate that 23% of the ELL students scored proficiency on the Reading portion.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the proficiency by 7 percentage points to 30%. |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading: | |
| 23% (5) | |

| | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 2.1.<br>ELL students do not have a strong foundation in the English language to fully comprehend when reading and are unable to make connections to prior knowledge. | 2.1.<br>Use Task Cards along with graphic organizers like Venn Diagram and KWL.<br><br>Teachers will guide students through the Reciprocal Teaching strategy and the appropriate pacing of lessons. | 2.1.<br>Administrators Reading Coach Literacy Leadership Team | 2.1.<br>Monitor on-going classroom assessments to ensure students are making sufficient progress.<br>The MTSS/RtI Team will review data Tri-weekly and make recommendation based on needs assessment.<br><br>Classroom walkthroughs | 2.1.<br>Formative: Classroom Assessments FAIR Assessments<br><br>Interim Assessments<br><br>Summative:<br>2013 CELLA |

| Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | |
|---|---|
| 3. Students scoring proficient in writing.<br><br>CELLA Goal #3: | The results of the 2012 CELLA indicate that 14% of the ELL students scored proficiency on the Writing portion.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the proficiency by 6 percentage points to 20%. |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing: | |
| 14% (3) | |

| | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | 2.1.<br>ELL students do not have a strong foundation in the English language to fully | 2.1.<br>Students will develop and maintain a writer's notebook/folder to:<br>? include table of | 2.1.<br>Reading Coach Literacy Leadership Team | 2.1.<br>Monitor on-going classroom assessments to ensure students are making sufficient | 2.1.<br>Formative: Monthly writing prompts |

| 1 | write in a second language. Parents lack fluency in the English language in order to fully assist the students in the use of English when writing. | content, ? list possible topics, ? and first drafts.<br><br>Use of Word Banks/Vocabulary Notebooks<br><br>Use of Heritage Language/English Dictionary<br><br>Students will complete writing prompts on a monthly basis. | | progress. Monitor the use of the writer's notebook. The MTSS/RtI Team will review data Tri-weekly and make recommendation based on needs assessment.<br><br>Classroom walkthroughs | Summative: 2013 CELLA |

CELLA Budget:

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

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

**Technology**

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

**Professional Development**

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

**Other**

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

*End of CELLA Goals*

# Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #1a: | The results of the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 20% of the students achieved Level 3 Proficiency.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase students scoring at a Level 3 to 36% |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 21% (23) | 33% (36) |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 1a.1.<br>The area of deficiency as noted on the 2011 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test was Numbers Fractions.<br><br>This deficiency is due to the lack of real world practice and lack of authentic work. | 1a.1.<br>Teachers will provide students with opportunities to develop an understanding of fractions and fraction equivalence through real world learning opportunities that require hands on experiences and the C-R-A Model (Concrete-Representation-Abstract) of teaching. | 1a.1.<br>Administrators<br>Math Coach | 1a.1.<br>Analyze Benchmark Mini-assessments scores<br><br>Review of Lesson Plans, student work folders, and Student Journals<br><br>Conduct Classroom Observations & Walkthroughs | 1a.1.<br>Formative:<br>Benchmark Mini-Assessments<br><br>District Interim Assessments<br><br>Go Math Chapter Tests<br><br><br>Summative:<br>2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment |
| 2 | 1a.2.<br><br>The area of deficiency as noted on the 2011 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test was Numbers Fractions.<br><br>This deficiency is due to the lack of real world practice and lack of authentic work. | 1a.2.<br>Teachers will engage in the practice of Lesson Study in order to design lessons that reflect the Gradual Release Model and the use of hands-on activities. | 1a.2.<br>Administrators<br>Math Coach | 1a.2.<br>Review of Lesson Plans, student work folders, and Student Journals<br><br>Conduct Classroom Observations & Walkthroughs | 1a.2<br>Formative:<br>Benchmark Mini-Assessments<br><br>District Interim Assessments<br><br>Go Math Chapter Tests<br><br>Summative:<br>2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment |

| 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:<br>Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #1b: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |

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

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

| | |
| --- | --- |
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #2a: | The results of the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 9% of students scored at achievement levels 4 and 5.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase students scoring at a Levels 4 & 5 to 13% |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 8% (9) | 13% (14) |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 2a.1.<br>The area of deficiency noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Assessment was Number Sense.<br><br>This deficiency is due to the lack of exposure of students to activities that require problem solving at a higher level of rigor and complexity. | 2.1.<br>Provide an opportunity for students to gain enrichment by engaging in mathematical discourse and problem solving activities through the use of collaborative strategies and student accountable talk using the Share and Show section of each lesson in the Go Math! Series, as well as math problems that are rated at medium and high levels of complexity through daily warm-ups or bell ringers. | 2.1.<br>Administrators<br>Math Coach | 2.1.<br>Review of Common Planning Agendas<br><br>Review of Coaching Logs<br><br>Review of Lesson Plans, student work folders, and Student Journals<br><br>Conduct Classroom Observations & Walkthroughs | 2.1.<br>Formative:<br>Benchmark Mini-Assessments<br><br>District Interim Assessments<br><br>Go Math Chapter Tests<br><br>Summative:<br>2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment |

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:<br>Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #2b: | |

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

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

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

| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #3a: | The results of the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 50% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains to 60%. |
|---|---|

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
|---|---|
| 50% (31) | 60% (37) |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 3.1.<br>The area of deficiency noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test Mathematics was Reporting Category Geometry & Measurement<br><br>Students have lacked appropriate opportunities for mathematical exploration and development of geometric and measurement concepts as they connect to real life application. | 3.1.<br>Departmentalize the fourth and fifth grade teachers in order to better focus professional development through the Coaching Cycle and in turn provide contexts for mathematical exploration and the development of student understanding of geometric and measurement concepts by support the use of manipulatives and engaging opportunities for practice through technology and differentiated instruction. | 3.1.<br>Administrators<br>Math Coach | 3.1.<br>Conduct Teacher/Admin Data Chats<br><br>Review Coaching Logs and Common Planning Agendas<br><br>Review monthly Success Maker usage reports and student data reports<br><br>Conduct Classroom walkthroughs and observations | 3.1.<br>Formative: Benchmark Mini-assessments<br><br>District Interim Assessments<br><br>Go Math Chapter Tests<br><br>Summative: Results from the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment |

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

| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #3b: |  |
|---|---|

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

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

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

| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #4: | The results of the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 55% in the Lowest 25% made learning gains.<br><br>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains to 65%. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 55% (N<30) | 65% (N<30) |

| 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 | 4.1.<br>The results of the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate students in the lowest 25% in grades 3-5 demonstrated deficiencies in the area of Base Ten and Fractions<br><br>Students in the lowest 25% are unable to develop an understanding of decimals, including the connection between fractions and decimals; develop quick recall of multiplication facts and related division facts and fluency with whole number | 4.1.<br>Provide students with necessary skill-focused interventions as reflected by assessment data through tutorial groups before, during, and after school using programs like Math Elevations, Voyager Math, or Everglades.<br><br>Engage students in activities to use technology (such as Gizmos, Riverdeep® or the National Library of Virtual Manipulatives) that include visual stimulus to develop conceptual understanding of numbers. | 4.1.<br>Administrators Math Coach MSSST/RtI Team | 4.1.<br>Review of Interim and Benchmark Mini-Assessment Data<br><br>Conduct Teacher/Admin Data Chats<br><br>Conduct Teacher-Student Data Chats every nine weeks | 4.1.<br>Formative: Benchmark Mini-Assessments<br><br>Go Math Chapter Tests<br><br>District Interim Assessments<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment. |

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 | Elementary School Mathematics Goal #<br><br>Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient  students by 50% |
|---|---|

by 50%.

5A :

| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Increase the pe | Increase the pe | Increase the pe | Increase the pe | Increase the pe | |

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.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5B: | The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 26% of the students in the Black subgroup made satisfactory progress. Our goal is to increase the percentage of students to 36%. |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Black:<br>26% (24) | Black:<br>40% (36) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 5B.1.<br>Black: An area of deficiency noted on the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Assessment was that of Base Ten and Fractions.<br><br>This barrier is due to the inability to bridge the gap of prerequisite skills required to master grade level curriculum. | 5B.1.<br>Teachers will use the Successmaker program as part of their Differentiated Instruction on a daily basis. | 5B.1.<br>Teachers<br>Math Coach<br>Administrators | 5B.1.<br>Administrators, curriculum coaches, and teachers will review Benchmark Mini-assessments and monthly Success Maker usage reports to ensure session goals are being met and progress is being made on all NGSSS being addressed as presented by the pacing guides. | 5B.1<br>Formative:<br>Benchmark Mini-Assessments<br><br>District Interim Assessments<br><br>Summative:<br>2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment |

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

| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5C: | N/A |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| N/A | N/A |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

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.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5D: | N/A | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
|---|---|
| N/A | N/A |

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

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |

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.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5E: | The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 27% of the students in the economically disadvantaged subgroup made satisfactory progress. Our goal is to increase the percent of students making satisfactory progress to 47%. |
|---|---|

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
|---|---|
| 27% (29) | 47% (51) |

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

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 5E.1.<br>An area of deficiency for the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup as seen in results of the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Assessment was that of Base Ten and Fractions. The latter is due to the inability to bridge the gap of prerequisite skills required to master grade level curriculum. | 5E.1.<br>Provide students with ongoing Success Maker practice through Differentiated Instruction time in order to address the missing prerequisite skills so as to develop understandings of multiplication and division and strategies for basic multiplication facts and related division facts. | 5E.1.<br>Teacher<br>Math Coach<br>Administrators | 5E.1.<br>Administrators, curriculum coaches, and teachers will review Benchmark Mini- assessments and monthly Success Maker usage reports to ensure session goals are being met and progress is being made on all NGSSS being addressed in the pacing guides. | 5E.1.<br>Formative:<br>Benchmark Mini-Assessments<br><br>Go Math Chapter Tests<br><br>District Interim Assessments<br><br>Summative:<br>2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment |

*End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals*

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Use of Collaborative Strategies | K-5 | Math Coach | K-5 Math Teachers | October 2012 | Strategies evidenced in lesson plans | Math Coach Principal Assistant Principal |
| Lesson Study | K-5 | Math Coach | K-5 Math Teachers | January 2013 | Classroom Walkthroughs | Math Coach Principal Assistant Principal |
| Utilizing the Gradual Release Model and Explicit Instruction | K-5 | Math Coach | K-5 Math Teachers | November 2012 | Classroom Walkthroughs | Math Coach Principal Assistant Principal |
| Interactive Journals | K-5 | Math Coach | K-5 Math Teachers | October 2012 | Rubrics for Interactive Journals | Math Coach Principal Assistant Principal |
| Rigor and Hands-On Math through Differentiated Instruction | K-5 | Math Coach | K-5 Math Teachers | August 2012-June 2013 | Classroom Walkthroughs and Lesson Plan Reviews | Math Coach Principal Assistant Principal |

Mathematics Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| 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 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.<br><br>Science Goal #1a: | On the 2012 Science FCAT Test, 19% of the students achieved proficiency (FCAT Level 3).<br><br>Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 3 percentage points to 24%. |

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
|---|---|
| 19% (8) | 24% (10) |

| 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 | 1a.1. The areas of deficiency according to the 2012 FCAT Science Assessment were Physical Science, and Life Science. Students had limited prior knowledge to real life applications in observing the natural world, recording observations, comparing scientific experiments and then analyzing the data provided. | 1a.1. Departmentalize the Fifth Grade teachers and provide professional development through the Coaching Cycle in the area of scientific inquiry through direct hands-on experiences and the use of Interactive Journals. Utilize P-Sell Science program to increase inquiry based learning opportunities. Create and implement the use of Instructional Focus Calendars through Common Planning so as to address primary focus strands as well as a secondary re-teach strand based on the data collected from benchmark mini-assessments. | 1a.1. Administrators Science Coach | 1a.1. Monitor students utilizing science labs and hands- on experiences by regular classroom walkthroughs. Review student interactive journals. Monitor student participation and Accelerated Reader scores from the science leveled readers. Review Coaching Logs and Common Planning Agendas | 1a.1. Formative: Benchmark Mini-assessments Student Journals Interim Assessments STAR Reading Test Summative: 2013 FCAT Science Test |

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

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

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

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

areas in need of improvement for the following group:

| | |
|---|---|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.<br><br>Science Goal #2a: | On the 2012 FCAT Science Test, 7% of students scored above proficiency at a Level 4 or 5.<br><br>Our goal is to increase student proficiency by 2 percentage points to 9%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 7% (3) | 9% (4) |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 2a.1.<br>The area of deficiency according to the 2012 FCAT Science Test students was Earth and Space Sciences.<br><br>Students lacked ability to fully comprehend when reading science content, were deficient in the area of content specific Tier 3 vocabulary, and were unable to relate the content presented to their everyday lives. | 2a.1.<br>Use the Lesson Study process as a way to provide additional hands on activities for students to demonstrate and model the Earth Space Science concepts in a relevant way.<br><br>Students will create PowerPoint presentations on concepts related to Earth Space Science.<br><br>Utilize GIZMOS as learning opportunities to present real life concepts. | 2a.1.<br>Administrators<br>Science Coach | 2a.1.<br><br>Review monthly Gizmo usage reports<br><br>Review Lesson Plans<br><br>Conduct focused classroom walkthroughs & observations<br><br>Peruse Lesson Study Agendas<br><br>Monitor Student Interactive Journals | 2a.1.<br>Formative:<br>Benchmark Mini-assessments<br><br>Student Journals<br><br>Interim Assessments<br><br>Summative:<br>2013 FCAT Science Test |

| | |
|---|---|
| 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:<br>Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science.<br><br>Science Goal #2b: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

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

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Lesson Study | Grade K-5 Science | Science Coach | All Teachers | January 2013 | Monitor lessons and activities during classroom walkthroughs | Principal Assistant Principal Science Coach |
| Rigor and Inquiry Based Learning | Grade K-5 Science | Science Coach | All Teachers | September 2012 | Monitor lessons and activities during classroom walkthroughs | Principal Assistant Principal Science Coach |
| Interactive Journals | Grade 4 & 5 Science | Science Coach | Science Teacher | September 2012 | Monitor lessons and activities during classroom walkthroughs | Principal Assistant Principal Science Coach |
| P-Sell Curriculum on Physical and Chemical, Life & Environmental, Earth & Space Science | Grade 5 Science | University of Miami Science Facilitator | 5th grade teachers | August 2012 | Monitor program implementation during classroom walkthroughs | Principal Assistant Principal Science Coach |
| P-Sell Science Curriculum on hands-on project based learning, inquiry and Science projects/experiments | Grade 5 Science | University of Miami Science Facilitator | 5th grade teachers | August, 2012 | Monitor program implementation during classroom walkthroughs | Principal Assistant Principal Science Coach |
| Gizmos | Grade 4 & 5 Science | Gizmo Trainer | Grade 4 & 5 Science Teacher | September 2012 | Monitor lessons and activities during classroom walkthroughs | Principal Assistant Principal Science Coach |

Science Budget:

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

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

### Technology

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

### Professional Development

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

### Other

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|---|---|---|---|
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |

# Writing Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.<br><br>Writing Goal #1a: | The results of the 2012 FCAT Writing Test indicate 63% of students scored at achievement Level 3 and higher.<br><br>The goal for the 2012-13 school year is to increase the number of students scoring at Level 3 and higher by 10 percentage points to 67%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 63% (19) | 67% (20) |

| 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 | 1a.1.<br><br>The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Writing Test is that students need additional practice in the area of support, as well as the skills necessary to write with a purpose that is directed to a specific audience or topic.<br><br>Students lack understanding of writing as a process. | 1a.1.<br>During writing instruction, students will use graphic organizers to set up a framework for their writing.<br><br>Teachers will utilize mentor text in order to expose students to the use of figurative language, "show not tell", "other words for", descriptive words, and magnified moments that will help them expand upon their vocabulary and add depth to their sentences.<br><br>Teachers will introduce students to self-editing and student-friendly rubrics so that they can assess and monitor their writing progress. | 1a.1.<br>Administrators<br>Reading Coach<br>Literacy<br>Leadership Team | 1a.1.<br>Administer and score monthly writing prompts to monitor student progress and adjust focus as needed.<br><br>The MTSS/RtI Team will review data of monthly writing prompts and make recommendation based on needs assessment | 1a.1.<br>Formative:<br>Monthly Writing Assessments<br><br>Student Friendly Rubrics<br><br>Summative: 2013 FCAT Writing Assessment |

| 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.<br><br>Writing Goal #1b: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |

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

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Process Writing | Grade K-5 | Reading Coach | All Reading/Language Arts Teachers | September 2012 | Conduct focused classroom walkthroughs, common planning sessions, and student folder reviews. | Reading Coach<br><br>Principal Assistant Principal |
| The 6 Writing Traits and the use of mentor texts | Grade K-5 | Reading Coach | Grade K-5 Teachers | August 2011 – February 2013 | Administration of Monthly Writing Assessments | Reading Coach<br><br>Principal Assistant Principal |

Writing Budget:

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

## Attendance Goal(s)

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

| Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
|---|---|
| 1. Attendance<br><br>Attendance Goal #1: | Our goal for this year is to increase attendance to a rate of 95.19% by minimizing excused absences due to illness and by reducing unexcused absences through a positive recognition plan.<br><br>Our second goal is to decrease the number of students with excessive absences (10 or more) and excessive tardies (10 or more) by 5% |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: |
| 94.69% (259) | 95.19% (261) |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) |
| 87 | 83 |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) |
| 101 | 96 |

| | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 1.1.<br>Attendance showed a slight decrease from the 2010-11 school year. Frequent illnesses may impact student attendance. | 1.1.<br>An on-site health clinic will provide basic medical services to our students and their siblings. | 1.1.<br>Administrators | 1.1.<br>Attendance will be reviewed weekly to determine students with excessive absences so that parents may be contacted. | 1.1.<br>Daily attendance bulletins |
| 2 | 1.2.<br>Unexcused absences have decreased by 3% from the 2011-12 school year. | 1.2.<br>Continue to identify and refer students who may be developing a pattern of unexcused absences to school counselor and RTI team for intervention services.<br><br>To encourage higher attendance, reward students with perfect attendance at quarterly awards assemblies and acknowledge class(es) with highest weekly attendance on morning announcements. | 1.2.<br>Administrators<br>Counselor<br>MSST/RtI Team | 1.2.<br>Attendance will be reviewed weekly to determine students with excessive unexcused absences and to determine classes with highest percentage of attendance. | 1.2.<br>Daily attendance bulletins. |

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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| RtI | K – 5 | Ms. Alberdi | All Teachers | November 2012 Professional Development Day | MTSS Meeting Agendas and Sign Sheets | Ms. Alberdi, Counselor Dr. Ventura, Assistant Principal Ms. Little, Principal |

Attendance Budget:

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

*End of Attendance Goal(s)*

# Suspension Goal(s)

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

| Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
|---|---|
| 1. Suspension<br><br>Suspension Goal #1: | Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease the total number of suspensions to 67. |
| 2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions |
| 18 | 16 |

| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School |
|---|---|
| 15 | 14 |
| 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions |
| 74 | 67 |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School |
| 45 | 41 |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 1.1.<br>The total number of indoor and outdoor suspensions increased to 92. Students demonstrate a lack social skills and exhibit aggressive behavior. | 1.1<br>The school will implement the Positive Discipline Plan developed by the school's Discipline Committee to encourage and reward positive behaviors and discourage inappropriate behaviors.<br><br>School counselor will address conflict resolution, anger management, and anti-bullying during classroom presentations and in individual and small group situations.<br><br>The parents will be provided with a workshop on assertive discipline and the importance of maintaining a safe school learning environment. | 1.1.<br>Administrators<br>Counselor<br>Discipline<br>Committee | 1.1.<br>Monitor COGNOS reports on student suspensions in addition to counselor reports | 1.1.<br>Counselor log, COGNOS suspension reports |

## 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| RtI | K – 5 | Ms. Alberdi | All Teachers | November 2012 Professional Development Day | MTSS Meeting Agendas and Sign Sheets | Ms. Alberdi, Counselor Dr. Ventura, Assistant Principal Ms. Little, Principal |
| School PBS Discipline Plan | K – 5 | Ms. Little | All Teachers | August 2012 Professional Development Day | MTSS Meeting Agendas and Sign Sheets | Ms. Alberdi, Counselor Dr. Ventura, Assistant Principal Ms. Little, Principal |

Suspension Budget:

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

*End of Suspension Goal(s)*

# Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
|---|---|
| 1. Parent Involvement<br><br>Parent Involvement Goal #1:<br><br>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.* | During the 2011-2012 school year 50 parent compacts were collected. The goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the number of parent compacts collected by 10% from 50 to 70 parent compacts. |
| 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement: | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: |
| 20% | 30% |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | |

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 2 | 1.1.<br>Parents lack of knowledge of School's expectations as well as the State's academic requirements | 1.1.<br>Ensure distribution and collection of Title I Parent Compacts during Open House, Resource Fair and Parent Meetings<br><br>Send a Connect-Ed message to inform parents of the Parent Compact and its implications | 1.1.<br>Administrators<br>Counselor<br>Title I CIS | 1.1.<br>Reviews of Parent Compacts | 1.1.<br>Parent Compacts |
| 3 | 1.2.<br>Low parental involvement or attendance to informative school functions/meetings | 1.2.<br>Host monthly workshops to address parents needs and interests. Have CIS contact parents to encourage them to attend. Provide incentives such as: dinners, refreshments and/or prizes/gift cards | 1.2.<br>Administrators<br>Counselor<br>Title I CIS<br>Academic Coaches | 1.2.<br>Review Workshop Agendas and sign-in logs | 1.2.<br>Attendance Sheets<br>Title I CIS Logs |

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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| How to Increase Parent Involvement | K – 5 | Parent Academy | All Teachers | February 2013 Professional Development Day | Review of Parent Communication Logs, Title I Sign In Sheets | Ms. Jones, CIS Dr. Ventura, Assistant Principal Ms. Little, Principal |

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |

*End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)*

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

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

| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
|---|---|
| 1. STEM<br><br>STEM Goal #1: | During the 2012-2013 school year, students will be exposed to at least one Interdisciplinary STEM Activity per nine week period. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 1.1.<br><br>Teachers lack the basic knowledge of STEM practices. | 1.1.<br><br>Students will participate in the Science Fair, and engage in weekly Science Inquiry Activities through scheduled Science Lab. | 1.1.<br><br>Administrators Academic Coaches | 1.1.<br><br>Conduct classroom walkthroughs<br><br>Review lessons plans and student work folders | 1.1.<br><br>Formative: Interactive Journals<br><br>Classroom Assessments and Projects |

### 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| STEM in the Elementary Classroom | K-5 | Ms. Ruiz | K-5 Teachers | August 2012 | Classroom Walkthroughs | Curriculum Coaches Administrators |

STEM Budget:

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

**Professional Development**

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

**Other**

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

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

## Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

# FINAL BUDGET

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Utilize Time for Kids Magazine in grades 3-5 to locate, interpret and analyze information through the use of graphics, charts, illustrations, diagrams and other text features. | Time for Kids Magazine: Grades 3-5. | Title I | $1,500.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $1,500.00 |
| **Technology** | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Incorporate the use of research based software focusing on the reading benchmarks. | Reading A-Z | Title I | $60.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $60.00 |
| **Professional Development** | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | CRISS Level I Training ( New Teachers) | Per participant fee $50.00 for training manual and E-newsletter subscription | Title I | $200.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $200.00 |
| **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: $1,760.00** |

# Differentiated Accountability

**School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance**

| ⌐ Priority | ⌐ Focus | ⌐ Prevent | ⌐ NA |
|---|---|---|---|

Are you a reward school: ⌐ Yes ⌐ No

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

View uploaded file (Uploaded on 10/12/2012)

# School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

✓ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

| Projected use of SAC Funds | Amount |
|---|---|
| Student attendance incentives | $300.00 |

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

The Educational Excellence School Advisory Council will meet to review student data, implement and monitor the School Improvement Plan and make recommendations/decisions to support student achievement. The council will also make decisions on utilizing EESAC funds to support student attendance, provide assistance and ideas to increase parental involvement and solicit support from the business community.

# AYP DATA

# SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

**Dade School District**
**ETHEL F. BECKFORD/RICHMOND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**
**2010-2011**

| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 57% | 55% | 79% | 35% | 226 | 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 | 62% | 56% | | | 118 | 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? | 53% (YES) | 50% (YES) | | | 103 | 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 | | | | | 447 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | C | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |

**Dade School District**
**ETHEL F. BECKFORD/RICHMOND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**
**2009-2010**

| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 52% | 55% | 84% | 14% | 205 | 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 | 49% | 48% | | | 97 | 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? | 60% (YES) | 50% (YES) | | | 110 | 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 | | | | | 412 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | D | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |