FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: LEWIS E. WADSWORTH ELEMENTARY

District Name: Flagler

Principal: Robin Dupont

SAC Chair: Keith Smith

Superintendent: Janet Valentine

Date of School Board Approval: October 16, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/5/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Assis Principal	Fred Terry	BS Physical Education K-12, Anderson University; Masters Of Educational Leadership, University of Central Florida Certifications: Physical Education K-12 Educational Leadership K-12	10	11	2011-2012 WES School Grade "A" – High Standards: 61% Reading, 54% Math, 80% Writing, 29% Science 2010-2011 WES School Grade "A"- High Standards: 79% Reading, 72% Math, 90% Writing, 46% Science; Learning Gains: 71% Reading, 64% Math; Lowest 25% Learning Gains: 67% Reading, 69% Math; AYP Information: 77% criteria met, Achievement cells that did not meet criterion: Math: Total, White, Black, Hispanic, and Economically Disadvantaged; Reading: Total, White, Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged 2009-2010 WES School Grade "B" – High Standards: 79% Reading, 75% Math, 92% Writing.
		BA Psychology & Education,University of Masschusetts; Master of Education,University			

Position	Name	Degree(s)/Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years	Prior Performance Record
Principal	Robin Dupont	of Maine; Educational Leadership, University of Central Florida. Certifications: Florida: Elementary Ed 1-6; Middle School Math 5-9, Ed Leadership; K-12 Principal Maine Certifications: Principal K-12, Director of Special Ed, Elementary K-8, Special Education K-12, SecondarySocial Studies; Massachusetts Certifications: Elementary K -8, Secondar Social Studies 9-12	4	8	2011-2012 WES School Grade "A" – High Standards: 61% Reading, 54% Math, 80% Writing, 29% Science 2010-2011 WES School Grade "A"- High Standards: 79% Reading, 72% Math, 90% Writing, 46% Science; Learning Gains: 71% Reading, 64% Math; Lowest 25% Learning Gains: 67% Reading, 69% Math; AYP Information: 77% criteria met, Achievement cells that did not meet criterion: Math: Total, White, Black, Hispanic, and Economically Disadvantaged; Reading: Total, White, Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged 2009-2010 WES School Grade "B" – High Standards: 79% Reading, 75% Math, 92% Writing.
Assis Principal	John Fanelli	BS Elementary Education, University of Central Florida; Masters of Educational Leadership, Stetson University Certifications: Elementary ed. 1-6, Educational Leadership K-12	2	7	2011-2012 WES School Grade "A" – High Standards: 61% Reading, 54% Math, 80% Writing, 29% Science 2010-2011 WES School Grade "A"- High Standards: 79% Reading, 72% Math, 90% Writing, 46% Science; Learning Gains: 71% Reading, 64% Math; Lowest 25% Learning Gains: 67% Reading, 69% Math; AYP Information: 77% criteria met, Achievement cells that did not meet criterion: Math: Total, White, Black, Hispanic, and Economically Disadvantaged; Reading: Total, White, Hispanic and Economically Disadvantaged 2009-2010 WES School Grade "B" – High Standards: 79% Reading, 75% Math, 92% Writing.

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)
Fourth Grade Academic Coach All Subject Areas	Susan Sigler	BS- Elementary Education Certified - K-12 ESE Middle School Math and Social Studies	25	5	2011-2012 WES School Grade "A" – High Standards: 61% Reading, 54% Math, 80% Writing, 29% Science 2010-2011 WES School Grade- A. High Standards: 79% Reading 72% Math, 90% Writing, 46% Science. Learning Gains: 71% reading, 64% math. Lowest 25% Learning Gains: 67% reading, 69% math. AYP Info: 77% criteria met, Achievement CELLS that did not meet Criterion: Math, T, W, B, H ED; Reading T,W, H, ED; *Total of R,M NA Cells = 8; Impr. Writing by 1%=Y. School grades 2005, 2006, 2008, 2011, and 2012 – A School grades 2007, 2009, 2010 – B FCAT writing – The year I was a coach for WES and the percentage of students that passed the test = 2008 (94%) 2009 (98%) 2010 (96%) 2011 (94%) 2012 (94%) 2010-2011 WES School Grade- A. High Standards: 79% Reading 72% Math, 90% Writing, 46% Science. Learning Gains: 71% reading, 64% math. Lowest 25% Learning Gains: 67% reading, 69% math. AYP Info: 77% criteria met, Achievement CELLS that did not meet Criterion: Math, T, W, B, H ED; Reading T,W, H, ED; *Total of R,M NA Cells = 8; Impr . Writing by 1%=Y. 2009-2010 WES percentages for meeting

					high standards were Reading 79%, Math 75%, Writing 92%. The percentages for gains in
Sixth Grade Academic Coach All Subject Areas	Lora Lee Craton	BFA Music MA Educational Leadership Certified: ESE K-12 Reading K-12 ESOL K-12 EducationalLeadership -all levels Elementary ed- K-6 Middle Grades Integrated Curriculum grades 5-9 Music K-12	4	4	2011-2012 WES School Grade "A" – High Standards: 61% Reading, 54% Math, 80% Writing, 29% Science 2010-2011 WES School Grade- A. High Standards: 79% Reading 72% Math, 90% Writing, 46% Science. Learning Gains: 71% reading, 64% math. Lowest 25% Learning Gains: 67% reading, 69% math. AYP Info: 77% criteria met, Achievement CELLS that did not meet Criterion: Math, T, W, B, H ED; Reading T,W, H, ED; *Total of R,M NA Cells = 8; Impr . Writing by 1%=Y. 2009-2010 WES received a "B" for 09. WES did not make AYP in '09. 2009-2010 WES School Grade "B" – High Standards: 79% Reading, 75% Math, 92% Writing.
Second Grade Academic Coach All Subject Areas	Kate Southworth	BS: Elementary Education MA: Elementary Education FL. Certifications: Elementary Education (K-6) ESE (K-12)	4	4	2011-2012 WES School Grade "A" – High Standards: 61% Reading, 54% Math, 80% Writing, 29% Science 2010-2011 WES School Grade- A. High Standards: 79% Reading 72% Math, 90% Writing, 46% Science. Learning Gains: 71% reading, 64% math. Lowest 25% Learning Gains: 67% reading, 69% math. AYP Info: 77% criteria met, Achievement CELLS that did not meet Criterion: Math, T, W, B, H ED; Reading T,W, H, ED; *Total of R,M NA Cells = 8; Impr. Writing by 1%=Y. 2009-2010 WES School Grade "B" – High Standards: 79% Reading, 75% Math, 92% Writing.
School Wide Reading Coach	Amy Neuenfeldt	BS: Elementary Education FL. Certifications: Elementary Education K-6 Deaf Education K-12 ESOL Endorsed Reading Endorsed	10	2	2011-2012 WES School Grade "A" – High Standards: 61% Reading, 54% Math, 80% Writing, 29% Science 2010-2011 WES School Grade- A. High Standards: 79% Reading 72% Math, 90% Writing, 46% Science. Learning Gains: 71% reading, 64% math. Lowest 25% Learning Gains: 67% reading, 69% math. AYP Info: 77% criteria met, Achievement CELLS that did not meet Criterion: Math, T, W, B, H ED; Reading T,W, H, ED; *Total of R,M NA Cells = 8; Impr. Writing by 1%=Y. 2009-2010 WES School Grade "B" – High Standards: 79% Reading, 75% Math, 92% Writing.
S.T.E.M. Coach	Martin Evans	BS: Elementary Education MA: Elementary Education			No Data
Kindergarten and First Grade Coach	Joanne Goodin	Bachelors of Art Biology Masters of Business Administration Elementary Education K-6 ESE Certified	6	1	2011-2012 WES School Grade "A" – High Standards: 61% Reading, 54% Math, 80% Writing, 29% Science 2010-2011 WES School Grade- A. High Standards: 79% Reading 72% Math, 90% Writing, 46% Science. Learning Gains: 71% reading, 64% math. Lowest 25% Learning Gains: 67% reading, 69% math. AYP Info: 77% criteria met, Achievement CELLS that did not meet Criterion: Math, T, W, B, H ED; Reading T,W, H, ED; *Total of R,M NA Cells = 8; Impr. Writing by 1%=Y. 2009-2010 WES School Grade "B" – High Standards: 79% Reading, 75% Math, 92% Writing. School grades 2006,2008, 2011 and 2012 – A School grades 2007, 2009 and 2010 – B
Third Grade Coach	Lesley Poland	BS: Elementary Education Special education FL Certifications: Elementary Ed. 1-6 Mentally Handicapped K-12	10	1	2011-2012 WES School Grade "A" – High Standards: 61% Reading, 54% Math, 80% Writing, 29% Science 2010-2011 WES School Grade- A. High Standards: 79% Reading 72% Math, 90% Writing, 46% Science. Learning Gains: 71% reading, 64% math. Lowest 25% Learning Gains: 67% reading, 69% math. AYP Info: 77% criteria met, Achievement CELLS that did not meet Criterion: Math, T, W, B, H ED; Reading T,W, H, ED; *Total of R,M NA Cells = 8; Impr. Writing by 1%=Y. 2009-2010 WES School Grade "B" – High Standards: 79% Reading, 75% Math, 92% Writing.

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	Through NEFEC and its Foundation for Rural Education Excellence, Flagler County Schools will participate in teacher recruitment efforts designed to help districts "grow their own". Specifically, partnerships between high schools and local community colleges are being established to increase interest in teaching within the northeast Florida region through the establishment of educational academies in high schools that serve as college credit to students who enter the field of education. The Flagler County School District Human Services Department actively recruits teachers who are highly qualified to apply to our district for teaching positions. We are located in a fast growing county that attracts many families from all over the United States. Additionally, we have our own Flagler County high school graduates who are now graduating with teaching degrees and returning to our county. Salaries are competitive with any district in the state. The University of Central Florida, the University of North Florida, and the Flagler College are all located within 60 miles of our county. We have many student teachers who are placed in our county and then apply for employment in our district. In addition, NEFEC and its Foundation are establishing a retention program that will increase mentoring to beginning, alternatively certified, and struggling teachers. Through NEFEC's newly created mentor cadre, high performing teachers are receiving training in mentoring skills and being matched with teachers in need of a mentor. To further the districts efforts to retain highly qualified teachers, teachers are given a variety of opportunities to receive an endorsement, many of which are reimbursable per the principal's request. To assist teachers in becoming highly qualified, Flagler County Public Schools has worked to bring the many of the Reading Endorsement Competencies to the county. Currently Competencies 4, 5, and 6 are available face-to-face in county. Competencies 1, 2, and 3 are available online. Flagler County has also paired with other neighboring districts and the NEFEC region to open the professional development needed that other counties may offer at a different time or face-to-face rather than online. RE-ESOL is also being provided in county as well. This will allow ESOL endorsed teachers an additional option to earn their Reading Endorsement.	Principal	on-going	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).
*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
All of our faculty members are Highly Qualified.	N/A

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
66	3.0%(2)	9.1%(6)	47.0%(31)	40.9%(27)	37.9%(25)	100.0%(66)	12.1%(8)	7.6%(5)	33.3%(22)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program/plan by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Lindsay Lowrey	Lauren Slaymaker	Our mentors are highly qualified, expereinced teachers and grade level coaches.	The district Mentoring Program model is Paula Rutherford's Mentoring in the 21st Century. Mentors are assigned to guide Early Career teachers, defined as those who are new or have two to three years of experience. The goals of the program are to increase the retention rate of Early Career teachers, to increase the efficacy of Early Career teachers as demonstrated in student achievement, and to increase the "happiness factor" of Early Career teachers. All mentors are required to attend training before taking on this role. The goal of the required training is to equip mentors with the skills they need and focuses on the following: • Best Practices in mentoring • roles and responsibilities • stages of new teacher development • adult learning styles • information processing styles • peer observations and feedback • Best Practices in standards-based teaching and learning Objectives of the Mentoring Program: • Increase the retention rate of Early Career teachers by 10 % over the year before. • Maintain a core group of trained at least three mentors at each school. • Maintain a district-level team of 4 mentors representing elementary, middle and high school who in turn are able to train teachers to become mentors as needed. • Increase the achievement level of students in the classes of Early Career teachers by 10% as demonstrated by standardized test data.
			The district Mentoring Program model is Paula Rutherford's Mentoring in the 21st Century. Mentors are assigned to guide Early Career teachers, defined as those who are new or have two to three years of experience. The goals of the program are to increase the retention rate of Early Career teachers, to increase the efficacy of Early Career teachers as demonstrated in student achievement, and to increase the "happiness factor" of Early Career teachers. All mentors are required to attend training before

Jill Stirling	William Eldredge	Our mentors are highly qualified, expereinced teachers and grade level coaches.	taking on this role. The goal of the required training is to equip mentors with the skills they need and focuses on the following: • Best Practices in mentoring • roles and responsibilities • stages of new teacher development • adult learning styles • information processing styles • peer observations and feedback • Best Practices in standards-based teaching and learning Objectives of the Mentoring Program: • Increase the retention rate of Early Career teachers by 10 % over the year before. • Maintain a core group of trained at least three mentors at each school. • Maintain a district-level team of 4 mentors representing elementary, middle and high school who in turn are able to train teachers to become mentors as needed. • Increase the achievement level of students in the classes of Early Career teachers by 10% as demonstrated by standardized test data.
Eliana Potash	Sandra Rush	Our mentors are highly qualified, expereinced teachers and grade level coaches.	The district Mentoring Program model is Paula Rutherford's Mentoring in the 21st Century. Mentors are assigned to guide Early Career teachers, defined as those who are new or have two to three years of experience. The goals of the program are to increase the retention rate of Early Career teachers, to increase the efficacy of Early Career teachers as demonstrated in student achievement, and to increase the "happiness factor" of Early Career teachers. All mentors are required to attend training before taking on this role. The goal of the required training is to equip mentors with the skills they need and focuses on the following: • Best Practices in mentoring • roles and responsibilities • stages of new teacher development • adult learning styles • information processing styles • peer observations and feedback • Best Practices in standards-based teaching and learning Objectives of the Mentoring Program: • Increase the retention rate of Early Career teachers by 10 % over the year before. • Maintain a core group of trained at least three mentors at each school. • Maintain a district-level team of 4 mentors

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

The Title I coordinator met with all of the schools that will be served under Title I, Part A and discussed the results of their Comprehensive Needs School Assessment. Title I professional development will be supplemental to district offerings and specific to the needs of the Title I schools. Title I teachers are included in any district offerings under Titles II A, II B, III, and IV for professional development activities. All Title I teachers previously received FRI training and updated FRI offerings. Needs for professional development for highly qualified requirements are reviewed by the curriculum department at curriculum meetings.
Parent Involvement activities are developed in collaboration with Title III requirements and IDEA requirements so that Title I, ELL and ESE parents have more opportunities for workshops and collaborative involvement. A minimum of five parent involvement activities were held by Title I. Parent trainings will provide math and reading make and take workshops such as Families Building Better Readers and MAPPS (Math and Parent partnerships). Title I and Title II A will allow for the training to support these programs. Parents are asked to give input into the Title I program at any of the parent meetings as well as through a survey included in the Title I newsletter. The newsletter is sent home and is available online. Youth at risk and/ or economically disadvantaged in an elementary school served by Title I would have services available to them through the Title I funding. Title I also funds .30 of a District Curriculum Specialist position to work with and provide reading professional development for the Reading Coaches, classroom teachers and ESE teachers. The District Curriculum Specialist also works with individual schools on data disaggregation, prescriptive and programmatic planning, and fidelity of implementation of the K-12 reading plan. This position also supports data disaggregation and intervention for Response to Intervention.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Flagler's migrant students are served through Alachua County with multiple counties participating. Students not served through that multi-county grant could receive some set aside from Title I. There is access to Full Service Schools for health and counseling issues. Our representative from the multi-county grant visits families and communicates with the Title I staff to resolve issues for students who do not have the necessary school supplies. Students who are considered migrant can access tutoring services through the Alachua County Migrant staff and through other sources available from the district.

Title I, Part D

Title I, Part D:
Title II, Part D, technology works collaboratively with the Title II, Part A program to bring the newest technology and training to the teachers and students in the district. This grant was not re-funded.

Title II

Title I teachers are included in any district offerings under Titles II A, II B, III, and IV for professional development activities. Title II, Part D, technology works collaboratively with the Title II, Part A program to bring the newest technology and training to the teachers and the students in the district. Title I teachers will continue to receive training supplemental to district initiatives in Learning Focused Strategies. The Safe and Drug Free Schools grant, Title IV, will work collaboratively with grants written by the Flagler County Sheriff's Department and the Title II, Part A grant for professional development which includes Title I Schools and Title I teachers. Additional programs are provided by the Flagler Youth Coalition who partners with the district to provide additional programs to reduce substance abuse and the use of alcohol. Parent Involvement will be encouraged through the Title II, Title I and the Title IV dollars. Title II also funds .45 of a District Curriculum Specialist position to work with and provide reading professional development for the Reading Coaches, classroom teachers and ESE teachers. The District Curriculum Specialist also works with individual schools on data disaggregation, prescriptive and programmatic planning, and fidelity of implementation of the K-12 reading plan. This position also supports data disaggregation and intervention for Response to Intervention.

Title III

Title III:
Title I teachers are included in any district offerings under Titles II A, II B, III, and IV for professional development activities. Parent Involvement activities are developed in collaboration with Title III requirements and IDEA requirements so that Title I, ESOL and ESE parents have more opportunities for workshops and collaborative involvement. A minimum of five parent involvement activities were be held by Title I. Parent workshops will provide math and reading make and take workshops. Parents are asked to give input into the Title I program at any of the parent meetings as well as through a survey included in the Title I newsletter. The newsletter was put on line for the first time this year. ELL and Immigrant students will be served through the Title III dollars and the grant for Newly Arrived Students and also Title I if attending a Title I school. Parent involvement will be encouraged through the Title III, Title I and the Title IV dollars. Title III also funds .25 of a District Curriculum Specialist position to work with and provide reading professional development for the Reading Coaches, ELL classroom teachers and ESE teachers. The District Curriculum Specialist also works with individual schools on data disaggregation, prescriptive and programmatic planning, and fidelity of implementation of the K-12 reading plan. This position also supports data disaggregation and intervention for Response to Intervention.

Title III A- The grant focuses on language instruction and language acquisition for limited English proficient students.

Title X- Homeless

Flagler County is a sub-grant recipient of Title X. The funding from these grants pays 20% of the salary and travel for the Homeless/Parent Specialist who will work closely with the Title I Coordinator. All schools will be monitored by the Title I Homeless/Parent Specialist to be sure the needs of all homeless students are met. The Title I Coordinator meets with each Title I school on a monthly basis. During those meetings the homeless student counts are discussed. Academic needs and attendance issues are discussed for individual students who may require additional services. Appropriate contacts are made to be sure that homeless student needs are met. There may be a need for additional academic assistance, school materials, health needs or transportation issues. In such cases the Homeless/Parent Specialist is contacted and a referral is made to request the liaison to follow up on the needs. The Homeless/Parent Specialist makes visits to homeless families when the school requests a home visit or when a new homeless student registers and the family needs assistance in obtaining missing documents such as birth certificates, immunizations, and school physical forms. The Homeless Parent Specialist will build trust relationships with homeless students and families. The Homeless Parent Specialist will provide case management to unaccompanied 7th-12th grade homeless youth and make referrals for community agencies and services. This grant provides some monies for tutoring at risk homeless students.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Florida Statute Chapter 2009-59, Section 1007.2d, Subsection (12) is added to section (12) (a) (6) CATEGORICAL FUNDS (b) If a district school board finds and declares in a resolution adopted at a regular meeting of the school board that the funds received for any of the following categorical appropriations are urgently needed to maintain school board specified academic classroom instruction, the school board may consider and approve an amendment to the school district operating budget transferring the identified amount of the categorical funds to the appropriate account for expenditure:

* Funds for supplemental academic instruction- $1,396,566 to be used for classroom teachers.

Violence Prevention Programs

The Safe and Drug Free Schools grant, Title IV, will work collaboratively with grants written by the Flagler County Sheriff's Department and the Title II, Part A grant for professional development which includes Title I Schools and Title I teachers. Additional programs are provided by the Flagler Youth Coalition who partners with the district to provide additional programs to reduce substance abuse and the use of alcohol. Parent Involvement will be encouraged through the Title II, Title I and the Title IV dollars.

Funds for safe schools. All funds, $300,556 are used to pay support School Resource Officers.

Nutrition Programs

Flagler County Schools offer free breakfast to all students in attendance. Our lunches are also offered at a reduced or free rate to qualifying students. All meals are balanced and offer appropriate nutrition.

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

> The school based MTSS leadership team includes the following professionals:
> Reading Coach – Amy Neuenfeldt
> School Psychologist – John Seaton
> Assistant Principal – John Fanelli
> Guidance Counselor – Patricia Carmo
> Guidance Counselor – Laura Houghton
> Kindergarten and Grade 1 Coach – Joanne Goodin
> Grade 2 Coach – Kate Southworth
> Grade 3 Coach – Lesley Poland
> Grade 4 Coach – Susan Sigler
> Grade 5 and 6 Coach – Lora Lee Craton

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 two times per month to discuss school wide data, trends and issues. The team also meets once per month with each grade level to discuss students currently in the MTSS process and students who need to become a part of the MTSS process. The MTSS leadership team meets with the teachers to develop tier 2 and tier 3 plans, as well as monitor the students who are currently on plans. The MTSS leadership team works with the PBS team on school wide and individual student behavior.

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

> The MTSS Leadership Team is focused on all areas of the school, and has an active role in developing and implementing the school improvement plan. The MTSS Leadership team works closely with the teachers to identify the needs, of students and teachers, and addresses these needs by providing support as necessary.

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.

> We use the core reading, math, science, writing and behavior programs for tier 1 data. The teachers present the data in chart and graph format so the MTSS leadership team is able to view trends in student achievement. For tier 2, the teachers implement the strategic intervention kits that accompany the reading series for reading and they use the Pearson diagnostic kit and lessons for math. The weekly assessments are presented in chart and graph format and the MTSS Leadership team, along with the teacher, decide what actions to take next based on the data. For tier 3, the teachers have more options to choose from and will implement one or more strategies in math or reading. The teachers will continue to present charts and graphs to the RtI leadership team in order to determine the next steps. Our MTSS leadership team utilizes an MTSS database with student data to manage the students' progress at each tier.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

> The MTSS Leadership Team plans to train each grade level on MTSS during a grade level planning to ensure that the teachers

receive the support needed in learning this process. The small group size will allow more interaction with the teachers in each grade level, and the MTSS leadership team will be able to tailor training examples to each grade level. Non instructional staff will be invited to join a grade level to participate in the learning of MTSS as well.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

We have a well defined system of policies and procedures with check and balances in place to make sure that our MTSS process runs smooth. We also build our MTSS days into the calendar at the beginning of the year to make sure adequate time is designated to the process.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Assistant Principal- John Fanelli
Reading Coach- Amy Neuenfeldt
Guidance Counselors
Grade Level Coach/ESE teachers
General Education- Classroom teachers

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

The school-based LLT meets three times per quarter in the form of PLC's (Professional Learning Communities) and grade level meetings. The PLC's allow for each team member to share their expertise and learn from each other new and more effective ways to implement research based teaching strategies in efforts attain academic gains for all students. Professional Learning Community meetings also allow time for on-going professional development for teachers in which needs are determined by school-wide data. As data analysis drives our instruction, we use PLC meetings as a time to analyze current student data to determine individual needs of students in efforts to differentiate instruction through iii and enrichment groups. Teachers collaborate and plan for literacy instruction during PLC's always referring to the Sunshine State Standards as their guide while utilizing FRI, Marzano & Learned Focused strategies to teach Reading/Language Arts standards.
As communication among team members is essential to our LLT's success we meet once per month in the form of grade level meetings to discuss and problem solve questions and concerns regarding Reading and Language Arts. Time management, implementation of teaching strategies, student concerns & grade level literacy planning takes place during these meetings. Teachers collaborate and problem solve with the goal of meeting all expectations and requirements of our districts K-12 Reading Plan.

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

The LLT's major initiative for the 2012-2013 school year will be to further analyze data to determine individualized needs of students and meet these needs through differentiated instruction. PLC's and Grade level meetings allow teachers time to discuss individual students while offering teachers support in making informed decisions. The support given for the decision making process is in the form of the Assistant Principal, Reading coach, RTI coach, Grade level coach and classroom teachers. The experience and knowledge of each LLT member is respected and required to implement an effective literacy program for all students.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
View uploaded file (Uploaded on 9/17/2012)

*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.

Wadsworth Elementary uses a program called staggered start. This program allows approximately six students to enter Kindergarten each day for the first three days of school. On each of the first three days of school, Kindergarten teachers are able to interact with their students on a 6 to 1 ratio. This ratio gives teachers time to get to know the students and to help them transition into Kindergarten. On the fourth day of the first week all students arrive but have already been acclimated to

the room and the teacher. The district has a VPK program which works with the schools to help educate and transition students into Kindergarten. Once in Kindergarten the students take the FLKRS to ensure the quality of our VPK program.

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	Our school wide reading average for the 2011-2012 school year was 62% (381 students). The state average was 59%. That means our school was 3% above the state average for students in grades 3rd through 6th.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
For the 2011-2012 school year the percentage of students that achieved a reading FCAT Level 3 was 62% (381 Students).	For 2012-2013 school year the expected level of performance is to maintain or exceed the 62% (381 Students) of students that achieved an FCAT level 3.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	We currently have 76% (672) students that are Economically Disadvantaged and with this population of students come many challenges and hardships. With high mobility rates and personal and academic challenges these students continue to utilize a huge percentage of our school's resources.	Through community involvement we will utilize all of our resources by implementing a new mentoring program where students will work one on one with classroom volunteers to work on individualized reading skills. The "I Can Read" mentoring program allows students the opportunity to read aloud to their assigned mentor and receive instant feedback in the one on one setting. In addition, the student's reading mentor will model reading through read-alouds with their student.	Principal Assistant Principals Reading Coach S.T.E.M. Coach	The effectiveness of the strategy will be monitored through data analysis as well as parent/teacher observation and feedback.	FAIR, Performance Matters, Benchmark Testing, Classroom grades & FCAT

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
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:	Our school wide reading average of level 4's and 5's for the 2011-2012 school year was 32% (196 students). The state average was 33%. That means our school was 1% below the state average for students in grades 3rd through 6th.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
For the 2011-2012 school year the percentage of students that achieved a reading FCAT Level 4 or 5 for reading was 32% (196 students).	For 2012-2013 school year the expected level of performance is to maintain or exceed the 32% (196 students)of students that will achieve a Reading FCAT level 4 or 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	We currently have 76% (672) students that are Economically Disadvantaged and with this population of students come many challenges and hardships. With high mobility rates and personal and academic challenges these students continue to utilize a huge percentage of our school resources.	Through community involvement we will utilize all of our resources by implementing a new mentoring program where students will work one on one with classroom volunteers to work on individualized reading skills. The "I Can Read" mentoring program allows students the opportunity to read aloud to their assigned mentor and receive instant feedback in the one on one setting. In addition, the student-reading mentor will model reading through read-alouds with their student.	Principal Assistant Principals Reading Coach S.T.E.M Coach	The effectiveness of the strategy will be monitored through data analysis as well as parent/teacher observation and feedback.	FAIR, Performance Matters, Benchmark Testing, Classroom Grades & FCAT

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	Our reading percentage of students making learning gains for the 2010-2011 school year was 71% (438 students). Our 2011-2012 percentage of students making learning gains is 75% (461 students) percent. We have seen a 4% increase in the percentage of students making learning gains over last year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The current percentage of students making learning gains in reading is 75% (461 students)	For the 2012-2013 school year the expected level of performance is to meet or exceed the 75% (461 students)of our students that made learning gains last year.

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	We currently have 76% (672) students that are Economically Disadvantaged and with this population of students come many challenges and hardships. With high mobility rates and personal and academic challenges these students continue to utilize a huge percentage of our school resources.	Through community involvement we will utilize all of our resources by implementing a new mentoring program where students will work one on one with classroom volunteers to work on individualized reading skills. The "I Can Read" mentoring program allows students the opportunity to read aloud to their assigned mentor and receive instant feedback in the one on one setting. In addition, the student's reading mentor will model reading through read-alouds with their student.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, Grade level coaches/ESE teacher, Classroom teacher	The effectiveness of the strategy will be monitored through data analysis as well as parent/teacher observation and feedback.	FAIR, Benchmark testing, Classroom grades and FCAT

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	The percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains for the 2010-2011 school year was 67% (413 students). The percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains for the 2011-2012 school year was 86% (401 students) That means there ahs been a 21% increase in the amount of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
For the 2011-2012 school year 86% (401 students) of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading.	The expected level of performance for the 2012-2013 school year is to exceed the previous years 86% (401 students) of students that made learning gains in our lowest 25%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	We currently have 76% (672) students that are Economically Disadvantaged and with this population of students come many challenges and hardships. With high mobility rates and personal and academic challenges these students continue to utilize a huge percentage of our school resources.	Through community involvement we will utilize all of our resources by implementing a new mentoring program where students will work one on one with classroom volunteers to work on individualized reading skills. The "I Can Read" mentoring program allows students the opportunity to read aloud to their assigned mentor and receive instant feedback in the one on one setting. In addition, the student-reading mentor will model reading through read-alouds with their student.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, Grade level coach/ESE teacher, Classroom teacher	The effectiveness of the strategy will be monitored through data analysis as well as parent/teacher observation and feedback.	FAIR, Benchmark testing, Classroom grades and FCAT

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 # Over the next five years we plan on reducing our acheivement gap by 50%. 5A :					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	61%	63%	67%	71%	74%	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	On the 2011-2012 FCAT 65% of our white students, 55% of our black students, 60% of our hispanic students and 81% of our asian students scored a level 3 or higher.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On the 2011-2012 FCAT 65% of our white students, 55% of our black students, 60% of our hispanic students and 81% of our asian students scored a level 3 or higher.	For the 2012-2013 school year our expected level of performance is for our subgroups to meet or exceed the current percentages of students scoring a level 3 or higher.

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	We currently have 76% (672) students that are Economically Disadvantaged and with this population of students come many challenges and hardships. With high mobility rates and personal and academic challenges these students continue to utilize a huge percentage of our school's resources.	Through community involvement we will utilize all of our resources by implementing a new mentoring program where students will work one on one with classroom volunteers to work on individualized reading skills. The "I Can Read" mentoring program allows students the opportunity to read aloud to their assigned mentor and receive instant feedback in the one on one setting. In addition, the student-reading mentor will model reading through read-alouds with their students.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, RTI Coach, Grade level coach and Classroom teacher	The effectiveness of the strategy will be monitored through data analysis as well as parent/teacher observation and feedback.	FAIR, Benchmark testing, Classroom grades and FCAT

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	The percentage of our ELL students performing on or above grade level in reading for the 2010-2011 school year was 19%. The percentage of our ELL students performing at or above grade level in reading for 2011-2012 school year was 33%. There was a 14% gain between the 2011 and 2012 school year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The curent level of performance for our ELL students in reading is 33%.	Our expected level of performance for the 2012-2013 school year is to meet or exceed the 33% that were at or above grade level for the 2012 school year.

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
	We currently have 76% (672) students that are Economically Disadvantaged and with this population of students come many challenges and hardships. With high mobility rates	Through community involvement we will utilize all of our resources by implementing a new mentoring program where students will work one on one with classroom volunteers to work on	Principal Assistant Principals Reading Coach S.T.E.M. Coach Grade level Coaches	The effectiveness of the strategy will be monitored through data analysis as well as parent/teacher observation and feedback.	FAIR, Performance Matters, Benchmark Testing, Classroom grades & FCAT

1	and personal and academic challenges these students continue to utilize a huge percentage of our school's resources.	individualized reading skills. The "I Can Read" mentoring program allows students the opportunity to read aloud to their assigned mentor and receive instant feedback in the one on one setting. In addition, the student's reading mentor will model reading through read-alouds with their 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:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	The percentage of our SWD students performing on or above grade level in reading for the 2010-2011 school year was 26%. The percentage of our SWD students performing at or above grade level in reading for 2011-2012 school year was 27%. There was a 1% gain between the 2011 and 2012 school year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The curent level of performance for our SWD students in reading is 27%.	Our expected level of performance for the 2012-2013 school year is to exceed the 27% of SWD students that were at or above grade level for the 2012 school year.

<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	We currently have 76% (672) students that are Economically Disadvantaged and with this population of students come many challenges and hardships. With high mobility rates and personal and academic challenges these students continue to utilize a huge percentage of our school's resources.	Through community involvement we will utilize all of our resources by implementing a new mentoring program where students will work one on one with classroom volunteers to work on individualized reading skills. The "I Can Read" mentoring program allows students the opportunity to read aloud to their assigned mentor and receive instant feedback in the one on one setting. In addition, the student's reading mentor will model reading through read-alouds with their student.	Principal Assistant Principals Reading Coach S.T.E.M. Coach	The effectiveness of the strategy will be monitored through data analysis as well as parent/teacher observation and feedback.	FAIR, Performance Matters, Benchmark Testing, Classroom grades & FCAT

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	The percentage of our ED students performing on or above grade level in reading for the 2010-2011 school year was 50%. The percentage of our ED students performing at or above grade level in reading for 2011-2012 school year was 59%. There was a 9% gain between the 2011 and 2012 school year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The curent level of performance for our ED students in reading is 59%.	Our expected level of performance for the 2012-2013 school year is to meet or exceed the 59% that were at or above grade level for the 2012 school year.

	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	We currently have 76% (672) students that are Economically Disadvantaged and with this population of students come many challenges and hardships. With high mobility rates and personal and academic challenges these students continue to utilize a huge percentage of our school's resources.	Through community involvement we will utilize all of our resources by implementing a new mentoring program where students will work one on one with classroom volunteers to work on individualized reading skills. The "I Can Read" mentoring program allows students the opportunity to read aloud to their assigned mentor and receive instant feedback in the one on one setting. In addition, the student's reading mentor will model reading through read-alouds with their student.	Principal Assistant Principals Reading Coach S.T.E.M. Coach Grade level Coaches	The effectiveness of the strategy will be monitored through data analysis as well as parent/teacher observation and feedback.	FAIR, Performance Matters, Benchmark Testing, Classroom grades & FCAT

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
PLC's allow for each team member to share their expertise and learn from each other new and more effective ways to impliment resaerch based teaching stratidgies to help attain academic gains for all students. Profesional Learning Community meetings also allow time for ongoing professional development for teachers where needs are determined by school	Grades; Kindergarten First Grade Second Grade Third Grade Fourth Grade Fifth Grade Sixth Grade

Subjects; Reading, Math, Science, Social Studies, RTI | Principal Assistant Principals Reading Coach S.T.E.M. Coach | Grades; K-6, ESE School-wide | 3 PLC's per Year:

October, January, March | Classroom Walkthroughs Teacher Surveys Data Analysis | Principal Assistant Principals Reading Coach S.T.E.M Coach |

wide data.						
Data team meetings allow teachers to come together in order to disaggrigate and discuss current grade level data. Teachers then use this data to plan and prepare lessons to meet the needs of their students.	Grades; Kindergarten First Grade Second Grade Third Grade Fourth Grade Fifth Grade Sixth Grade Subjects; Reading, Math, Science, Social Studies, RTI	Principal Assistant Principals Reading Coach S.T.E.M. Coach	Grades; K-6, ESE School-wide	3 Data Teams per year; September, November, February	Classroom Walkthroughs Teacher Surveys Data Analysis	Principal Assistant Principals Reading Coach S.T.E.M Coach
Ruby Payne Training focusing on the needs of our increasingly high poverty student population.	Grades; Kindergarten First Grade Second Grade Third Grade Fourth Grade Fifth Grade Sixth Grade Subjects; Reading, Math, Science, Social Studies, RTI	Assistant Principals Reading Coach	Grades; K-6, ESE School-wide	District Scheduled professional development day September 28, 2012	Classroom Walkthroughs Teacher Surveys Data Analysis	Principal Assistant Principals Reading Coach S.T.E.M Coach
The comprehension toolkit focuses on reading strategies especially with nonfiction text. With the new common core standards reading is to be taught throughout the disciplines. The strategies would benefit everyone no matter what subject they teach as reading is in all of the content areas.	Grades; Kindergarten First Grade Second Grade Third Grade Fourth Grade Fifth Grade Sixth Grade Subjects; Reading, Science, Social Studies	Reading Coach	Grades; K-6, ESE School-wide	August and September of 2012	Classroom Walkthroughs Teacher Surveys Data Analysis	Principal Assistant Principals Reading Coach S.T.E.M Coach
Book Studies	Grades; Kindergarten First Grade Second Grade Third Grade Fourth Grade Fifth Grade Sixth Grade Subjects; Reading	Reading Coach	Grades; K-6, ESE School-wide	2012-2013 school year	Classroom Walkthroughs Teacher Surveys Data Analysis Weekly Meetings	Principal Assistant Principals Reading Coach

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Core Reading Program	Harcourt Story Town	General Fund	$783.00
Supplemental Reading Program	SRA Reading Mastery	General Fund	$6,102.68
Supplemental Reading Materials in the content area	Florida Studies Weekly Time for Kids National Geographic Weekly Readers	General Fund	$9,974.36
Supplemental reading Materials	Comprehension Tool Kit	Title I	$8,500.00
			Subtotal: $25,360.04

Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Computer Assisted Reading Program	Reading A-Z	General Fund	$749.50
Online instructional Reading program	Kids College	General Fund	$1,500.00
Data Assessment and Disaggregation Program	Performance Matters	Race to the top Grant	$1,202.00
Computer Assisted Reading Program	Spelling City	General Fund	$1,550.00
Computer assisted Reading Program	Reading Counts	Genereal Fund	$500.00
			Subtotal: $5,501.50

Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Book Studies	Books:	Title I	$2,000.00
Comprehenson Tool Kit Training	Comprehension Tool Kits	Title I	$500.00
Prossional Learning Communities	Reading Training based off of Max Thompson's Learning Focused Strategies	Title I	$12,000.00
A Frame work for poverty training	Ruby Payne	Title I	$2,500.00
			Subtotal: $17,000.00

Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $47,861.54

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.

1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.

CELLA Goal #1:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:	
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

CELLA Budget:

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

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

Technology

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

Professional Development

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

Other

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	Our school wide math average for the 2011-2012 school year was 57% (350 students). The state average was 57%. That means our school average meet the state average for students in grades 3rd through 6th.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
For the 2011-2012 school year the percentage of students that achieved a Math FCAT Level 3 was 57% (332 Students).	For the 2012-2013 school year the expected level of performance is to maintain or exceed the 57% (332 Students) of students that achieved an FCAT level 3 on the 2011 Math FCAT.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of parental involvement	* Offer parent workshops to help their children with math * monitor progress of all students regularly through data days, the RtI process and immediate intensive intervention and partner with parents to address the problems.	Principal Assistant Principals S.T.E.M. Coach	Benchmark tests results, workshop evalution forms and monitoring the fidelity of instruction through the RtI process.	Scholastic Math Inventory, Pearson benchmark tests,FCAT, Performance Matters Progress Monitoring
2	*The SSS have changed and are more rigorous.	Provide professional development for teachers. * Continue to use our new textbook that is aligned to the new standards. *Provide on- going intervention and remediation for those who lack prerequisite skills.	District Math Curriculum Specialist Principal Assistant Principal S.T.E.M. Coach	Evaluation forms	Scholastic Math Inventory, Pearson benchmark tests,FCAT Performance Matters Progress Monitoring

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	Our school wide math average for the 2011-2012 school year was 24% (147 students). The state average was 29%. That means our school was 5% below the state average for students in grades 3rd through 6th.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
For the 2011-2012 school year the percentage of students that achieved a reading FCAT Level 4 or 5 for reading was 24% (147 students).	For the 2012-2013 school year the expected level of performance is to maintain or exceed the 24% (147 students) of students that will achieve a Reading FCAT level 4 or 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	* The SSS have been revised and are currently more difficult. They expect students to come with a certain amount of skill and knowledge that they do not have.	*Closely monitor the students' success throughout the year and provide for scaffolded support when necessary. * During the day provide time for enrichment to these students. * Offer before/after school clubs designed to interest and engage this population of students in activities that address the areas that present the most difficulty for this group.	Principal Assistant Principal S.T.E.M. Coach	Progress monitoring	Pearson benchmark assessments, Scholastic Math Inventory, IXL data, Performance Matters

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	Our math percentage of students making learning gains for the 2010-2011 school year was 64% (393 students). Our 2011-2012 percentage of students making learning gains is 79% (368 students) percent. We have seen a 15% increase in the percentage of students making learning gains over last year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The current percentage of students making learning gains in reading is 79% (368 students)	For the 2012-2013 school year the expected level of performance is to meet or exceed the 79% (368 students)of our students that made learning gains last year.

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	* New textbooks * SSS have been revised and are more difficult * Students do not have sufficient background knowledge.	* Provide on-going professional development and support in math for our teachers * monitor students' achievement closely and provide for remediation and scaffolded support as needed	Administration and the Leadership Team	Feedback from teachers regarding the support needed and provided. Progress monitoring of math scores.	Peason Progress Monitoring Tests, Scholastic Math Inventory & FCAT, Performance Matters Progress Monitoring

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

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

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

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

of improvement for the following group:

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	The percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in math for the 2010-2011 school year was 69% (424 students). The percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in math for the 2011-2012 school year was 78% (363 students). That means there has been a 9% increase in the amount of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
For the 2011-2012 school year 78% (363 students) of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.	The expected level of performance for the 2012-2013 school year is to exceed the previous years 78% (363 students) of students that made learning gains in our lowest 25%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	* Lack of parent support * transportation * teacher expertise in teaching math	* provide parent workshops on math * provide on-going training/support in using the new math materials, the new standards and addressing critical SWD issues regarding curriculum and teaching materials.	Administration and the Leadership Team	Progress monitoring, classroom walkthroughs, grade level meetings, Professional Learning Community trainings	Pearson Math Benchmark tests, Scholastic Math Inventory, IXL data, FCAT, Performance Matters Progress Monitoring
2	*The SSS have changed and are more rigorous.	Provide professional development for teachers. * Adopt a new textbook that is aligned to the new standards. *Provide on- going intervention and remediation for those who lack prerequisite skills.	School administration	District Evaluation forms Progress monitoring	Scholastic Math Inventory, Pearson benchmark tests,FCAT, Performance Matters Progress Monitoring
3	Students lack prerequisite skills to be successful at grade level math.	Hire a math intervention specialist to work with children to gain necessary background knowledge and skills	Principal	Progress monitoring data	Scholastic Math Inventory, Pearson benchmark tests,FCAT, Performance Matters Progress Monitoring

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target	
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Elementary School Mathematics Goal # 5A : Over the next five years we plan on reducing our acheivement gap by 50%.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	54%	57%	61%	65%	70%	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	On the 2011-2012 FCAT 59% of our white students, 46% of our black students, 51% of our hispanic students and 100% of our asian students scored a level 3 or higher.

Mathematics Goal #5B:	

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On the 2011-2012 FCAT 59% of our white students, 46% of our black students, 51% of our hispanic students and 100% of our asian students scored a level 3 or higher.	For the 2012-2013 school year our expected level of performance is for our subgroups to meet or exceed the current percentages of students scoring a level 3 or higher.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of prerequisite skills	*Provide before and after school tutoring * Teach with differentiated instruction * Provide immediate intensive intervention *Hire a math interventional specialist to work with small groups of students who are severely behind	Principal Assistant Principals S.T.E.M. Coach Grade level Coaches	Data Analysis, feedback from participants	Workshop evalutions,Data Spreadsheets, Pearson Benchmark tests, FCAT, Performance Matters Progress Monitoring
2	Lack of parent involvement	Offer parent/student math workshops Provide on-going professional development for teachers	Principal Assistant Principals S.T.E.M. Coach Grade level Coaches	Data Analysis, Feedback from participants	Workshop evalutions, Data Spreadsheets, Pearson Benchmark tests, FCAT, Performance Matters Progress Monitoring

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	The percentage of our ELL students performing on or above grade level in math for the 2010-2011 school year was 14%. The percentage of our ELL students performing at or above grade level in math for 2011-2012 school year was 33%. There was a 50% gain between the 2011 and 2012 school year.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The curent level of performance for our ELL students in math is 50%.	Our expected level of performance for the 2012-2013 school year is to meet or exceed the 50% that were at or above grade level for the 2012 school year.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of prerequisite skills	*Provide before and after school tutoring * Teach with differentiated instruction * Provide immediate intensive intervention *Hire a math interventional specialist to work with small groups of students who are severely behind	Principal Assistant Principals S.T.E.M. Coach Grade level Coaches	Data Analysis, feedback from participants	Workshop evalutions,Data Spreadsheets, Pearson Benchmark tests, FCAT, Performance Matters Progress Monitoring
	Lack of parent involvement	Offer parent/student math workshops	Principal Assistant Principals	Data Analysis, Feedback from participants	Workshop evalutions, Data Spreadsheets,

			Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring		Evaluation Tool
2		Provide on-going professional development for teachers	S.T.E.M. Coach Grade level Coaches		Pearson Benchmark tests, FCAT, Performance Matters Progress Monitoring

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	The percentage of our SWD students performing on or above grade level in math for the 2010-2011 school year was 18%. The percentage of our SWD students performing at or above grade level in math for 2011-2012 school year was 24%. There was a 6% gain between the 2011 and 2012 school year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The curent level of performance for our SWD students in math is 24%.	Our expected level of performance for the 2012-2013 school year is to exceed the 24% of SWD students that were at or above grade level for the 2012 school year.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of prerequisite skills	*Provide before and after school tutoring * Teach with differentiated instruction * Provide immediate intensive intervention *Hire a math interventional specialist to work with small groups of students who are severely behind	Principal Assistant Principals S.T.E.M. Coach Grade level Coaches	Data Analysis, Feedback from participants	Workshop evalutions,Data Spreadsheets, Pearson Benchmark tests, FCAT, Performance Matters Progress Monitoring
2	Lack of parent involvement	Offer parent/student math workshops Provide on-going professional development for teachers	Principal Assistant Principals S.T.E.M. Coach Grade level Coaches	Data Analysis, Feedback from participants	Workshop evalutions, Data Spreadsheets, Pearson Benchmark tests, FCAT, Performance Matters Progress Monitoring

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	The percentage of our ED students performing on or above grade level in math for the 2010-2011 school year was 43%. The percentage of our ED students performing at or above grade level in math for 2011-2012 school year was 53%. There was a 10% gain between the 2011 and 2012 school year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The curent level of performance for our ED students in reading is 53%.	Our expected level of performance for the 2012-2013 school year is to meet or exceed the 53% that were at or above grade level for the 2012 school year.

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
	Lack of prerequisite skills	*Provide before and after	Principal	Data Analysis, Feedback	Workshop

		school tutoring * Teach with differentiated instruction * Provide immediate intensive intervention *Hire a math interventional specialist to work with small groups of students who are severely behind	Assistant Principals S.T.E.M. Coach Grade level Coaches	from participants	evelutions,Data Spreadsheets, Pearson Benchmark tests, FCAT, Performance Matters Progress Monitoring
1					
2	Lack of parent involvement	Offer parent/student math workshops Provide on-going professional development for teachers	Principal Assistant Principals S.T.E.M. Coach Grade level Coaches	Data Analysis, Feedback from participants	Workshop evelutions, Data Spreadsheets, Pearson Benchmark tests, FCAT, Performance Matters Progress Monitoring

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
S.T.E.M. Math Trainings	K-6 and ESE	S.T.E.M. Coach	All Instructional Faculty	Throughout the 2012-2013 school year	Follow-up through classroom walkthroughs	Principal Assistant Principals S.T.E.M. Coach
PLC training on differentiating math instruction and data analysis	K-6 and ESE	Assistant Principal and S.T.E.M. Coach	All Instructional Faculty	October 2012 January 2013 March 2013	Follow-up through classroom walkthroughs and RTI	Principal Assistant Principals S.T.E.M. Coach
Data Team Meetings	K-6 and ESE	Assistant Principal and S.T.E.M. Coach	All Instructional Faculty	September 2012 November 2012 February 2013 May 2013	Follow-up through classroom walkthroughs and at future meetings	Principal Assistant Principals S.T.E.M. Coach
Dr Chew Math Trainings	K-6 and ESE	Dr Chew and District Math Specialist	All Instructional Faculty	September 2012	Follow-up through classroom walkthroughs	Principal Assistant Principals S.T.E.M. Coach

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Core Math Instruction	Pearson Envision Series	General Fund	$5,000.00
Supplemental Math Instruction	Pearson Investigations	General Fund	$2,500.00
			Subtotal: $7,500.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Individualized computer program to increase math skills	IXL online math program	General Fund	$3,850.00
Individualized computer program to assess math acheivement	Scholastic Math Inventory	General	$12,000.00
Individualized computer program to increase math skills	Kids College	General Fund	$1,500.00
			Subtotal: $17,350.00

Professional Development

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Professional Learning Communities	Math Training focusing on differentiated instruction and hands-on learning	Title I	$2,140.00
Data Teams	Math data desagrigation training to focus on grade level and student needs	Title I	$8,000.00
S.T.E.M. Math Trainings	Teachers will be given training on how to encorporate S.T.E.M. activities into their lesson plans	Title I	$1,100.00
Dr. Chew Math Trainings	Training provided for our teachers through the district involving teaching new math concepts and ideas	General Fund	$3,500.00
			Subtotal: $14,740.00

Other

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Encourage low performing students to seek tutoring	Tutoring provided by a variety of outside vendors	SES Funds	$120,000.00
Provide Accelerated learning through previewing	During school for level 2 and 3 students in the RTI process.	Title I Funds	$800.00
			Subtotal: $120,800.00
			Grand Total: $160,390.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	Our 5th grade science average for the 2011-2012 school year was 31% (50 students). The state average was 51%. That means our school was 20% below the state average.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
For the 2011-12 school year the percentage of students that achieved a Science FCAT Level 3 was 31% (53 Students).	For the 2012-2013 school year the expected level of performance is to increase the level of acheivement from 31% (53 Students) of students scoring at or above a level 3 to 49% (69 students) scoring at or above a level 3.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	School time constraints negatively impact science instructional time.	Infuse science content reading into the 90 minute reading block to free up time for experiential learning.	Principal Assistant Principals S.T.E.M. Coach Teachers	Progress monitoring Benchmark assessments	Performance Matters Progress Monitoring Grade level Benchmark Assessments
2	Students do not have the necessary science background knowledge when they reach fifth grade.	Encourage more science content reading by supplementing with weekly news articles addressing the SSS. Impliment the districts Turnaround Science	Principal Assistant Prinicpals S.T.E.M. Coach District Science Coordinator Teachers	Progress monitoring benchmark tests and FCAT scores	Performance Matters Progress Monitoring and FCAT

		Stratigies			
3	There is a lack of experiential learning using the scientific process.	Purchase the materials required to conduct experiments. Holding a school-wide Science Fair. Encouraging 5th and 6th grade students to participate in the	Principal Assistant Principals S.T.E.M. Coach District Science Coordinator	Progress monitoring benchmark tests and FCAT scores	Performance Matters Progress Monitoring and FCAT

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	Our 5th grade science average for students scoring a level 4 or above for the 2011-2012 school year was 8% (14 students). The state average was 9%. That means our school was 1% below the state average.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
For the 2011-2012 school year the percentage of students that achieved a Science FCAT Level 4 or 5 was 8% (14 Students).	For the 2012-2013 school year the expected level of performance is to maintain or exceed the 8% (14 Students) of students that achieved a FCAT level 4 or 5 in 2012.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of programs and equipment used to provide opportunities for students to work in an environment that promotes inquiry-based learning.	Purchase equipment and materials to support inquiry-based learning. Host a school-wide Science Fair. Offer after school clubs that focus on FCAT tested	Principal Assistant Principals S.T.E.M. Caoch District Science Coordinator	Science Benchmark test data	Performance Matters Progress Monitoring Grade level benchmark assessments

standards.

Impliment the districts Turn Around Science Stratigies

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Data Team Meetings	K-6 and ESE	Assistant Principal S.T.E.M. Coach	All Instructional Staff	September 2012 November 2012 February 2013 May 2013	Follow-up through classroom walkthroughs and at future meetings	Principal Assistant Principals S.T.E.M. Coach
Professional Learning Communities	K-6 and ESE	Assistant Principal S.T.E.M. Coach	All Instructional Staff	October 2012 January 2013 March 2013	Classroom walkthoughs and Performance Matters Progress Monitoring Assessments	Principal Assistant Principals S.T.E.M. Coach
Dr. Chew Science Summit Trainings	3rd, 4th and 5th Science	Dr. Chew and District Science Specialist	3rd, 4th and 5th grade teachers	November 29th & 30th, December 5th, 6th & 7th	1. Participate in two and a half days of lesson study implementation in their schools. 2. Complete a one-day lesson study follow up session. 3. Attend a two-day follow up workshop.	Principal Assistant Principals S.T.E.M. Coach District Science specialist
S.T.E.M. Science Trainings	K-6 and ESE	S.T.E.M. Coach	All Instructional Staff	Ongoing throughout the 2012-2013 school year	Classroom walkthoughs and Performance Matters Progress Monitoring Assessments	Principal Assistant Principals S.T.E.M. Coach

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Core Science Program	Discovery Education Online Science	General Fund	$5,000.00
		Subtotal: $5,000.00	
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Teacher Instructional Resource	Science A-Z	Title I	$1,678.60
Teacher Instructional Resource	Science Weeklies	Title I	$1,200.00
		Subtotal: $2,878.60	
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
		Subtotal: $0.00	
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Science Equipment for Science Lab	Noncosumable and Consumable resources for science lab	Title I	$1,200.00
		Subtotal: $1,200.00	
		Grand Total: $9,078.60	

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	Our 4th grade writing average for the 2011-2012 school year was 94% (117 students) scoring a 3.5 or higher. The state average was 48%. That means our school was 32% above the state average.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
For the 2011-2012 school year the percentage of students that achieved a Writing FCAT Level 3.5 was 94% (117 students).	For the 2012-2013 school year the expected level of performance is to maintain or exceed the 94% (117 Students) of students that achieved a Writing FCAT level 3 in 2012.

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	Expository prompt given on 2012 FCAT Writes Test.	Classroom teachers will spend October through December teaching only expository essays. Starting in January, will alternate weeks teaching narrative and expository essays.	Principal Assistant Principals Reading Coach Susan Sigler	Classroom teachers will assess writing on a weekly basis. Panther Writes practice tests will be given in August, October, and February.	Panther Writes Progress Monitoring Assessments and Write Score

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

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
narrative and Expository Writing Trainings	K-6	4th Grade Academic Coach	All Instructional Staff	2012-2013 School Year	Monthly Writing Assessments Write Score Administrative Walkthroughs	Principal Assistant principals 4th Grade Academic Coach
Narrative and Excpository Writing Scoring Trainings	3rd and 4th Grade Language Arts	K-8 Reading Specialist	3rd and 4th grade teachers	September 24, 2012	Classroom walkthroughs and Write Score Assessments	Principal Assistant Principal 4th Grade Academic Coach

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Write Score	Prescriptive writing and scoring program	General Fund	$1,764.18
			Subtotal: $1,764.18
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

Narative and expository writing coaching	On goiong coaching on the writing process	Title I	$1,000.00
		Subtotal: $1,000.00	

Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
WES panther writes progress monitoring assessments	Writing assessments will be collected and scored by trained staff	General	$1,750.00
Student Incentives	Awards and Rewards for high acheivement	general Fund	$800.00
		Subtotal: $2,550.00	
		Grand Total: $5,314.18	

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	Our goal is to reduce the percent of students with excessive absenses to less than 20%.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
The current attendance rate for Wadsworth Elementary for the 2011-2012 school year was 95.2% (*68 students).	We would like to see this rate increase this year to 97%.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
The current number of students with excessive absences are 90.	Our goal at Wadsworth Elementary is to decrease this number to under 75.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
The current number of students with excessive tardies are 23.	Our goal at Wadsworth Elementary is to decrease this number to under 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	There are illnesses that run through the school that we can not control.	Give talks on appropriate hand washing. Make sure that students do not come to school when they are ill and spread germs. Parent awareness and early intervention	Principal Assistant Principals School Nurse Attendance Clerk	We will check reports quaterly to review attendance data. We will also look at year end overall percentages to see if what we did was effective.	Skyward 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
No Data Submitted						

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 Suspension Goal #1:	Our goal is to reduce the number of in-school and out-of-school suspensions at Wadsworth Elementary for the 2012-2013 school year.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
The total number of suspensions at Wadsworth Elementary for the 2011-2012 school year were 332 days.	The total expected number of in-school suspensions at Wadsworth Elementary for the 2012-2013 school year is 250 days or less.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
The total number of students suspended at Wadsworth	The total expected number of students suspended at

Elementary during the 2011-2012 school year were 260 students.	Wadsworth Elementary during the 2012-2013 school year is 200 or less.
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
The total number of out-of-school suspensions at Wadsworth Elementary during the 2011-2012 school year were 152.5 days.	The total number of expected out-of-school suspensions at Wadsworth Elementary during the 2012-2013 school year is 130 days or less.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
The total number of students with out-of-school suspensions at Wadsworth Elementary during the 2010-2011 school year were 79 students.	The total expected number of students with out-of-school suspensions at Wadsworth Elementary during the 2012-2013 school year is 65 students or less.

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	I do not think we have any barriers that would keep us from accomplishing this goal.	We will focus more on our school wide tier I interventions. We will utilize our morning announcements to reinforce our school expectations and district code of conduct.	Fred Terry Assistant Principal, PBS Team Members	We will compare our data from the 2009-2010 school year to determine the effectiveness of our current interventions.	Total number of referrals per grade level
2	Using our RTI process to correct behavior.	Meeting with teachers through PLC meetings and doing training to help teachers understand the RTI process.	Fred Terry Assistant Principal, John Fanelli Assistant Principal, Ellen Kincaid Behavior Specialist	Reduction of referrals	We will meet as a team to help the teacher put interventions in place that may help the student with behavior.

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

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

Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Positive Behavior Supports Training	Posters, Books, Substitutes	Title I	$500.00
			Subtotal: $500.00

Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Positive Rewards and Awards	Chance Tickets, Purr, Store, Safety Patrol, Intervention Groups, 6th grade no referral party, Terrific Kids Assemblies, Perfect Attendance Awards, Mentoring Program	PTO, District Grants, Principal's Account, Kiwanis Club	$1,000.00
			Subtotal: $1,000.00
			Grand Total: $1,500.00

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	We will create successful students by working with our parents to understand and use successful learning strategies both when presenting challenging yet engaging academic instruction in the classroom and practicing newly learned material at home.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
Less than 10% of parents attended any given function at Wadsworth Elementary during the 2010-2011 school year.	The expected level of parent involvement at Wadsworth Elementary for the 2011-2012 school year is over 10% of our population.

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Parent work hours	Hold meetings at a time that is most convenient for parents	Principal	parent feedback, attendance data	Sign in sheets
2	Transportation to school events.	Bring an event to the neighborhood	Administration, Literacy Team	parent feedback, attendance data	Sign in sheets
3	Lack of knowledge on how to best help thei children with school work.	Provide parent workshops to build their academic capacity in reading and math.	Leadership Team	parent feedback	Evaluation forms
4	Parents feel intimidated	Provide fun, welcoming, non-academic activities such as a Kindergarten Boo Hoo Breakfast and the Fall Festival	Administration, PTO,	Attendance data, parent & student feedback.	Parent Involvement summary report

5	Cultural differences create a sense of uneasiness and unwillingness to participate	*Provide critical signs in may languages * use transact services to translate written communications to the parents in their native language. *Provide interpreters and translators at meetings when necessary	Principal	Parent feedback, attendance data	Sign in sheets

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Parent/Student Workshop	Families Building Better Readers (Make it, Take it)	Title I	$500.00
Parent/Student Workshop	Step-Up to Literacy (make it, Take it)	Title I	$500.00
Parent/Student Workshop	Biker Building Better Readers	Title I	$500.00
Parent/Student Workshop	K-3 Math Night (Make it, Take it)	Title I	$500.00
Parent/Student Workshop	3rd-6th Math Night (Make it, Take it)	Title I	$500.00
Parent/Student Workshop	4th Grade Writing FCAT Night	Title I	$500.00
		Subtotal: $3,000.00	
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
		Subtotal: $0.00	
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
		Subtotal: $0.00	
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
School/Home Seasonal Celebration	Fall Festival	Internal Accounts	$500.00
School/Home Seasonal	Holiday Shop	Parent-Teacher Orginization/Internal	$500.00
Student Recognition	Quarterly Academic Acheivement Award Assemblies	Internal Accounts	$1,000.00

Student Recognition	Terrific Kids Awards	Kiwanis Club	$1,200.00
School/Home Seasonal Celebration	Dr. Suess' Birthday Celebration	Internal Account, General Fund and Title I	$500.00
Parent/Student Workshop	Bikers Building Better Readers	Internal Accounts	$500.00
			Subtotal: $4,200.00
			Grand Total: $7,200.00

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:	1. WES will increase the percentage of its students scoring at or above the proficiency rating on the 5th Grade FCAT Science score from 40% to 50%. 2. WES will increase the percentage of standards mastered on the 3rd-6th Grade Science Performance Matters assessments from 20% to 50%. 3. Teachers will receive science and engineering based professional development during 2 of the professional development days during the school year. 4. WES administration will provide teachers with the necessary supplies to complete 5 STEM challenge activities with their classes during the school year. 5. The STEM Coach will model lessons for teachers using the discovery method for teaching science. 6. The STEM Coach will provide curricular support by assisting teachers with developing lessons that use the highest levels of Bloom's Taxonomy.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of knowledge base and resources to adequatley instruct.	WES has provided a STEM Coach to help teachers pull together resouces and expand their knowledge base.	Principal Assistant principals S.T.E.M. Coach	Classroom Walkthroughs Ongoing Coaching	Performance Matters Progress Monitoring Science Common Assessments FCAT
2	Historically, curriculum training for elementary teachers has focussed on intense reading instruction.	Offer professional development for teachers that focus on teaching high level math and science skills.	Administration	Classroom walkthroughs and lesson plan review.	FASTe
3	Teachers have complained that science activities require too much out-of-pocket expenses and preparation time	Provide teachers with easy access to supplies needed for hands-on science and math lessons.	STEM Coach	Monitor scores of common assessments to ensure that students are achieving mastery of skills.	Common Assessments Performance Matters
4	The school's assessment scores indicate that students are not understanding the higher level questions related to the National Science Standards.	Create model lessons that include discovery teaching and high level questioning skills.	STEM Coach Reading Coach	Monitor progress monitoring scores for non-fictional reading and science concepts.	Performance Matters

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

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

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Core Reading Program	Harcourt Story Town	General Fund	$783.00
Reading	Supplemental Reading Program	SRA Reading Mastery	General Fund	$6,102.68
Reading	Supplemental Reading Materials in the content area	Florida Studies Weekly Time for Kids National Geographic Weekly Readers	General Fund	$9,974.36
Reading	Supplemental reading Materials	Comprehension Tool Kit	Title I	$8,500.00
Mathematics	Core Math Instruction	Pearson Envision Series	General Fund	$5,000.00
Mathematics	Supplemental Math Instruction	Pearson Investigations	General Fund	$2,500.00
Science	Core Science Program	Discovery Education Online Science	General Fund	$5,000.00
Writing	Write Score	Prescriptive writing and scoring program	General Fund	$1,764.18
Parent Involvement	Parent/Student Workshop	Families Building Better Readers (Make it, Take it)	Title I	$500.00
Parent Involvement	Parent/Student Workshop	Step-Up to Literacy (make it, Take it)	Title I	$500.00
Parent Involvement	Parent/Student Workshop	Biker Building Better Readers	Title I	$500.00
Parent Involvement	Parent/Student Workshop	K-3 Math Night (Make it, Take it)	Title I	$500.00
Parent Involvement	Parent/Student Workshop	3rd-6th Math Night (Make it, Take it)	Title I	$500.00
Parent Involvement	Parent/Student Workshop	4th Grade Writing FCAT Night	Title I	$500.00
				Subtotal: $42,624.22

Technology

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Computer Assisted Reading Program	Reading A-Z	General Fund	$749.50
Reading	Online instructional Reading program	Kids College	General Fund	$1,500.00
Reading	Data Assessment and Disaggregation Program	Performance Matters	Race to the top Grant	$1,202.00
Reading	Computer Assisted Reading Program	Spelling City	General Fund	$1,550.00
Reading	Computer assisted Reading Program	Reading Counts	Genereal Fund	$500.00
Mathematics	Individualized computer program to increase math skills	IXL online math program	General Fund	$3,850.00
Mathematics	Individualized computer program to assess math acheivement	Scholastic Math Inventory	General	$12,000.00
Mathematics	Individualized computer program to increase math skills	Kids College	General Fund	$1,500.00
Science	Teacher Instructional Resource	Science A-Z	Title I	$1,678.60
Science	Teacher Instructional Resource	Science Weeklies	Title I	$1,200.00
				Subtotal: $25,730.10

Professional Development

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Book Studies	Books:	Title I	$2,000.00
Reading	Comprehenson Tool Kit Training	Comprehension Tool Kits	Title I	$500.00
		Reading Training based		

Reading	Prossional Learning Communities	off of Max Thompson's Learning Focused Strategies	Title I	$12,000.00
Reading	A Frame work for poverty training	Ruby Payne	Title I	$2,500.00
Mathematics	Professional Learning Communities	Math Training focusing on differentiated instruction and hands-on learning	Title I	$2,140.00
Mathematics	Data Teams	Math data desagrigation training to focus on grade level and student needs	Title I	$8,000.00
Mathematics	S.T.E.M. Math Trainings	Teachers will be given training on how to encorporate S.T.E.M. activities into their lesson plans	Title I	$1,100.00
Mathematics	Dr. Chew Math Trainings	Training provided for our teachers through the district involving teaching new math concepts and ideas	General Fund	$3,500.00
Writing	Narative and expository writing coaching	On goiong coaching on the writing process	Title I	$1,000.00
Suspension	Positive Behavior Supports Training	Posters, Books, Substitutes	Title I	$500.00
				Subtotal: $33,240.00

Other

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Mathematics	Encourage low performing students to seek tutoring	Tutoring provided by a variety of outside vendors	SES Funds	$120,000.00
Mathematics	Provide Accelerated learning through previewing	During school for level 2 and 3 students in the RTI process.	Title I Funds	$800.00
Science	Science Equipment for Science Lab	Noncosumable and Consumable resources for science lab	Title I	$1,200.00
Writing	WES panther writes progress monitoring assessments	Writing assessments will be collected and scored by trained staff	General	$1,750.00
Writing	Student Incentives	Awards and Rewards for high acheivement	general Fund	$800.00
Suspension	Positive Rewards and Awards	Chance Tickets, Purr, Store, Safety Patrol, Intervention Groups, 6th grade no referral party, Terrific Kids Assemblies, Perfect Attendance Awards, Mentoring Program	PTO, District Grants, Principal's Account, Kiwanis Club	$1,000.00
Parent Involvement	School/Home Seasonal Celebration	Fall Festival	Internal Accounts	$500.00
Parent Involvement	School/Home Seasonal	Holiday Shop	Parent-Teacher Orginization/Internal	$500.00
Parent Involvement	Student Recognition	Quarterly Academic Acheivement Award Assemblies	Internal Accounts	$1,000.00
Parent Involvement	Student Recognition	Terrific Kids Awards	Kiwanis Club	$1,200.00
Parent Involvement	School/Home Seasonal Celebration	Dr. Suess' Birthday Celebration	Internal Account, General Fund and Title I	$500.00
Parent Involvement	Parent/Student Workshop	Bikers Building Better Readers	Internal Accounts	$500.00
				Subtotal: $129,750.00
				Grand Total: $231,344.32

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

j͡n Priority	j͡n Focus	j͡n Prevent	j͡n NA

Are you a reward school: ⊙ Yes ⊙ No

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

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
Provide funding for PALS (Panthers Accelerated Learning) summer school program.	$4,000.00

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

The main activity of the School Advisory Council is to monitor the implementation of the school improvement plan through quarterly updates and make recommendations for improvement throughout the school year. they will determine how the SAC funds are allocated to help raise student achievement.

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Flagler School District
LEWIS E. WADSWORTH ELEMENTARY
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	79%	72%	90%	46%	287	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	71%	64%			135	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	67% (YES)	69% (YES)			136	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					558	
Percent Tested = 98%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Flagler School District
LEWIS E. WADSWORTH ELEMENTARY
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	79%	75%	92%	48%	294	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	66%	61%			127	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?	52% (YES)	50% (YES)			102	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					523	
Percent Tested = 98%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested