# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: LELY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Collier

Principal: Dr. Susan L. Barcellino

SAC Chair: Mr. Sam Samaha

Superintendent: Dr. Kamela Patton

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 10/15/2012



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)/<br>Certification(s)   | # of<br>Years at<br>Current<br>School | # of Years as<br>an<br>Administrator | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year) |
|-----------|-------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| Principal | Dr. Susan<br>Barcellino | Bachelor of Science- Elementary Education- Indiana University of PA  Masters of Science- Curriculum & Instruction- University of Pittsburgh  Doctorate Ed.D. Educational Leadership- Duquesne University | 3                                     | 12                                   | 2010-2011: A<br>2011-2012: C  |
|           |                         | Bachelor of<br>Science in Social<br>Sciences<br>-Minor: Physical   |                                       |                                      |   |

| Assis Principal | Dr. Tobin<br>Walcott | Education Grand Valley State University  Masters of Science- Educational Leadership Nova Southeastern University  Doctorate Ed.D. Educational Leadership Nova Southeastern University |  |  | 2010-2011: B<br>2011-2012: C |
|-----------------|----------------------|---|--|--|------------------------------|
|-----------------|----------------------|---|--|--|------------------------------|

## 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)/<br>Certification(s)  | # of<br>Years at<br>Current<br>School | # of Years as<br>an<br>Instructional<br>Coach | Prior Performance Record (include<br>prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide<br>Assessment Achievement Levels,<br>Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and<br>AMO progress along with the<br>associated school year) |
|--------------|---------------------|---|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| Reading      | Amanda Blind        | BS in Early<br>Childhood<br>Education (Pre-<br>K-3), Certified<br>Elementary<br>Education K-<br>6, Gifted K-12,<br>Reading K-12   |                                       |   | 2010-2011: B<br>2011-2012: B   |
| Math         | Linda<br>Robitaille | BS in University Without Walls: concentration in Elementary Education, MS in "Elementary Mathematical Problem Solving", Elementary Education K-6, Middle School Math 6-9, ESOL K-12 |                                       | 4   | 2010-2011: A<br>2011-2012: A   |

## EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

|   | Description of Strategy  | Person<br>Responsible                     | Projected<br>Completion<br>Date           | Not Applicable (If not, please explain why) |
|---|--|---|---|---|
| 1 | CCPS New Teacher Orientation Meeting   | Principal<br>Assistant<br>Principal       | August 2012                               |   |
| 2 | Assign mentors to new teachers   | Principal                                 | August 2012                               |   |
| 3 | Monthly meetings with new teachers   | School Based<br>Leadership<br>Team (SBLT) | June 2013                                 |   |
| 4 | Weekly PLC Meetings  | SBLT                                      | June 2013                                 |   |
| 5 | Site based professional development at Faculty Meetings, on Early Release Days, and Staff Development Days | SBLT                                      | June 2013                                 |   |
| 6 | Attend CCPS Transfer Fair and Recruitment Fair   | SBLT                                      | Spring 2013                               |   |
| 7 | Interview/hire only candidates who are HQT   | SBLT                                      | Prior to,<br>during, and<br>end of school |   |

| L |  |                                     | year.     |  |
|---|--|-------------------------------------|-----------|--|
| 8 | Provide opportunities for new teachers to observe in classrooms throughout the school. | Principal<br>Assistant<br>Principal | June 2013 |  |

# Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

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

# Staff Demographics

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

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

| Total Number<br>of<br>Instructional<br>Staff | % of<br>First-Year<br>Teachers |           | % of<br>Teachers<br>with 6-14<br>Years of<br>Experience | % of<br>Teachers<br>with 15+<br>Years of<br>Experience | % of<br>Teachers<br>with<br>Advanced<br>Degrees | % Highly<br>Effective<br>Teachers | % Reading | % National<br>Board<br>Certified<br>Teachers | % ESOL<br>Endorsed<br>Teachers |
|--|--------------------------------|-----------|---|--|---|-----------------------------------|-----------|--|--------------------------------|
| 64   | 4.7%(3)                        | 15.6%(10) | 45.3%(29)   | 34.4%(22)  | 43.8%(28)                                       | 100.0%(64)                        | 14.1%(9)  | 0.0%(0)                                      | 76.6%(49)                      |

# Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

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

| Mentor Name   | Mentee<br>Assigned | Rationale<br>for Pairing   | Planned Mentoring<br>Activities   |
|---------------|--------------------|--|---|
| Megan Noe     | Emily<br>Denlinger | Mrs. Noe is a first grade teacher, has received clinical education training, and has successfully mentored teachers in her career.         | Weekly meetings to review lesson plans, instructional strategies, and differentiation of instruction  Monthly New Teacher Orientation meetings                  |
| Sherie Barton | Linda<br>Pattyson  | Mrs. Barton is a Reading Resource Teacher, has received clinical education training, and has successfully mentored teachers in her career. | Weekly meetings to<br>review lesson plans,<br>instructional strategies,<br>and differentiation of<br>instruction<br>Monthly New Teacher<br>Orientation meetings |
| Tammy Simmons | Michael Nappi      | Mrs. Simmons is a second grade teacher, has received clinical education training, and  | Weekly meetings to review lesson plans, instructional strategies, and differentiation of instruction.   |

|              |              |  | Monthly New Teacher<br>Orientation meetings.   |
|--------------|--------------|--|--|
| Sarah Barber | Bonnie Fauls | reacher, has received clinical education training, and has | Weekly meetings to review lesson plans, instructional strategies, and differentiation of instruction  Monthly New Teacher Orientation meetings |

# ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

# Coordination and Integration

#### Note: For Title I schools only

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

#### Title I, Part A

#### Title I, Part A

- The Collier County School district provides a systematic and strategic approach to providing services through the District Strategic Plan, 3 Year Academic Plan, the K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan and District Collaborative Planning process. Goals and objectives of each program and department are aligned with these overarching district plans. Additionally:
- Title I Parts A, C, D, and School Improvement (1003a and 1003g), Title II Part A and Title III are managed out of the same Federal and State Grants and English Language Learner Office in Collier County. They share administrative staff so that oversight, coordination, budgeting, staffing, and monitoring are efficiently and effectively coordinated. In addition to informal communications, monthly formal administrative meetings are held to discuss program needs, issues and coordinate efforts.
- Support staff of the Title I Part A, Title I Part C, Title I Part D, and Title X programs meet regularly to coordinate efforts and receive joint staff development for improving their services.
- Regularly scheduled Curriculum and Instruction department meetings are scheduled that include district level program coordinators, including IDEA, Perkins, Head Start, Supplemental Academic Instruction, Advanced Placement Initiative, Career and Technical Education.
- LEA, Title I Basic, Title I Migrant, Title X coordinate services to assist homeless parents of homeless children, and shelters representing the homeless children to resolve problems concerning registration and educational services at Title I schools. The LEA provides services in coordination with the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act.
- Title I and District joint funding of the Homeless Liaison staff position and use of additional Title I Part A funds to provide after school tutorials for homeless students in non-Title I schools.
- Title I Part A, Title II Part A and RTTT fund exam reimbursements to ensure staff meet HQT Requirements.
- Title I Part A funds used in collaboration with Title I SIG 1003g, Title II Part A and Reading to fund Academic Coaches at Elementary, Middle and High schools, depending on school DA status and professional learning needs of school faculty.

#### Title I, Part C- Migrant

#### Title I, Part C- Migrant

- Title I Migrant, Title I Basic, Title III funds are coordinated to provide at risk students with supplemental instructional support and resources in form of supplemental resource teachers, counselors, paraprofessionals, tutors.
- Title I Migrant, Title I Basic and Title II Part A funds are coordinated to provide customized professional learning that ensures students receive high quality, differentiated instruction.
- Title I Migrant and school collaboration occurs with local eye doctor to provide eye exams and glasses at no cost to migrant students in need or at a discounted price to our program.
- Coordination occurs with Homeless Liaison staff and Title I Migrant staff in identifying eligible students and families that can be served as homeless.

#### Title I, Part D

#### Title II

#### Title I

• Title II, Part A collaborates with Collier County Public School's Human Resources in providing funds that are used to

reimburse teachers striving to meet Highly Qualified

- Teacher requirements through subject area tests. This helps ensure that all teachers meet HQT requirements and provide high quality instruction.
- Title II funds will support schools with instructional coaching, lesson planning and professional learning by funding several teachers on special assignment in areas of Math and Science; these staff will integrate with the instructional staff at school sites to ensure high quality instruction differentiated to address unique student needs.
- $\bullet \ \ Coordination \ of \ professional \ learning \ activities, \ including \ those \ funded \ by \ Title \ II, \ occurs \ through \ the \ following \ activities:$
- o Individual schools conduct annual staff development surveys to determine staff development needs. A district comprehensive Staff Development Plan and consolidated planning coordinates all available district resources.
- o Staff development within a school (including the use of Title I money) is coordinated through the SIP/Title I Plan and comprehensive needs assessment.
- o Title I and II in-service is coordinated through Learning Support Services departmental curriculum staff.
- o The Director of Federal and State Grants, Executive Director of Federal and State Grants and ELL, the Chief Academic Officer review the professional development allocations in the Title I plans and in the Title II project.
- o Reading coaches receive ongoing professional development through their bi-monthly literacy team meetings. The teacher's individual plan (IPDP) is based upon an assessment of student learning needs, and this analysis of student achievement data in reading is essential to the creation of each teacher's professional development plan.
- o The district will provide ongoing professional development and support for principals on classroom walk-through strategies, including how to give feedback to teachers.

#### Title III

#### Title III

Title I and Title III administrators have met to collaborate by providing Title I schools the optimum resources necessary to bring improve academic instruction. This has allowed them to maximize productivity while also eliminating duplicity of services, use of personnel and instructional materials. There are five major areas of collaboration: 1) tutoring, 2) teacher training, 3) parental involvement activities, 4) highly qualified personnel and 5) before and after school programs to address the needs of our most needy students in order to improve student achievement and development while meeting the Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs). Upon reviewing and analyzing the English Language Learners' (ELLs) data, found key factors that prevented the District from achieving the Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs). Among those factors are included two groups:

Group 1 presented the following challenges:

- 1) Lack of previous education or limited education,
- 2) Lack of literacy in heritage language
- 3) Lack of academic skills in ELLs' heritage language,
- 4) Lack of consistency in attending school in home country and/or in the United States, and
- 5) Lack of parental support in the home.

Group 2 presented the following challenges:

- 1) Uninterrupted education.
- 2) Average literacy in heritage language.
- 3) Less than average academic proficiency in heritage language.
- 4) Consistency in attending school, and
- 5) Some parental support in the home.
- (See District School Improvement Plan for English Language Learners.)

#### Title X- Homeless

#### Title X- Homeless

The Collier County School District, through a No Child Left Behind grant, provides support services and resources for homeless students and their families. A homeless liaison works with school staff, Title I Migrant staff, and community agencies, and local shelters to identify eligible students, expedite school registration and bus transportation, as well as provide school supplies, shoes and uniforms. The homeless liaison aids in securing before and after school care for students when appropriate. The liaison also monitors enrollment data, attendance records, and grades for all homeless students through the district database and school contacts. Coordination services are provided by the LEA as they relate to the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act.

The support staff from the Title I Part A, Title I Part C, Title I Part D, and Title X programs regularly meets to coordinate services as well as participate in staff development. Homeless students and their parents are served by LEA, Title I Basic, Title I Migrant personnel and shelters to address issues concerning the registration and educational services at Title I schools. Title I and district funding provides for after school tutorials for homeless students in non-title I schools.

| Supplemental | Academic Instruction (S | SAI) |  |  |
|--------------|-------------------------|------|--|--|
|              |                         |      |  |  |

| Violence | Preve | ention | Programs |
|----------|-------|--------|----------|
|----------|-------|--------|----------|

Nutrition Programs: The District is offering breakfast at no charge to all students through the USDA Provision 2 breakfast program. All reduced students are receiving lunch at no charge. The NSLP Fresh Fruit and Vegetable program is being offered in twelve elementary schools. We are continuing to institute the OrganWise program through the University of Florida in qualifying elementary schools.

#### Housing Programs

#### Housing Programs - NA

The Collier County School District, through a No Child Left Behind grant, provides support services and resources for homeless students and their families. A homeless liaison works with school staff, Title I Migrant staff, and community agencies, and local shelters to identify eligible students, expedite school registration and bus transportation, as well as provide school supplies, shoes and uniforms. The homeless liaison aids in securing before and after school care for students when appropriate. The liaison also monitors enrollment data, attendance records, and grades for all homeless students through the district database and school contacts. Coordination services are provided by the LEA as they relate to the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act

The support staff from the Title I Part A, Title I Part C, Title I Part D, and Title X programs regularly meets to coordinate services as well as participate in staff development. Homeless students and their parents are served by LEA, Title I Basic, Title I Migrant personnel and shelters to address issues concerning the registration and educational services at Title I schools. Title I and district funding provides for after school tutorials for homeless students in non-title I schools.

#### Head Start

Head Start: The Head Start Program in Collier County Public Schools serves 712 four-year-olds in targeted elementary sites based on the needs of the parents and students. The Head Start Program includes students identified for ESE services, Voluntary Prekindergarten (VPK) students, and students identified as Title I and Migrant. By coordinating efforts and funding, the all-encompassing Head Start Program is able to serve approximately 300 additional eligible students than the funding from Head Start alone supports.

Head Start provides comprehensive services to eligible families and their children. These comprehensive services include education, social services, parent involvement, and health services. These services are coordinated with the requirements of the other funding sources as a seamless service for parents and our 4-year-old students. The Head Start Program is a vital part of our school community and these students are included in all academic and extra-curricular/enrichment programs as appropriate.

#### Adult Education

#### Career and Technical Education

#### Career and Technical Education

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.

#### Career and Technical Education

Career Education students are offered the opportunity to earn a third party industry approved certification which is designed to demonstrate to potential employers the technical skills and abilities for the students. Students also have the opportunity to earn the Florida Ready to Work Credential which is designed to demonstrate to future employers the reading and mathematics skills of the students. The purpose of both credentials is to integrate real world skills and abilities to the instructional objectives for both career and academic courses. In addition all CE programs offer the opportunity to include both On-the-Job Training and or Executive Internships to further show the relationships between high school programs and real world skills.

#### Job Training

#### Job Training

Students are offered Job Training programs through a variety of programs. All CE programs offer On-The-Job Training programs for situations where students are paid. Non-Paid opportunities are offered as Executive Internships. Students may also enroll for the Volunteer class which is offered in many school locations.

In addition to the Career and Technical courses available to all students, the Collier Skill Training for Employment Program (CO-STEP) is designed to meet the unique needs of students with disabilities. This program provides individualized instruction, training, and counseling services to assist students with disabilities in successfully developing marketable skills in career and technical coursework as well as on-the-job training in the community.

| - | 1. |  |
|---|----|--|
|   |    |  |
|   |    |  |

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Principal- Dr. Susan Barcellino Assistant Principal- Dr. Tobin Walcott Invention Support Specialist- Meredith Kirby

Reading Coach- Amanda Blind School Psychologist- Kim Tucker Guidance Counselor- Emily Denlinger Behavior Specialist- Denise Scappaticcio Speech - Emily Graeve, Nicole Richards

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 functions as a school-based Response to Intervention problem solving team. A member of the MTSS Leadership Team meets weekly with grade level PLC teams to review on-going progress monitoring data and to ensure interventions are being met with fidelity. The team then meets weekly to discuss student progress with information attained through grade-level PLC meetings. The students identified through data analysis are brought to the team to determine effectiveness of interventions. Data showing successful interventions will be used to inactivate progress monitoring plans. Interventions that are not showing success will be altered through frequency and intensity of the interventions in place. As a cohesive team, the MTSS Leadership Team meets with grade levels on a quarterly basis to review changes to interventions that have been made, move students to different tiers, discuss the need for further evaluation and celebrate successful interventions. At this time, parent conference notes are reviewed through Data Warehouse, to ensure parental involvement is taking place.

The Principal, Assistant Principal and Intervention Support Specialist will provide leadership and guidance to ensure the implementation of MTSS with fidelity while providing resources and opportunities for staff development.

The Principal and Assistant Principal will coordinate school procedures and activities regarding MTSS and provide leadership for site-based staff development. The Intervention Support Specialist will attend district meetings where current state and county initiatives are discussed.

The Reading Coach will attend MTSS meetings and assist the MTSS teams in planning and implementing reading and language arts interventions and assessments. The Reading Coach will support teams in developing problem statements, assist with data collection, and take part in professional development and instructional support.

The Guidance Counselor will attend PBS meetings as needed to support behavioral or social-emotional concerns. She will support data collection, student refocus papers, and be the parent/community contact.

The School Psychologist will participate in MTSS meetings as needed to assist in data collection and interpretation, then guide teams in the selection and implementation of interventions.

The ESE team, along with the speech teachers, will participate in MTSS meetings as needed to assist in data interpretation and the selection of interventions.

The ELL Resource Teacher will participate in grade level MTSS meetings and support teachers in problem identification, data collection, and implementation of interventions.

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?

Teachers receive Professional Development on the MTSS model during Early Release Days provided by the Intervention Support Specialist. Teachers have learned how to triangulate data for academic and behavioral concerns and identify individual student needs. Progress Monitoring Plans (PMP's) are written using specific data and research-based interventions. Student progress is monitored through Data Warehouse and weekly Professional Learning Communities (PLC) meetings. Math and writing are two new areas where Lely needs to focus on this year. Each grade level team has a facilitator to ensure that protocol for the meeting is followed. During PLC's each team will come up with two common assessments every nine weeks. Week 1 the common assessment in math will be created. Week 2 the common assessment in writing will be created. Week 3 the data from the math will be disaggregated and teachers will discuss strengths and weaknesses. Week 4, the data from the writing be disaggregated and teachers will discuss strengths and weaknesses.

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.

Collier County's web-based Data Warehouse application will be the data management system used to summarize assessments. Data Warehouse contains authentic student performance data and is linked to the Florida Center for Reading Research's Progress Monitoring and Reporting Systems (PMRN), which receives and houses assessment data from the Florida Assessment in Reading (FAIR) system. District baseline assessments are given in reading, math, science and writing in September. This data is used in conjunction with prior year FCAT scores to determine student needs. Students still not making progress will be brought before the MTSS Leadership Team to determine more intensive interventions. Behavior will be addressed through PBS using Student Pass to document the interventions used by teachers. The guidance counselor will be involved in the process. The targeted intervention called "Check In, Check Out" will also be documented through Student Pass.

Kindergarten: Reading-FLRKS, FAIR, District Math Assessments, Custom Assessments

First Grade: Reading- FAIR, District Reading Benchmark Assessments, District Math Benchmark Assessments, District Writing Benchmark Assessments, Formative Assessments, Custom Assessments

Second Grade: Reading- FAIR, District Reading Benchmark Assessments, District Math Benchmark Assessments, District Writing Benchmark Assessments, Formative Assessments, Custom Assessments

Third Grade: Reading- FAIR, FCAT, District Reading Benchmark Assessments, District Math Benchmark Assessments, District Writing Benchmark Assessment, Formative Assessments, Custom Assessments, District Science Benchmark Assessments

Fourth Grade: Reading- FAIR, FCAT, District Reading Benchmark Assessments, District Math Benchmark Assessments, District Writing Benchmark Assessments, Formative Assessments, Custom Assessments, District Science Benchmark Assessments

Fifth Grade: Reading- FAIR, FCAT, District Reading Benchmark Assessments, District Math Benchmark Assessments, District Writing Benchmark Assessment, Formative Assessments, Custom Assessments, District Science Benchmark Assessments

Behavior: MTSS grade level teams along with the School Leadership Team meet to discuss behaviors, referrals, and refocuses. After three minor offenses the student receives a major referral. The guidance counselor in conjunction with the Intervention Support Specialist may be a part of these meetings. Positive Behavior Support is used as a way to encourage students to do their best. Tier 2 and Tier 3 progress monitoring plans for behavior will be written for students demonstrating continuous non-compliance of school-wide expectations. Data will be reviewed by the INSS, Behavior specialist, and Psychologist to monitor, chart, and graph student progress.

Baseline data will include: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)

Progress Monitoring: PMRN, Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM)

Midyear: Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), quarterly formative assessments

End of Year: FAIR, FCAT, end-of-year formative assessments

Frequency of Data Days: Grade level team meetings are once per week, or as needed, PLC meetings are monthly, focusing on specific data and assessments, MTSS facilitator are once a month, or as needed.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional Development will be provided during pre-school staff development days, early release days and common teacher planning by the Intervention Support Specialist. The MTSS Leadership Team will also evaluate additional staff Professional Development needs will be identified during the quarterly MTSS Leadership meetings. An Intervention Support Specialist and PBS Coach have been designated in every school. The role of the Intervention Support Specialist is to oversee the problem solving process, ensure the integrity and consistency of implementation of the process, and facilitate the MTSS meetings. The role of the PBS coach is to facilitate and oversee the PBS process, hold monthly PBS meetings and provide staff with data for positive referrals and infractions.

The entire staff will be trained on how to properly write PMP's, using baseline date to evaluate the need for interventions and how to implement them with fidelity. Research-based interventions will be provided for teachers to implement. Teachers will be made aware of the resources available to them regarding the MTSS process through faculty meetings and early release days. Some resources include on-line courses available on ANGEL containing websites, video clips, and tutorials for staff to review independently.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

MTSS will be supported through trainings and monthly team meetings. Specific trainings will be presented on writing datadriven PMPs, creating custom assessments, monitoring progress and research-based interventions. Teachers will meet in grade level team meetings, as well as one-on-one meetings with the Intervention Support Specialist to review student data and meet student needs. Teachers will implement with fidelity intervention groups and be monitored by the MTSS Leadership Team. The MTSS Leadership Team will meet with grade level PLC's on a quarterly basis, or as needed, to make changes to intervention and monitor student progress.

# Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Principal- Dr. Susan Barcellino

Assistant Principal- Dr. Tobin Walcott

Intervention Support Specialist- Meredith Kirby

Reading Coach- Amanda Blind

Reading Resource- Sherie Barton

Pre-K- Teresa Monty

First Grade- Alyssa Heberle

Second Grade- Tammy Simmons

Third Grade- Jamie Sebold

Fourth Grade- Elizabeth Hall

Fifth Grade- Sara Johnessee

ESE- Anessa Lubas

Autism- Cynthia Craft-Mueller

Related Arts- Michael Miller

Media Specialist- Miffy Ruggiero

ELL- Jodi Schreiber

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

The Literacy Leadership Team is chaired by the Reading Coach with the Principal and Assistant Principal in supporting roles. The Literacy Leadership Team meets monthly to discuss the School Improvement Plan reading goals, the effectiveness of the core curriculum, the instructional strategies, and the implementation of writing across the curriculum. The teachers will administer quarterly writing benchmark assessments. This will show strengths and weaknesses in each student's writing to provide differentiated instruction. We will monitor instruction and student writing as we focus on revisions in all grade levels. Representation from every grade level and every department is represented on the Literacy Leadership Team to ensure information is shared with all staff members at weekly team meetings.

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

The major initiative of the Literacy Leadership Team this year will include increasing our resources and use of informational and complex text through close reading strategies. All teams will utilize their weekly PLCs to analyze and track common and formative assessment data and share instructional strategies that are producing results. This analysis will allow teacher to target specific skill areas that need improvement, then provide research-based instruction. Our reading coach will continue to model effective instructional writing strategies that follow our district initiative Write Traits. She will also model writing instruction as students learn to respond to reading with evidence and support from the text. Leveled Literacy Intervention will be used in as an intensive intervention for students reading below grade level. Progress monitoring will continue to be a method used to help struggling students improve in reading and writing.

#### Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification View uploaded file (Uploaded on 9/21/2012)

## \*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.

All schools implement a minimum of two transition activities for incoming kindergarten students and their families each year. The spring event includes an orientation for parents and students with registration available at that time. At this event, parents and students meet the teachers, visit classrooms, learn about the expectations and the curriculum, and tour the

school.

At the spring Orientation and also upon registration, a booklet (available in multiple languages) is provided to all parents. This booklet is designed to help parents look at their child's physical, social, emotional, and cognitive development. It provides checklists and tips to help guide them as they work and play with their child. The checklists contain items that are important to the child's success in kindergarten and are specifically designed for four-year-olds. It also contains school enrollment information and suggestions for the first day of school.

Before school begins in mid-August, the schools hold an Open House for all students and parents to attend. The students and parents are given the opportunity to visit their classrooms, tour the school, visit the cafeteria and media center. This helps with the transition to the start of school.

The School District of Collier County is also a VPK provider, both during the school year and during the summer session. The school year program includes the Head Start/ESE Inclusion/Title I/Migrant prekindergarten classes and a few full-day and half-day VPK/child care classes. These prekindergarten programs are provided in various school sites across the county. Both programs provide opportunities for students to learn the basics for success in school and also provide an easy transition to kindergarten for the students.

FAA eligible students with disabilities: Emphasis, training, and support in Universal Design for Learning (UDL) will provide focal points for considering effective strategies and technologies to empower educators to become creative instructional designers of their classrooms (Rose and Meyer, 2002). An Individual Educational Plan (IEP) meeting will be held for each student in the Preschool Disability Program in order to develop specific goals and objectives which focus on the academic, social/emotional and independent functioning skills necessary for successful transition to Kindergarten. Screening data will be collected, aggregated, and used to plan daily academic and social/emotional instruction for all students who may need intervention beyond core instruction. Core academic and behavioral instruction will include daily explicit instruction, modeling, and guided and independent practice of all academic and/or social emotional skills. Daily social skills lessons will be reinforced throughout the school day by utilizing common language, re-teaching, and positive reinforcement of pro-social behavior.

\*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

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.

The percentage of students achieving proficiency on the 2013 FCAT reading (Level 3) in reading will increase from 27% (85) to 28% (93).

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

28% (93)

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

|   | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy  | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring                       | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy  | Evaluation Tool   |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| 1 | Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking.  | Teachers will plan for and include higher order questions in weekly lesson plans so that the questions are purposeful and aligned to the NGSSS or CCSS.   | Leadership Team<br>(SBLT): Principal,<br>Assistant Principal,<br>Math Coach, | Check students' level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning; adjust instruction based on need. SBLT will analyze trend data from monthly DOK report. | Lesson plans<br>Collier Teacher<br>Evaluation Model<br>(CTEM) |
| 2 | Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction  Instructional: Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | online classes,<br>evening/Saturday<br>classes, lesson study  | SBLT   | Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. Coaching cycles.   | Lesson plans<br>Collier Teacher<br>Evaluation Model           |
| 3 |   | Teachers will scaffold support for reading text by incorporating reading strategies with written text dependent responses, ensuring that reading difficulties do not impede progress in developing concepts and skills. | SBLT   | Implement and provide feedback for cross-content area journals/notebooks/exit tickets. Utilize student responses to guide instruction.  | Lesson plans<br>Collier Teacher<br>Evaluation Model           |

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.

The percentage of students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading on the Florida Alternate Assessment will increase from 25% (2) to 27% (3).

Reading Goal #1b:

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

| 2012 | Current Level of Perforn  | nance:                   | 2013 Expected  | Level of Performance:  |   |
|------|---|--------------------------|--|--|---|
| 25%  | 25% (2)   |                          |  |  |   |
|      | Pr  | roblem-Solving Process   | to Increase Studer                                     | nt Achievement   |   |
|      | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy                 | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy   | Evaluation Tool   |
| 1    | Data-driven planning for instruction is limited, and instructional practices and interventions are not uniform for students working on Florida's Access Points. | planning and instruction | SBLT and IEP Team<br>Members                           | Analyze and interpret progress monitoring data collected through assessments to drive instructional decisions. | Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) CTEM |

|   | Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: |   |  |   |  |  |
|---|--|---|--|---|--|--|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading.  Reading Goal #2a: |  |   | The percentage 4 and 5) on the   | The percentage of students scoring above proficiency (levels 4 and 5) on the 2013 FCAT in Reading will increase from 30% (93) to 33% (110).                                     |  |  |
| 2012  | Current Level of Perforn   | nance:  | 2013 Expected  | d Level of Performance:   |  |  |
| 30% (93)  |  |   | 33% (110)  |   |  |  |
|   | Pr   | oblem-Solving Process t   | to Increase Studer   | nt Achievement  |  |  |
|   | Anticipated Barrier  | Strategy  | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring                       | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy  | Evaluation Tool  |  |
| 1   | Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking.                 | Teachers will plan for and include higher order questions in weekly lesson plans so that the questions are purposeful and aligned to the NGSSS or CCSS. | Leadership Team<br>(SBLT): Principal,<br>Assistant Principal,<br>Math Coach, | Check students' level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning; adjust instruction based on need. SBLT will analyze trend data from monthly DOK report. | Lesson plans Collier Teacher Evaluation Model (CTEM) PLC meeting notes |  |
|   |  | Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities such as online classes, evening/Saturday classes, lesson study                            | SBLT   | Conduct walkthroughs<br>and observations and<br>provide specific feedback<br>to teachers. Coaching<br>cycles.   | Lesson plans CTEM PLC meeting notes                                    |  |

| 4 | 2 | accountable talk to<br>show, tell, explain and<br>prove reasoning aligned<br>to the standards.                                   | and/or coaching support<br>to develop knowledge<br>and understanding in the<br>use of cooperative<br>structures/strategies.<br>Teachers will be<br>accountable for<br>implementing professional<br>learning. |   |                                     |
|---|---|--|--|---|-------------------------------------|
|   | 3 | Teach Reading and<br>Writing Skills and<br>Strategies<br>Students have<br>inadequate opportunities<br>for reading and writing in | support for reading text<br>by incorporating reading<br>strategies with written<br>text dependent<br>responses, ensuring that<br>reading difficulties do not<br>impede progress in                           | Implement and provide feedback for cross-content area notebooks/exit tickets. | Lesson plans CTEM PLC meeting notes |

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 The percentage of students scoring at or above achievement reading. level 7 in reading on the Florida Alternate Assessment will increase from 25% (2) to 28% (3). Reading Goal #2b: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: 25% (2) 28% (3) Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine **Anticipated Barrier** Strategy **Evaluation Tool** Responsible for Effectiveness of Monitoring Strategy SBLT and IEP Team Analyze and interpret Provide UDL based Data-driven planning for Unique Learning instruction is limited, and System (ULS): professional learning on Members progress monitoring instructional practices planning and instruction data collected through Monthly Benchmark and interventions are not to support modified assessments to drive Assessments, uniform for students curriculum through instructional decisions. Unit Checkpoints, working on Florida's multiple means of: Access Points. a) Representation- vary Student Profile the ways students Comparisons obtain/receive UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills information and knowledge b) Action and (GPS) Expression- vary the options for CTEM demonstrating/ acting upon information and knowledge c) Engagement- identify learners' interests and offer appropriate challenges to increase motivation

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.

The percentage of students achieving learning gains on the 2013 FCAT in Reading will increase from 64% (126) to 68% (134).

Reading Goal #3a:

| 2012 | Current Level of Perforn  | nance:   | 2013 Expected  | d Level of Performance:   | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:                  |  |  |
|------|---|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| 64%  | 64% (126)   |  | 68% (134)  |   |  |  |  |
|      | Pr  | oblem-Solving Process t  | to Increase Studer   | nt Achievement  |  |  |  |
|      | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy   | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring                       | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy  | Evaluation Tool                                      |  |  |
| 1    | Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking.  |  | Leadership Team<br>(SBLT): Principal,<br>Assistant Principal,<br>Math Coach, | Check students' level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning; adjust instruction based on need. SBLT will analyze trend data from monthly DOK report. | Lesson plans Collier Teacher Evaluation Model (CTEM) |  |  |
| 2    | Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction  Instructional: Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | online classes,<br>evening/Saturday<br>classes, lesson study   |  | Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. Coaching cycle.  | Lesson plans<br>CTEM                                 |  |  |
| 3    | Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies  Students have inadequate opportunities for reading and writing in all content areas.   | Teachers will scaffold support for reading text by incorporating reading strategies with written text dependent responses, ensuring that reading difficulties do not | SBLT   | Implement and provide feedback for cross-content area journals/notebooks/exit tickets.  | Lesson plans<br>CTEM                                 |  |  |

of improvement for the following group: 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in The percentage of students making learning gains in reading reading. on the Florida Alternate Assessment will increase from 78% (3) to 80% (--). Reading Goal #3b: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: 78%(3) 80%(--) Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier Strategy **Evaluation Tool** Responsible for Effectiveness of Monitoring Strategy Data-driven planning for Provide UDL based SBLT and IEP Team Analyze and interpret Unique Learning

| 1 | instruction is limited, and instructional practices and interventions are not uniform for students working on Florida's Access Points. | planning and instruction |  | data collected through assessments to drive | System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) CTEM |
|---|--|--------------------------|--|---|---|
|---|--|--------------------------|--|---|---|

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% The percentage of students in the lowest 25% making making learning gains in reading. learning gains on the 2013 FCAT in Reading will increase from 65% (31) to 69% (35). Reading Goal #4: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: 65% (31) 69% (35) Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier Strategy **Evaluation Tool** Responsible for Effectiveness of Monitoring Strategy Rigor 1a. Teachers will plan for School Based Check students' level of Lesson plans Leadership Team and include higher order understanding through questions in weekly (SBLT): Principal, Instructional: discussion and higher-Collier Teacher Lessons do not routinely lesson plans so that the Assistant Principal, order questioning; adjust Evaluation Model questions are purposeful Math Coach, (CTEM) incorporate questioning instruction based on strategies designed to and aligned to the NGSSS Reading Coach, need. SBLT will analyze promote critical, or CCSS. Intervention trend data from monthly Targeted and Support Specialist intensive Progress independent, and DOK report. creative thinking. 1b. Teacher will develop Monitoring Plans higher order questions (PMPs) that are text dependent and require students to utilize close reading with appropriate scaffolded support (differentiated instruction, tiered support). Questions and supports should be designed in such a way as to lead students into strategic and extended thinking (Webb's Depth of Knowledge). 1c. Monitor progress a minimum of once every month using miniassessments. Disaggregate data by subgroup to determine additional supports that

may be needed to close

|   |   | the gap for a specific group.  |  |   |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| 2 | Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction  Instructional: Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | online classes,<br>evening/Saturday<br>classes, lesson study   | and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. Coaching cycles. | Lesson plans CTEM Targeted and intensive Progress Monitoring Plans (PMPs) |
| 3 | Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies  Students have inadequate opportunities for reading and writing in all content areas.   | support for reading text<br>by incorporating reading<br>strategies with written<br>text dependent<br>responses, ensuring that<br>reading difficulties do not<br>impede progress in | journals/notebooks/exit<br>tickets.  | Lesson plans CTEM Targeted and intensive Progress Monitoring Plans (PMPs) |

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

| ΓΛ Λ.           | -   +                                   | lavet Aplaine de la                                       | \                                       | Reading Goal # |                       |  |   |   |  |
|-----------------|---|---|---|----------------|-----------------------|--|---|---|--|
| Measu           | ırable Ok<br>I will red                 | but Achievable A<br>pjectives (AMOs)<br>uce their achiev  | . In six year                           | 50%.           | ears                  | school will  | reduc   | e their achievem  |  |
|                 |   |   |   | 5A :           |                       | T  |   |   | <u></u>  |
|                 | ine data<br>0-2011                      | 2011-2012   | 2012-2013                               | 2013-201       | 4                     | 2014-201   | 5   | 2015-2016   | 2016-2017  |
|                 |   |   |   |                |                       |  |   |   |  |
|                 |   | •   |   | '              |                       | 1  |   |   |  |
|                 |   | analysis of stude<br>at for the followin                  |   |                | efere                 | nce to "Guiding  | Ques  | tions", identify and  | define areas in need                                 |
| Hispa<br>satisf | ınic, Asia                              | subgroups by ean, American Ir<br>progress in read<br>#5B: | ndian) not n                            |                | (<br>;<br>i<br>\<br>E | (White, Black, F   | dispaningress in following to 77% to 50% to | %(88)<br>%(38)<br>6%(72)  | ndian)making   |
| 2012            | Current                                 | Level of Perfor   | mance:                                  |                |                       |  | `   | of Performance:   |  |
| Black<br>Hispar | 74%(82<br>44%(27)<br>nic51%(6<br>67%(2) | •   |   |                | E<br>H                | White 77%(88)<br>Black 50%(38)<br>Hispanic 56%(7<br>Asian 70%(4)             | 2)  |   |  |
|                 |   | F   | Problem-Sol                             | ving Process   | to I n                | crease Studer  | nt Ach  | ievement  |  |
|                 | Antic                                   | ipated Barrier  | St                                      | rategy         |                       | Person or<br>Position<br>sponsible for<br>Monitoring                         |   | rocess Used to<br>Determine<br>ffectiveness of<br>Strategy  | Evaluation Tool                                      |
| 1               |   | ional:<br>do not routinely<br>ate questioning             | include hig<br>questions<br>lesson plan |                | Lead<br>(SBL<br>Assi: | ool Based<br>dership Team<br>_T): Principal,<br>stant Principal,<br>n Coach, | under<br>discus<br>order  | students' level of<br>standing through<br>ssion and higher-<br>questioning; adjust<br>action based on | Lesson plans Collier Teacher Evaluation Model (CTEM) |

|   | strategies designed to<br>promote critical,<br>independent, and<br>creative thinking.   | and aligned to the NGSSS or CCSS.  |      | need. SBLT will analyze trend data from monthly DOK report.  |   |
|---|---|--|------|--|---|
| 2 | Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction  Instructional: Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | online classes,<br>evening/Saturday<br>classes, lesson study   |      | Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. Coaching cycles.                                      | Lesson plans<br>Collier Teacher<br>Evaluation Model           |
| 3 | Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies  Students have inadequate opportunities for reading and writing in all content areas.   | support for reading text<br>by incorporating reading<br>strategies with written<br>text dependent<br>responses, ensuring that<br>reading difficulties do not<br>impede progress in | SBLT | Implement and provide feedback for cross-content area journals/notebooks/exit tickets. Utilize student responses to guide instruction. | Lesson plans<br>Collier Teacher<br>Evaluation Model           |
| 4 | See interactive learning strategies and differentiated instruction.   |  |      |  | Lesson plans will include and target specific ELL strategies. |

|                                  | d on the analysis of studen<br>provement for the following  |  | eference to "Guiding   | g Questions", identify and o  | define areas in need                                  |  |
|----------------------------------|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| satisfactory progress irreduing. |   |  |  | The percentage of ELL students achieving level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT in mathematics will increase from 37%(30) to 43%(32).   |   |  |
| 2012                             | Current Level of Perforn  | nance:   | 2013 Expected  | d Level of Performance:   |   |  |
| 37%(30)                          |   |  | 43%(32).   |   |   |  |
|                                  | Pr  | oblem-Solving Process t                                      | to Increase Studer   | nt Achievement  |   |  |
|                                  | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy   | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring                       | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy  | Evaluation Tool                                       |  |
| 1                                | Rigor  Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking.         | · ·  | Leadership Team<br>(SBLT): Principal,<br>Assistant Principal,<br>Math Coach, | Check students' level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning; adjust instruction based on need. SBLT will analyze trend data from monthly DOK report. | Lesson plans  Collier Teacher Evaluation Model (CTEM) |  |
| 2                                | Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction  Instructional: Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to | online classes,<br>evening/Saturday<br>classes, lesson study |  | Conduct walkthroughs<br>and observations and<br>provide specific feedback<br>to teachers. Coaching<br>cycles.   | Lesson plans<br>Collier Teacher<br>Evaluation Model   |  |

|   | show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards.   | use of cooperative<br>structures/strategies.<br>Teachers will be<br>accountable for<br>implementing professional<br>learning.                                |  |   |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| 3 | Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies  Students have inadequate opportunities for reading and writing in all content areas. | support for reading text<br>by incorporating reading<br>strategies with written<br>text dependent<br>responses, ensuring that<br>reading difficulties do not |  | Lesson plans<br>Collier Teacher<br>Evaluation Model |

|        | all content areas.  | skills.   |  |   |   |
|--------|---|---|--|---|---|
|        |   |   |  |   |   |
|        | on the analysis of studen provement for the following   |   | eference to "Guiding   | Questions", identify and o  | define areas in need  |
| satisf | tudents with Disabilities<br>factory progress in readi  | _   | satisfactory pro   | of Students with Disabilitingress on the 2013 FCAT in   |   |
| Read   | ing Goal #5D:   |   | increase from 3  | 1%(12)to 38%(18).   |   |
| 2012   | Current Level of Perforn  | nance:  | 2013 Expected  | d Level of Performance:   |   |
| 31%(   | 12)   |   | 38%(18)  |   |   |
|        | Pr  | oblem-Solving Process t   | to Increase Studer   | nt Achievement  |   |
|        | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy  | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring                       | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy  | Evaluation Tool   |
| 1      | Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking.  | Teachers will plan for and include higher order questions in weekly lesson plans so that the questions are purposeful and aligned to the NGSSS or CCSS.   | Leadership Team<br>(SBLT): Principal,<br>Assistant Principal,<br>Math Coach, | Check students' level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning; adjust instruction based on need. SBLT will analyze trend data from monthly DOK report. | Lesson plans<br>Collier Teacher<br>Evaluation Model<br>(CTEM) |
| 2      | Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction  Instructional: Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | online classes,<br>evening/Saturday<br>classes, lesson study  | SBLT   | Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. Coaching cycles.   | Lesson plans<br>Collier Teacher<br>Evaluation Model<br>(CTEM) |
| 3      |   | Teachers will scaffold support for reading text by incorporating reading strategies with written text dependent responses, ensuring that reading difficulties do not impede progress in developing concepts and skills. | SBLT   | Implement and provide feedback for cross-content area journals/notebooks/exit tickets. Utilize student responses to guide instruction.  | Lesson plans<br>Collier Teacher<br>Evaluation Model           |

| Based   | on the analysis of studen   | t achievement data, and re  | eference to "Guiding   | g Questions", identify and o  | define areas in need  |  |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|--|
|   | provement for the following   |   |  |   |   |  |
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.  Reading Goal #5E: |   |   | The percentage making satisfac   | The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students making satisfactory progress on the 2013 FCAT in reading will increase from 52%(118) to 57%(139).                         |   |  |
| 2012  | Current Level of Perforn  | nance:  | 2013 Expected  | d Level of Performance:   |   |  |
| 52%(  | 118)  |   | 57%(139)   |   |   |  |
|   | Pr  | oblem-Solving Process t   | o Increase Studer  | nt Achievement  |   |  |
|   | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy  | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring                       | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy  | Evaluation Tool   |  |
| 1   | Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking.  | Teachers will plan for and include higher order questions in weekly lesson plans so that the questions are purposeful and aligned to the NGSSS or CCSS.   | Leadership Team<br>(SBLT): Principal,<br>Assistant Principal,<br>Math Coach, | Check students' level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning; adjust instruction based on need. SBLT will analyze trend data from monthly DOK report. | Lesson plans<br>Collier Teacher<br>Evaluation Model<br>(CTEM) |  |
| 2   | Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction  Instructional: Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | online classes,<br>evening/Saturday<br>classes, lesson study  | SBLT   | Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. Coaching cycles.   | Lesson plans<br>Collier Teacher<br>Evaluation Model           |  |
| 3   |   | Teachers will scaffold support for reading text by incorporating reading strategies with written text dependent responses, ensuring that reading difficulties do not impede progress in developing concepts and skills. | SBLT   | Implement and provide feedback for cross-content area journals/notebooks/exit tickets. Utilize student responses to guide instruction.  | Lesson plans<br>Collier Teacher<br>Evaluation Model           |  |

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

| Close<br>Reading  | K-5 |  | School-wide<br>instructional staff | Early Release   | Grade level team meetings,<br>quarterly   | Assistant<br>Principal,<br>Reading Coach   |
|---|-----|--|------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| Multi-Tiered<br>System of<br>Support<br>(MTSS)          | K-5 | Intervention<br>Support<br>Specialist (InSS) | Instructional Staff                | Early Release,<br>Common<br>Planning, PLC<br>Meetings | Response to Intervention (RtI) Leadership team will support PLC's and individual teachers as they work through the RtI Process.                             | Principal,<br>Assistant<br>Principal, InSS |
| Webb's<br>Depth of<br>Knowledge<br>(DOK)                | K-5 |  | School-wide<br>Instructional Staff | On-going  | Students in grades 2 -5<br>have a DOK resource sheet<br>in their academic binders.<br>Administration will assess<br>use during classroom walk-<br>throughs. | SBLT                                       |
| Book Study: "How to Grade for Learning" by Ken O'Connor | 3   |  | instructional team                 | Early Release,<br>Common<br>planning                  | Teachers in grades K-3 will continue to monitor student progress during weekly PLCs.  | SBLT                                       |

# Reading Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Mat             | erial(s)   |                          |                          |
|---|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Strategy                                  | Description of Resources   | Funding Source           | Available<br>Amount      |
| Junior Great Books                        | These resources will challenge our advanced readers as they think critically using complex text.   | Internal Funds           | \$1,000.00               |
| Informational Text                        | These resources will allow students to interact with a variety text.   | Internal Funds           | \$1,000.00               |
| After school tutoring program.            | This resource will focus on specific literacy standards for the lowest quartile students in reading for grades 3, 4, and 5.  | Title I Basic Allocation | \$25,000.00              |
| Resource teacher                          | Intervention support for at-risk students.   | Title I Basic Allocation | \$63,638.00              |
|   |  |                          | Subtotal: \$90,638.00    |
| Technology                                |  |                          |                          |
| Strategy                                  | Description of Resources   | Funding Source           | Available<br>Amount      |
| No Data                                   | No Data  | No Data                  | \$0.00                   |
|   |  |                          | Subtotal: \$0.00         |
| Professional Development                  |  |                          |                          |
| Strategy                                  | Description of Resources   | Funding Source           | Available<br>Amount      |
| Kagan Training                            | The participants will attend the cooperative learning training so their students can interact with new knowledge and deepen their understanding of the content and skills. | Internal Funds           | \$1,500.00               |
| Reading coach                             | Support for teachers, including coaching cycles, interventions,implementation of common core, including differentiated instruction.  | Title I Basic FSG Funds  | \$44,672.00              |
|   |  |                          | Subtotal: \$46,172.00    |
| Other                                     |  |                          |                          |
| Strategy                                  | Description of Resources   | Funding Source           | Available<br>Amount      |
| Instructional and miscellaneous supplies. | Copy paper and academic notebooks.   | Title I A Funds          | \$1,500.00               |
|   |  |                          | Subtotal: \$1,500.00     |
|   |  | G                        | rand Total: \$138,310.00 |

# 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.

| Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.  CELLA Goal #1: |   |  |  | The percentage of students scoring proficient in listening/speaking on the 2013 CELLA will increase from 27%(40) to 30% (51). |  |                                   |
|--|---|--|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|
| 2012   | Current Percent of St   | udents Proficient in list  | ening/speaki   | ng:   |  |                                   |
| 27%  | (40)  |  |  |   |  |                                   |
|  | Pro   | bblem-Solving Process  | to Increase S  | tudent Ach  | ievement   |                                   |
|  | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy   | Person o<br>Position<br>Responsible<br>Monitorin         | e for Eff   | ocess Used to<br>Determine<br>ectiveness of<br>Strategy  | Evaluation Too                    |
| 1  | Students have insufficient background knowledge of US cultural norms and content specific vocabulary to fully understand oral language. | Provide scaffolded support for ELL learners by inclusion in small group support for L 1 and 2 students as appropriate. | ELL contact as SBLT                                      | monthi<br>studen<br>collabo<br>and ma<br>assess<br>Disagg<br>determ<br>suppor<br>needed<br>langua                             | r progress y by monitoring t participation in prative activities aintaining ment data. regate data to aine additional ts that may be to improve oral ge skills of ed ELL learners. | Lesson plans                      |
|  |   |  |  |   |  |                                   |
|  | ents read in English at gr<br>  | rade level text in a manne   |  |   |  |                                   |
|  | A Goal #2:  | ont irreduing.   |  | ortion of the   | dents scoring pr<br>2013 CELLA will  | oficient in the increase from 20% |
| 2012   | Current Percent of St   | udents Proficient in rea   | ding:  |   |  |                                   |
| 20%  | (30)  |  |  |   |  |                                   |
|  | Pro   | bblem-Solving Process  | to Increase S  | tudent Ach  | ievement   |                                   |
| Anti   | cipated Barrier Stra  | tegy F   | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible<br>or<br>Monitoring | Process Us<br>Determine<br>Effectiven<br>Strategy   | Eve  | aluation Tool                     |
|  |   | No D   | ata Submitted  |   |  |                                   |
| Stude  | ents write in English at g  | rade level in a manner sir   | milar to non-El  | L students.   |  |                                   |
|  | udents scoring proficie A Goal #3:  | ent in writing.  |  | rtion of CELI   | dents scoring pr<br>A will increase fr   | roficient on the rom 28% (41) to  |

| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing: |          |   |  |                 |  |  |  |
|---|----------|---|--|-----------------|--|--|--|
| 28% (41)  |          |   |  |                 |  |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement |          |   |  |                 |  |  |  |
| Anticipated Barrier                                     | Strategy | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible<br>for<br>Monitoring | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy | Evaluation Tool |  |  |  |
| No Data Submitted                                       |          |   |  |                 |  |  |  |

# CELLA Budget:

| Evidence-based Progra | am(s)/Material(s)        |                |                     |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Technology            |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Professional Developm | nent                     |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Other                 |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>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 The percentage of students achieving proficiency (Level 3) mathematics. on the 2013 FCAT in mathematics will increase from 28% (86) to 31% (102). Mathematics Goal #1a: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: 28% (86) 31% (102) Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine **Anticipated Barrier** Strategy **Evaluation Tool** Responsible for Effectiveness of Monitoring Strategy Teachers will plan for and School Based Check students' level of Rigor Lesson plans include higher order Leadership Team understanding through Instructional: questions in weekly (SBLT): Principal, discussion and higher-Collier Teacher Lessons do not routinely lesson plans so that the Assistant Principal, order questioning; adjust Evaluation Model incorporate questioning questions are purposeful Math Coach. instruction based on (CTEM) strategies designed to and aligned to the NGSSS Reading Coach, need. SBLT will analyze trend data from monthly promote critical, or CCSS. Intervention independent, and Support Specialist DOK report. creative thinking. Interactive Learning Teachers will be provided SBLT Conduct walkthroughs Lesson plans Strategies and professional learning and observations and Differentiated Instruction opportunities such as provide specific feedback Collier Teacher online classes, to teachers. Coaching **Evaluation Model** evening/Saturday cycles. Instructional: Students classes, lesson study do not have opportunities and/or coaching support to engage in rigorous to develop knowledge accountable talk to and understanding in the show, tell, explain and use of cooperative structures/strategies. prove reasoning aligned to the standards. Teachers will be accountable for implementing professional learning. Use of Informational Text Teachers will scaffold SBLT Implement and provide Lesson plans across all Content to support for reading text feedback for cross-Teach Reading and by incorporating reading content area Collier Teacher Writing Skills and strategies with written journals/notebooks/exit **Evaluation Model** Strategies text dependent tickets. Utilize student 3 responses, ensuring that responses to guide reading difficulties do not Students have instruction. inadequate opportunities impede progress in for reading and writing in developing concepts and all content areas. skills. Use of Informational Text Students will be provided Math Coach, SBLT Implement and provide Lesson plans across all Content to opportunities to explain feedback for cross-Teach Reading and Collier Teacher their thinking to content area **Evaluation Model** Writing Skills and mathematical problems journals/notebooks/exit Strategies. through writing. tickets. Utilize student 4 responses to guide Students have instruction. inadequate opportunities for reading and writing in all content areas.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: The percentage of students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. mathematics on the Florida Alternate Assessment will increase from 13% (1) to 20% (10). Mathematics Goal #1b: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: 13% (1) 20% (10) Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier Strategy **Evaluation Tool** Responsible for Effectiveness of Monitoring Strategy Provide UDL based Data-driven planning for SBLT and IEP Team Analyze and interpret Unique Learning instruction is limited, and professional learning on Members progress monitoring System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark instructional practices planning and instruction data collected through and interventions are not to support modified Assessments, assessments to drive uniform for students curriculum through Unit Checkpoints, instructional decisions. working on Florida's multiple means of: and Access Points. a) Representation- vary Student Profile the ways students Comparisons obtain/receive UNIQUE Goals, information and Preferences, Skills knowledge b) Action and (GPS) Expression- vary the CTEM options for demonstrating/ acting upon information and knowledge c) Engagement- identify learners' interests and offer appropriate challenges to increase motivation

|   | Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: |                                       |  |  |                 |  |
|---|--|---------------------------------------|--|--|-----------------|--|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #2a: |  |                                       | The percentage (Levels 4 and 5   | The percentage of students scoring above proficiency (Levels 4 and 5) on the 2013 FCAT mathematics test will increase from 25% (77) to 27% (89).                                       |                 |  |
| 2012  | Current Level of Perforn   | nance:                                | 2013 Expected  | d Level of Performance:  |                 |  |
| 25% (   | (77)   |                                       | 27% (89)   | 27% (89)   |                 |  |
|   | Pr   | oblem-Solving Process t               | to Increase Stude  | nt Achievement   |                 |  |
|   | Anticipated Barrier  | Strategy                              | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring                       | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy   | Evaluation Tool |  |
| 1   | Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical,   | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | Leadership Team<br>(SBLT): Principal,<br>Assistant Principal,<br>Math Coach, | Check students' level of<br>understanding through<br>discussion and higher-<br>order questioning; adjust<br>instruction based on<br>need. SBLT will analyze<br>trend data from monthly | (CTEM)          |  |

|   | independent, and creative thinking.   |  | Support Specialist | DOK report.   |                                     |
|---|---|--|--------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| 2 | Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction  Instructional: Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | online classes,<br>evening/Saturday<br>classes, lesson study   | SBLT               | Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. Coaching cycles.   | Lesson plans CTEM PLC meeting notes |
| 3 |   | Teachers will scaffold support for reading text by incorporating reading strategies with written text dependent responses, ensuring that reading difficulties do not impede progress in developing concepts and skills.  | SBLT               | Implement and provide feedback for cross-content area notebooks/exit tickets.   | Lesson plans CTEM PLC meeting notes |
| 4 | Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking.  | Utilize embedded learning goals and scales, appropriate questioning techniques, and multiple representations with the expectation that students demonstrate their conceptual understandings both orally and in writing. Provide challenge opportunities, such as, Investigations, Differentiation, and Invervention Guide, for advanced learners to demonstrate mastery of the standard/benchmark at exemplary levels. | SBLT               | Implement and provide feedback for cross-content area journals/notebooks/exit tickets.  Utilize a variety of assessments, including but not limited to formative, summative and performance-based assessments.  Utilize content area coaches and the coaching cycle, designating time to debrief, discuss observations and plan for next steps. |                                     |
| 5 | See goal barrier 3.   | Students will be provided opportunities to explain their thinking to mathematical problems through writing.  | Math Coach, SBLT   | Implement and provide feedback for cross-content area journals/notebooks/exit tickets.  | Lesson plans<br>CTEM                |

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 The percentage of students scoring at or above achievement mathematics. Level 7 in mathematics on the Florida Alternate Assessment will increase from 13% (1) to 14% (7). Mathematics Goal #2b: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: 13% (1) 14% (7) Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to

|   | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy                 | Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring | Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy  | Evaluation Tool   |
|---|---|--------------------------|---|--|---|
| 1 | Data-driven planning for instruction is limited, and instructional practices and interventions are not uniform for students working on Florida's Access Points. | planning and instruction | Members                                   | Analyze and interpret progress monitoring data collected through assessments to drive instructional decisions. | Unique Learning System (ULS): Monthly Benchmark Assessments, Unit Checkpoints, and Student Profile Comparisons UNIQUE Goals, Preferences, Skills (GPS) CTEM |

|      | d on the analysis of studen provement for the following                 |   | eference to "Guiding   | g Questions", identify and c  | define areas in need  |  |
|------|---|---|--|---|---|--|
|      |   |   | The percentage   | The percentage of students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT in mathematics will increase from 87% (160) to 88% (173).   |   |  |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perforn  | nance:  | 2013 Expected  | d Level of Performance:   |   |  |
| 87%  | (160)   |   | 88% (173)  |   |   |  |
|      | Pr  | oblem-Solving Process t   | o Increase Studer  | nt Achievement  |   |  |
|      | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy  | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring                       | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy  | Evaluation Tool   |  |
| 1    |   | Teachers will plan for and include higher order questions in weekly lesson plans so that the questions are purposeful and aligned to the NGSSS or CCSS.   | Leadership Team<br>(SBLT): Principal,<br>Assistant Principal,<br>Math Coach, | Check students' level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning; adjust instruction based on need. SBLT will analyze trend data from monthly DOK report. | Lesson plans<br>Collier Teacher<br>Evaluation Model<br>(CTEM) |  |
| 2    | prove reasoning aligned to the standards.                               | online classes, evening/Saturday classes, lesson study and/or coaching support to develop knowledge and understanding in the use of cooperative structures/strategies. Teachers will be accountable for implementing professional learning. |  | Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. Coaching cycle.  | Lesson plans<br>CTEM  |  |
|      | Use of Informational Text<br>across all Content to<br>Teach Reading and | Teachers will scaffold support for reading text by incorporating reading  | SBLT   | Implement and provide feedback for cross-content area   | Lesson plans<br>CTEM  |  |

| 3 | Strategies Students have inadequate opportunities for reading and writing in         | strategies with written<br>text dependent<br>responses, ensuring that<br>reading difficulties do not<br>impede progress in<br>developing concepts and<br>skills. |   | journals/notebooks/exit<br>tickets. |                      |
|---|--|--|---|-------------------------------------|----------------------|
| 4 | Students have inadequate opportunities for reading and writing in all content areas. |  | · | feedback for cross-                 | Lesson plans<br>CTEM |

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.

The percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics on the Florida Alternate Assessment will increase from 52% (2) to 57% (--).

Mathematics Goal #3b:

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

52% (2)

57% (--)

# Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

|   | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy                 | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy   | Evaluation Tool  |
|---|---|--------------------------|--|--|--|
| 1 | Data-driven planning for instruction is limited, and instructional practices and interventions are not uniform for students working on Florida's Access Points. | planning and instruction | SBLT and IEP Team<br>Members                           | Analyze and interpret progress monitoring data collected through assessments to drive instructional decisions. | Unique Learning<br>System (ULS):<br>Monthly Benchmark<br>Assessments,<br>Unit Checkpoints,<br>and<br>Student Profile<br>Comparisons<br>UNIQUE Goals,<br>Preferences, Skills<br>(GPS) |

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:

| or improvement to the following group.  |  |
|---|--|
| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #4: | The percent of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT in mathematics will increase from 86% (38) to 87% (44). |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:  |
| 86% (38)  | 88% (44)   |

|   | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|   | Anticipated Barrier  | Strategy   | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring   | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  | Evaluation Tool  |  |  |
| 1 | Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking. | 1a. Teachers will plan for and include higher order questions in weekly lesson plans so that the questions are purposeful and aligned to the NGSSS or CCSS.  1b. Teacher will develop higher order questions that are text dependent and require students to utilize close reading with appropriate scaffolded support (differentiated instruction, tiered support). Questions and supports should be designed in such a way as to lead students into strategic and extended thinking (Webb's Depth of Knowledge).  1c. Monitor progress a minimum of once every month using miniassessments. Disaggregate data by subgroup to determine additional supports that may be needed to close the gap for a specific group. | School Based<br>Leadership Team<br>(SBLT): Principal,<br>Assistant Principal,<br>Math Coach,<br>Reading Coach,<br>Intervention<br>Support Specialist | Check students' level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning; adjust instruction based on need. SBLT will analyze trend data from monthly DOK report.  | Lesson plans  Collier Teacher Evaluation Model (CTEM)  Targeted and intensive Progress Monitoring Plans (PMPs) |  |  |
| 2 | do not have opportunities<br>to engage in rigorous<br>accountable talk to  | online classes,<br>evening/Saturday<br>classes, lesson study   |  | Conduct walkthroughs<br>and observations and<br>provide specific feedback<br>to teachers. Coaching<br>cycles.  | Lesson plans CTEM Targeted and intensive Progress Monitoring Plans (PMPs)                                      |  |  |
| 3 |  |  | SBLT   | Implement and provide feedback for cross-content area journals/notebooks/exit tickets.   | Lesson plans CTEM Targeted and intensive Progress Monitoring Plans (PMPs)                                      |  |  |
| 4 |  | Monitor progress a minimum of once every month using miniassessments. Disaggregate data by subgroup to determine additional supports that may be needed to close the gap for a specific  | SBLT   | Meet with grade level<br>data teams to analyze<br>data from common<br>assessments, determine<br>if instruction/intervention<br>is working and adjust<br>instruction if needed.<br>Maintain minutes of<br>meetings in Collier | Lesson plans CTEM PLC notes  |  |  |

|   | group.  |   | County's data<br>management analysis<br>system (Data<br>Warehouse) to reflect<br>data monitoring. |                      |
|---|---|---|---|----------------------|
| 5 | Students will be provided opportunities to explain their thinking to mathematical problems through writing and model drawing. | · | Implement and provide feedback for cross-content area journals/notebooks/exit tickets.            | Lesson plans<br>CTEM |

| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target                       |           |           |                                |                                       |                  |             |  |
|---|-----------|-----------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------|-------------|--|
| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual<br>Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year<br>school will reduce their achievement gap<br>by 50%. |           |           | Elementary School In six years | Mathematics Goal #<br>the achievement | gap will be redu | ced by 50%. |  |
| Baseline data<br>2010-2011  | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014                      | 2014-2015                             | 2015-2016        | 2016-2017   |  |
|   |           |           |                                |                                       |                  |             |  |

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: The percentage of students in each subgroup by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in math on the 2013 FCAT will increase 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, from the following: Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making White 66%(73) to 69%(79) satisfactory progress in mathematics. Black 40%(25) to 46%(34) Hispanic 45%(58) to 51%(64) Mathematics Goal #5B: Asian 100%(3) to 100%(4) American Indian 50%(1) to 55%(0) 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: White 66%(73) White 69%(79) Black 40%(25) Black 46%(34) Hispanic 45%(58) Hispanic 51%(64) Asian 100%(3) Asian 100%(4) American Indian 50%(1) American Indian 55%(0) Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

|   |  | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy   | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring   | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy                 | Evaluation Tool   |  |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| 1 |  | Instructional:<br>Lessons do not routinely<br>incorporate questioning<br>strategies designed to | questions in weekly  | Leadership Team<br>(SBLT): Principal,<br>Assistant Principal,<br>Math Coach,<br>Reading Coach, | understanding through<br>discussion and higher-<br>order questioning; adjust | Lesson plans<br>Collier Teacher<br>Evaluation Model<br>(CTEM) |  |
|   |  | Differentiated Instruction  | Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities such as online classes, evening/Saturday | SBLT   | and observations and provide specific feedback                               | Lesson plans<br>Collier Teacher<br>Evaluation Model           |  |

| 2 | Instructional: Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards.                         | classes, lesson study and/or coaching support to develop knowledge and understanding in the use of cooperative structures/strategies. Teachers will be accountable for implementing professional learning. |      |                                      |   |
|---|---|--|------|--------------------------------------|---|
| 3 | Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies  Students have inadequate opportunities for reading and writing in all content areas. | support for reading text<br>by incorporating reading<br>strategies with written<br>text dependent<br>responses, ensuring that<br>reading difficulties do not<br>impede progress in                         |      |                                      | Lesson plans<br>Collier Teacher<br>Evaluation Model |
| 4 | Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies  Students have inadequate opportunities for reading and writing in all content areas. | Students will be provided opportunities to explain their thinking to mathematical problems through writing and model drawing.  | SBLT | Mathematic<br>notebooks/exit tickets | Lesson plans<br>Collier Teacher<br>Evaluation Model |

| 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 ELL students achieving level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT in mathematics will increase from 30%(25) to 37%(28).   |   |  |
| 2012  | Current Level of Perforn  | nance:   | 2013 Expected  | Level of Performance:   |   |  |
| 30%(2   | 25)   |  | 37%(28)  |   |   |  |
|   | Pr  | oblem-Solving Process t                                      | o Increase Studer  | nt Achievement  |   |  |
|   | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy   | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring                       | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy  | Evaluation Tool   |  |
| 1   | Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking.  |  | Leadership Team<br>(SBLT): Principal,<br>Assistant Principal,<br>Math Coach, | Check students' level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning; adjust instruction based on need. SBLT will analyze trend data from monthly DOK report. | Lesson plans<br>Collier Teacher<br>Evaluation Model<br>(CTEM) |  |
| 2   | Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction  Instructional: Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned | online classes,<br>evening/Saturday<br>classes, lesson study | SBLT   | Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. Coaching cycles.   | Lesson plans<br>Collier Teacher<br>Evaluation Model           |  |

|   |  | accountable for implementing professional learning.  |  |   |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| 3 | Use of Informational Text<br>across all Content to<br>Teach Reading and<br>Writing Skills and<br>Strategies<br>Students have<br>inadequate opportunities<br>for reading and writing in<br>all content areas. | support for reading text<br>by incorporating reading<br>strategies with written<br>text dependent<br>responses, ensuring that<br>reading difficulties do not<br>impede progress in |  | Lesson plans<br>Collier Teacher<br>Evaluation Model |
| 4 | Use of Informational Text<br>across all Content to<br>Teach Reading and<br>Writing Skills and<br>Strategies<br>Students have<br>inadequate opportunities<br>for reading and writing in<br>all content areas. | Teachers will develop and utilize interactive math word walls within input from students and incorporate student math vocabulary and concept notebooks.                            |  | Lesson plans<br>Collier Teacher<br>Evaluation Model |

|       | on the analysis of student<br>provement for the following   |   | eference to "Guiding   | Questions", identify and o  | define areas in need  |  |
|-------|---|---|--|---|---|--|
| satis | tudents with Disabilities<br>factory progress in math<br>ematics Goal #5D:  | _   | level 3 or highe   | The percent of students with disabilities (SWD) achieving level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT in mathematics will increase from 23%(9) to 31%(15).                               |   |  |
| 2012  | Current Level of Perforn  | nance:  | 2013 Expected  | d Level of Performance:   |   |  |
| 23%(  | 9)  |   | 31%(15)  |   |   |  |
|       | Pr  | oblem-Solving Process t   | to Increase Studer   | nt Achievement  |   |  |
|       | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy  | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring                       | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy  | Evaluation Tool   |  |
| 1     | Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking.  | Teachers will plan for and include higher order questions in weekly lesson plans so that the questions are purposeful and aligned to the NGSSS or CCSS. | Leadership Team<br>(SBLT): Principal,<br>Assistant Principal,<br>Math Coach, | Check students' level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning; adjust instruction based on need. SBLT will analyze trend data from monthly DOK report. | Lesson plans  Collier Teacher  Evaluation Model  (CTEM)       |  |
| 2     | Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction  Instructional: Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | online classes,<br>evening/Saturday<br>classes, lesson study  | SBLT   | Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. Coaching cycles.   | Lesson plans<br>Collier Teacher<br>Evaluation Model<br>(CTEM) |  |
|       | Use of Informational Text<br>across all Content to<br>Teach Reading and<br>Writing Skills and   | Teachers will scaffold support for reading text by incorporating reading strategies with written  | SBLT   | Implement and provide feedback for cross-content area journals/notebooks/exit   | Lesson plans<br>Collier Teacher<br>Evaluation Model           |  |

| 3 | Strategies  Students have inadequate opportunities for reading and writing in all content areas.  | text dependent responses, ensuring that reading difficulties do not impede progress in developing concepts and skills.         | tickets. Utilize student<br>responses to guide<br>instruction. |   |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| 4 | Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies  Students have inadequate opportunities for reading and writing in all content areas. | support for reading text using Investigations Differentiation and Intervention Guide for intervention and practice activities. |  | Lesson plans<br>Collier Teacher<br>Evaluation Model |

| all content areas.  |   |   |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|
|   |   |   |  |  |  |
|   |   | eference to "Guiding  | g Questions", identify and o   | define areas in need   |  |
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #5E:                                     |   |   | The percent of economically disadvantaged students achieving level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT in mathematics will increase from 48%(109) to 53%(129).  |  |  |
| Current Level of Perforn  | nance:  | 2013 Expected   | d Level of Performance:  |  |  |
| 109)  |   | 53%(129)  |  |  |  |
| Pr  | oblem-Solving Process t   | to Increase Studer  | nt Achievement   |  |  |
| Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy  | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring  | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy   | Evaluation Tool  |  |
| Rigor  Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking. | include higher order<br>questions in weekly<br>lesson plans so that the<br>questions are purposeful   | Leadership Team<br>(SBLT): Principal,<br>Assistant Principal,<br>Math Coach,  | instruction based on<br>need. SBLT will analyze<br>trend data from monthly   | Lesson plans  Collier Teacher  Evaluation Model  (CTEM)  |  |
| Instructional: Students   | professional learning<br>opportunities such as<br>online classes,<br>evening/Saturday<br>classes, lesson study  |   | Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. Coaching cycles.  | Lesson plans<br>Collier Teacher<br>Evaluation Model  |  |
| across all Content to<br>Teach Reading and<br>Writing Skills and<br>Strategies<br>Students have<br>inadequate opportunities                         | support for reading text<br>by incorporating reading<br>strategies with written<br>text dependent<br>responses, ensuring that<br>reading difficulties do not<br>impede progress in  | SBLT  | Implement and provide feedback for cross-content area journals/notebooks/exit tickets. Utilize student responses to guide instruction.   | Lesson plans<br>Collier Teacher<br>Evaluation Model  |  |
|   | d on the analysis of studen provement for the following conomically Disadvantage factory progress in mathematics Goal #5E:  Current Level of Performational: Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking.  Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction  Instructional: Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards.  Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies  Students have inadequate opportunities for reading and writing in | d on the analysis of student achievement data, and reprovement for the following subgroup:  conomically Disadvantaged students not making factory progress in mathematics.  ematics Goal #5E:  Current Level of Performance:  109)  Problem-Solving Process to Strategy  Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking.  Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards.  Instructional: Students to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards.  Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies  Students have inadequate opportunities for reading and writing in developing concepts and include higher order questions in weekly lesson plans so that the questions are purposeful and aligned to the NGSSS or CCSS.  Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities such as online classes, evening/Saturday classes, lesson study and/or coaching support to develop knowledge and understanding in the use of cooperative structures/strategies. Teachers will be accountable for implementing professional learning.  Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies with written text dependent responses, ensuring that reading difficulties do not impede progress in developing concepts and | d on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding provement for the following subgroup:  conomically Disadvantaged students not making factory progress in mathematics.  ematics Goal #5E:  Current Level of Performance:  Current Level of Performance:  2013 Expected will increase fro  Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring  Rigor  Rigor  Instructional: Lessons do not routinely lesson plans so that the questions in weekly lesson plans so that the questions are purposeful and aligned to the NGSSS or CCSS.  Interactive Learning Strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking.  Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction Support to develop knowledge and prove reasoning aligned to the standards.  Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities such as online classes, evening/Saturday classes, lesson study and/or coaching support to develop knowledge and understanding in the use of cooperative structures/strategies.  Teachers will be accountable for implementing professional learning.  Use of Informational Text across all Content to teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies with written text dependent responses, ensuring that reading difficulties do not impede progress in developing concepts and | I on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and or provement for the following subgroup:  Comomically Disadvantaged students not making factory progress in mathematics.  Ematics Goal #5E:  Current Level of Performance:  Current Level of Performance:  Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  Anticipated Barrier  Strategy  Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring Strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking.  Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking.  Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction  Unferentiated Instruction  Differentiated Instruction Strategy  Differentiated Instruction Strategy  Differentiated Instruction Strategy  Differentiated Instruction  Differentiated Instruction on the velopity of the velopit |  |

| 4 | Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies  Students have inadequate opportunities for reading and writing in all content areas. | support for reading text using Investigations Differentiation and Intervention Guide for intervention and practice activities. | feedback for cross-<br>content area | Lesson plans<br>Collier Teacher<br>Evaluation Model |
|---|---|--|-------------------------------------|---|
| 5 | Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies  Students have inadequate opportunities for reading and writing in all content areas. | support for reading text using Investigations Differentiation and Intervention Guide for intervention and practice activities. |                                     | Lesson plans<br>Collier Teacher<br>Evaluation Model |

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<br>Content /Topic<br>and/or PLC<br>Focus    | Grade<br>Level/Subject   | PD Facilitator<br>and/or PLC<br>Leader                                  | PD Participants<br>(e.g., PLC,<br>subject, grade<br>level, or school-<br>wide) | Target Dates (e.g.,<br>early release) and<br>Schedules (e.g.,<br>frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-<br>up/Monitoring  | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring                     |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|--|
| Investigations incorporating Mimio technology  | K-5  | Math Coach<br>and District<br>Instructional<br>Technology<br>Specialist | School-wide<br>instructional<br>staff members                                  | Early Release   | CTEM observations  | Principal,<br>Assistant<br>Principal, Math<br>Coach                        |
| Math Pioneer<br>Trainings                      | K-1 Pioneer<br>Teacher<br>2-3 Pioneer<br>Teacher<br>4-5 Pioneer<br>Teacher | District<br>Personnel   | Selected<br>Pioneer Teacher<br>Leaders   | Three monthly<br>meetings/trainings   | Math Pioneers will<br>disseminate information<br>and share strategies<br>from their district<br>trainings at faculty<br>meetings, early release<br>days, and team<br>meetings. | Principal,<br>Assistant<br>Principal, Math<br>Coach, District<br>Personnel |
| Webb's<br>Depth of<br>Knowledge<br>(DOK)       | K-5  | District Director<br>of Advanced<br>Studies and<br>Gifted Learners      | School-wide<br>Instructional<br>Staff  | On-going  | Students in grades 2 -5<br>have a DOK resource<br>sheet in their academic<br>binders. Administration<br>will assess use during<br>classroom walk-<br>throughs.                 | SBLT   |
| Multi-Tiered<br>System of<br>Support<br>(MTSS) | K-5  | Intervention<br>Support<br>Specialist<br>(InSS)                         | School-wide<br>Instructional<br>Staff  | Early Release,<br>Common Planning, PLC<br>Meetings                                      | Response to Intervention (RtI) Leadership team will support PLC's and individual teachers as they work through the RtI Process.  | Principal,<br>Assistant<br>Principal, InSS                                 |
| Math Coach<br>meetings                         | K-5  | District<br>Peronnel  | Math Coach   | Monthly   | Math Coach will<br>disseminate information<br>to Team Leaders and<br>share strategies at<br>faculty meetings and<br>early release days.  | Principal,<br>Assistant<br>Principal                                       |

Mathematics Budget:

| Evidence-based Program | n(s)/Material(s)         |                |                     |
|------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy               | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |

| Student Math Journals    | 2nd-5th grade math students to document concept development  | Internal Funds          | \$648.00                |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------|-------------------------|
|                          |  |                         | Subtotal: \$648.00      |
| Technology               |  |                         |                         |
| Strategy                 | Description of Resources   | Funding Source          | Available<br>Amount     |
| No Data                  | No Data  | No Data                 | \$0.00                  |
|                          |  |                         | Subtotal: \$0.00        |
| Professional Development |  |                         |                         |
| Strategy                 | Description of Resources   | Funding Source          | Available<br>Amount     |
| Math Coach               | Support for teachers, including coaching cycles, interventions, implementation of common core, including differentiated instruction. | Title 1 Basic FSG Funds | \$68,330.00             |
|                          |  | •                       | Subtotal: \$68,330.00   |
| Other                    |  |                         |                         |
| Strategy                 | Description of Resources   | Funding Source          | Available<br>Amount     |
| No Data                  | No Data  | No Data                 | \$0.00                  |
|                          |  |                         | Subtotal: \$0.00        |
|                          |  | G                       | rand Total: \$68,978.00 |

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<br>Level 3 in science.<br>Science Goal #1a:   |  |   |  | The percent of students scoring level 3 on the 2013 FCAT in science will increase from 29% (31) to 32% (33).  |   |  |
| 2012   | Current Level of Perfo   | ormance:  | 2013 Expecte   | ected Level of Performance:   |   |  |
| 29% (31)   |  |   | 32% (33)   | 32% (33)  |   |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to I   |  |   | o Increase Stude                                       | ent Achievement   |   |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier  | Strategy  | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy  | Evaluation Tool                                     |  |
| 1  | Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking. | Teachers will plan for<br>and include higher<br>order questions in<br>weekly lesson plans so<br>that the questions are<br>purposeful and aligned<br>to the NGSSS or CCSS. | Assistant<br>Principal, Math<br>Coach, Reading         | Check students' level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning; adjust instruction based on need. SBLT will analyze trend data from monthly DOK report. | Evaluation Model<br>(CTEM)                          |  |
|  | Interactive Learning<br>Strategies and<br>Differentiated<br>Instruction<br>Instructional: Students   | Teachers will be<br>provided professional<br>learning opportunities<br>such as online classes,<br>evening/Saturday<br>classes, lesson study                               | SBLT   | Conduct walkthroughs<br>and observations and<br>provide specific<br>feedback to teachers.<br>Coaching cycles.   | Lesson plans<br>Collier Teacher<br>Evaluation Model |  |

| 2 | do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards.   | and/or coaching support to develop knowledge and understanding in the use of cooperative structures/strategies. Teachers will be accountable for implementing professional learning. |  |                 |
|---|---|--|--|-----------------|
| 3 | Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies  Students have inadequate opportunities for reading and writing in all content areas. |  | Implement and provide feedback for cross-content area journals/notebooks/exit tickets. Utilize student responses to guide instruction. | Collier Teacher |

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: The percentage of students scoring at levels 4, 5, and Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. 6 in science on the Florida Alternate Assessment will increase from 50% (1) to 55% (7). Science Goal #1b: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: 50% (1) 55% (7) Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier **Evaluation Tool** Strategy Responsible for Effectiveness of Monitoring Strategy Data-driven planning Provide UDL based SBLT and IEP Analyze and interpret Unique Learning for instruction is professional learning on Team Members progress monitoring System (ULS): limited, and planning and data collected through Monthly instructional practices instruction to support assessments to drive Benchmark and interventions are modified curriculum instructional decisions. Assessments, not uniform for through multiple means Unit Checkpoints, students working on Florida's Access Points. a) Representation-Student Profile Comparisons vary the ways students UNIQUE Goals, obtain/receive Preferences, information and Skills (GPS) knowledge b) Action CTEM and Expression- vary the options for demonstrating/acting upon information and knowledge c) Engagementidentify learners' interests and offer appropriate challenges to increase motivation

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:

| A TOTAL CONTROL CONTRO |                     |                     | (levels 4 and 5    | The percent of students scoring above proficiency (levels 4 and 5) on the 2013 FCAT in science will increase from 18% (19) to 20% (21). |                 |  |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---|-----------------|--|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:   |                     |                     | 2013 Expecte       | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:   |                 |  |
| 18%  | (19)                |                     | 20% (21)           | 20% (21)  |                 |  |
|  | Prob                | lem-Solving Process | to Increase Stude  | ent Achievement   |                 |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy            | Person or Position | Process Used to Determine   | Evaluation Tool |  |

|   | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy  | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy  | Evaluation Tool                     |
|---|---|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|
| 1 | Rigor Instructional: Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking.  |   | Assistant<br>Principal, Math<br>Coach, Reading         | Check students' level of understanding through discussion and higher-order questioning; adjust instruction based on need. SBLT will analyze trend data from monthly DOK report. | Evaluation Model<br>(CTEM)          |
| 2 | Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction  Instructional: Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities such as online classes, evening/Saturday classes, lesson study and/or coaching support to develop knowledge and understanding in the use of cooperative structures/strategies. Teachers will be accountable for implementing professional learning. | SBLT   | Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide specific feedback to teachers. Coaching cycles.   | Lesson plans CTEM PLC meeting notes |
| 3 | Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies  Students have inadequate opportunities for reading and writing in all content areas.   | Teachers will scaffold support for reading text by incorporating reading strategies with written text dependent responses, ensuring that reading difficulties do not impede progress in developing concepts and skills.   |  | Implement and provide feedback for cross-content area notebooks/exit tickets.   | Lesson plans CTEM PLC meeting notes |
| 4 | Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills and Strategies  Students have inadequate opportunities for reading and writing in all content areas.   | Teachers will use the DE: Techbook Brief Constructed Responses or Writing Prompt Builder tool to suppport writing.  |  | Implement and provide feedback for cross-content area science notebooks/exit tickets.   | Lesson plans CTEM PLC meeting notes |

| 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   | The percentage of students scoring at or above          |  |
| in science.  | achievement level 7 in science on the Florida Alternate |  |

| Scier  | nce Goal #2b:   |   | Assessment wi  | Assessment will increase from 0% ( 0) to 10% ( 1).   |                 |  |  |
|--------|---|---|--|--|-----------------|--|--|
| 2012   | Current Level of Perfo  | ormance:  | 2013 Expecte   | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:  |                 |  |  |
| 0% (0) |   |   | 10% (1 )   | 10% (1)  |                 |  |  |
|        | Prob  | lem-Solving Process t   | o Increase Stude                                       | ent Achievement  |                 |  |  |
|        | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy  | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy   | Evaluation Tool |  |  |
| 1      | Data-driven planning for instruction is limited, and instructional practices and interventions are not uniform for students working on Florida's Access Points. | Provide UDL based professional learning on planning and instruction to support modified curriculum through multiple means of:  a) Representation-vary the ways students obtain/receive information and knowledge b) Action and Expression- vary the options for demonstrating/ acting upon information and knowledge c) Engagement-identify learners' interests and offer appropriate challenges to increase motivation | SBLT and IEP<br>Team Members                           | Analyze and interpret progress monitoring data collected through assessments to drive instructional decisions. | Benchmark       |  |  |

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

| PD<br>Content /Topic<br>and/or PLC<br>Focus | Grade<br>Level/Subject | PD<br>Facilitator<br>and/or PLC<br>Leader | PD Participants<br>(e.g. , PLC,<br>subject, grade<br>level, or school-<br>wide)    | Target Dates<br>(e.g., early<br>release) and<br>Schedules (e.g.,<br>frequency of<br>meetings) | Strategy for Follow-<br>up/Monitoring   | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible<br>for Monitoring |
|---|------------------------|---|--|---|---|--|
| Lesson Study                                | 5th grade              | Dr. Barcellino<br>(principal)             | 5th grade math<br>and science<br>teachers and<br>instructional<br>resource teacher | neetings  | The leadership team will support the participants as they learn and use the lesson study process. | SBLT   |

#### Science Budget:

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
|----------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| No Data  | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|          |                          | •              | Subtotal: \$0.00    |

| Strategy                 | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| No Data                  | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                          |                          | •              | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Professional Development |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy                 | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data                  | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                          |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Other                    |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy                 | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data                  | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                          |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
|                          |                          |                | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of Science Goals

#### Writing Goals

instruction,

interventions and

enrichment are not

driven by data and do

not address individual student needs.

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

in need of improvement for the following group: 1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level The percentage of students achieving proficiency on 3.0 and higher in writing. 2013 FCAT Writing will increase from 67% (72) to 74% (81). Writing Goal #1a: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: 67% (72) 74% (81) Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine **Evaluation Tool Anticipated Barrier** Strategy Responsible for Effectiveness of Monitoring Strategy Meet with grade level Instructional: Data-Lesson plans and **SBLT** Lesson plans instruction will reflect driven planning, data teams to analyze differentiated instruction and data and test items PLC meeting communication have instruction based on from common notes not become uniform careful data analysis. assessments, determine practice across all instruction/intervention classrooms. Consequently, is working, adjust

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: |   |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.  Writing Goal #1b:   | The percentage of students scoring at level 4 in writing on the Florida Alternate Assessment will increase from 33% (1) to 37% (5). |  |  |  |  |
|  |   |  |  |  |  |

instruction if needed.

Maintain minutes of

meetings to reflect

data monitoring.

| 2012 | Current Level of Perfo  | 2013 Expecte  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:                    |  |   |
|------|---|---|--|--|---|
| 33%  | 33% (1)   |   |  |  |   |
|      | Prol  | blem-Solving Process t  | o Increase Stude                                       | ent Achievement  |   |
|      | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy  | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy   | Evaluation Tool   |
| 1    | Data-driven planning for instruction is limited, and instructional practices and interventions are not uniform for students working on Florida's Access Points. | Provide UDL based professional learning on planning and instruction to support modified curriculum through multiple means of:  a) Representation- vary the ways students obtain/receive information and knowledge b) Action and Expression- vary the options for demonstrating/ acting upon information and knowledge c) Engagementidentify learners' interests and offer appropriate challenges to increase motivation |  | Analyze and interpret progress monitoring data collected through assessments to drive instructional decisions. | Unique Learning<br>System (ULS):<br>Monthly<br>Benchmark<br>Assessments,<br>Unit Checkpoints,<br>and<br>Student Profile<br>Comparisons<br>UNIQUE Goals,<br>Preferences, Skills<br>(GPS) |

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

| PD<br>Content /Topic<br>and/or PLC<br>Focus                            | Grade<br>Level/Subject | PD<br>Facilitator<br>and/or PLC<br>Leader | PD Participants (e.g. ,<br>PLC, subject, grade<br>level, or school-wide)  | Target Dates<br>(e.g., early<br>release) and<br>Schedules (e.g.,<br>frequency of<br>meetings) | Strategy for<br>Follow-<br>up/Monitoring                            | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible<br>for Monitoring |
|--|------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| Varying<br>sentence<br>structures to<br>improve<br>sentence<br>fluency | 2-5                    | Reading<br>Coach                          | All instructional staff members in grades 2-5 will observe our reading coach as she models strategies to improve varied sentence structures.                          | Teach planning<br>day   | Observe writing instruction and monitor student writing portfolios. | SBLT   |
| Written responses to reading with evidence and support from the text   | 1-5                    | Reading<br>Coach                          | All instructional staff<br>members in grades 1-5<br>will observe our reading<br>coach as she models<br>instruction that will<br>teach students to<br>respond to text. | level planning  | Observe writing instruction and monitor student writing portfolios. | SBLT   |

Writing Budget:

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

| Technology            |                          |                |                     |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Professional Developm | nent                     |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Other                 |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
|                       |                          |                | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of Writing Goals

# Attendance Goal(s)

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

|                     | d on the analysis of atter<br>provement:  | ndance data, and referer | nce to "Guiding Que   | estions", identify and defi  | ne areas in need  |  |
|---------------------|---|--------------------------|---|--|---|--|
|                     |   |                          |   | By July 2013, the Average Daily Attendance (ADA) will increase from 95% to 96%.                                    |   |  |
| Attendence Cool #1. |   |                          |   | By July 2013, the percentage of students accruing 10 or more days absent in a one year period will decrease by 2%. |   |  |
|                     |   |                          |   | the percentage of studer<br>a one year period will de  |   |  |
| 2012                | Current Attendance Ra   | ate:                     | 2013 Expecte  | ed Attendance Rate:  |   |  |
| 95%                 |   |                          | 96%   | 96%  |   |  |
| _                   | Current Number of Stunces (10 or more)  | udents with Excessive    |   | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)  |   |  |
| 24%                 | (230)   |                          | 22% (165)   | 22% (165)  |   |  |
| -                   | Current Number of Stues (10 or more)  | udents with Excessive    |   | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)   |   |  |
| 15%                 | (123)   |                          | 13% (98)  | 13% (98)   |   |  |
|                     | Prol  | olem-Solving Process t   | to Increase Stude   | ent Achievement  |   |  |
|                     | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy                 | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring                | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy   | Evaluation Tool   |  |
|                     | some students may have limited home attendance in school resources and limited during School Advisory |                          | Assistant<br>Principal,<br>Intervention<br>Support<br>Specialist, and | Run weekly attendance<br>reports and recognize<br>students twice a year<br>for perfect attendance<br>at schoolwide | StudentPass and<br>TERMS<br>(attendance and<br>discipline system) |  |

| 1 | . , , , , ,   | counselor. | celebrations. Monthly<br>PBS meetings to review<br>any chronic<br>absenteeism conerns. |  |
|---|---|------------|--|--|
|   | 1c. MTSS/ PBS team/<br>Guidance counselor<br>meet to discuss chronic<br>absenteeism and<br>implement individualized<br>interventions. |            |  |  |

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

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

#### Attendance Budget:

| Evidence-based Progra | am(s)/Material(s)        |                |                     |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Technology            |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Professional Developm | nent                     |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Other                 |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
|                       |                          |                | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of Attendance Goal(s)

# Suspension Goal(s)

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

|              | d on the analysis of susp<br>provement:  | ension data, and referen   | ice to "Guiding Que   | estions", identify and defi   | ne areas in need                                      |  |
|--------------|--|--|---|---|---|--|
|              | uspension<br>pension Goal #1:  |  | assigned, and<br>suspension day<br>By July 2013, i                          | By July 2013, number of in-school suspension days assigned, and percent of students receiving in-school suspension days will decrease from 3% (25) to 2% (15). By July 2013, number of out-of-school suspension days will be reduced from 1% (5) to 0.5% (4). |   |  |
| 2012         | 2 Total Number of In-Sc  | chool Suspensions  | 2013 Expecte  | d Number of In-School   | Suspensions   |  |
| 37           |  |  | 22  |   |   |  |
| 2012         | 2 Total Number of Stude  | ents Suspended In-Sch  | ool School  | ed Number of Students   | Suspended In-   |  |
| 3% (         | 25)  |  | 2% (15)   | 2% (15)   |   |  |
| 2012         | 2 Number of Out-of-Sch   | ool Suspensions  | 2013 Expecte<br>Suspensions   | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School<br>Suspensions  |   |  |
| 8            |  |  | 4   | 4   |   |  |
| 2012<br>Scho | 2 Total Number of Stude<br>ool   | ents Suspended Out-of  | - 2013 Expecte of-School  | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-<br>of-School  |   |  |
| 1% (         | 5)   |  | 0.5% (4)  | 0.5% (4)  |   |  |
|              | Pro  | blem-Solving Process   | to Increase Stude   | ent Achievement   |   |  |
|              | Anticipated Barrier  | Strategy   | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring                      | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy  | Evaluation Tool                                       |  |
| 1            | There is a lack of social norm and self-discipline instruction within our instructional programming. | Teachers will implement and instruct PBS expectations and utilize PBS incentive processes in their classrooms. | Administration,<br>School Counselor,<br>Instructional<br>Support Specialist | Analyze StudentPass data to target where areas of focus are needed.  Implement Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS) for individual students in Tier 2 and Tier 3.  | Discipline data<br>from StudentPass<br>Data Warehouse |  |

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

| PD<br>Content /Topic<br>and/or PLC<br>Focus | Grade<br>Level/Subject | PD Facilitator<br>and/or PLC<br>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<br>Follow-<br>up/Monitoring | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible<br>for Monitoring |
|---|------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| No Data Submitted                           |                        |  |  |  |  |  |

#### Suspension Budget:

| Evidence-based Progra | am(s)/Material(s)        |                |                     |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Technology            |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Professional Developm | nent                     |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Other                 |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
|                       |                          |                | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of Suspension Goal(s)

## Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

|   | Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:                             |  |   |                           |   | and define areas                  |
|---|---|--|---|---------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| 1. Pa   | rent Involvement  |  |   |                           |   |                                   |
| Pare  | nt Involvement Goal #7  | 1:   |   |                           | y School will collaborate   |                                   |
| *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated. |   |  | full partners in the learning and development of their children by increasing the volunteer hours by 10%. |                           |   |                                   |
| 2012  | Current Level of Parer  | nt Involvement:                                |   | 2013 Expecte              | d Level of Parent Invo  | Ivement:                          |
| 3,950 hours   |   |  |   | 3,990 hours               |   |                                   |
|   | Prol  | olem-Solving Process t                         | to I r  | ncrease Stude             | ent Achievement   |                                   |
|   | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy                                       | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring  |                           | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy              | Evaluation Tool                   |
| 1   | A majority of the students are from families of "Economically Needy". Parents desire to attend school functions and activities but have difficulty attending day-time | 1b.Plan teacher/parent conferences to meet all | Coc   | unteer<br>ordinator<br>_T | Monitor volunteer logs<br>and attendance at<br>conferences and<br>events. | Sign-In Sheets<br>RSVPs to events |

|                 | services at parent training events. |  |  |
|-----------------|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| and employment- |                                     |  |  |
| related issues. |                                     |  |  |

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

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

#### Parent Involvement Budget:

| Evidence-based Progra |                          |                | ما جاء ان در ۱      |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Technology            |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.0     |
| Professional Developm | ent                      |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Other                 |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.0     |
|                       |                          |                | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:

1. STEM

STEM Goal #1:

90% of teachers will receive professional learning designed to develop pedagogical skills in integrated inquiry-based teaching and learning of STEM concepts. These skills include technology content that includes the use of tools for enhancing teaching and learning science and mathematics while incorporating inquiry-based,

|   | project-based instruction that encourages innovations inventions and applications.  Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement                       |  |   |  |                      |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|---|--|----------------------|--|--|--|
|   | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy   | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring  | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy   | Evaluation Tool      |  |  |  |
| 1 | Teachers have not been trained in STEM-focused strategies.  | Provide meaningful professional learning that effectively models STEM skills and strategies and builds collaborative PLCs for the purpose of infusing these skills and strategies across all content | School Based<br>Leadership Team<br>(SBLT): Principal,<br>Assistant<br>Principal, Reading<br>Coach, Math<br>Coach, and<br>Intervention<br>Support<br>Specialist. | SBLT will create and utilize a checklist that documents implementation of technology being infused through core curriculum and analyze frequency of usage. | CTEM<br>Lesson Plans |  |  |  |
| 2 | Many teachers do not understand the connection of STEM to a specific content and may be resistant to incorporating STEM skills and strategies into their content. | Provide opportunities<br>for peer modeling of<br>Vernier probes, iPod<br>touch labs, and flip<br>cameras in student<br>directed lessons.   | SBLT and<br>Instructional<br>Resource teacher.  | SBLT will create and utilize a checklist that documents implementation of technology being infused through core curriculum and analyze frequency of usage. | CTEM<br>Lesson Plans |  |  |  |

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

| PD<br>Content /Topic<br>and/or PLC<br>Focus  | Grade<br>Level/Subject | PD Facilitator<br>and/or PLC<br>Leader | PD Participants<br>(e.g. , PLC,<br>subject, grade<br>level, or school-<br>wide)    | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-<br>up/Monitoring   | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible<br>for Monitoring |
|--|------------------------|--|--|--|---|--|
| Lesson Study   | 5th grade              | Dr. Barcellino<br>(principal)          | 5th grade math<br>and science<br>teachers and<br>instructional<br>resource teacher | Team planning<br>meetings  | The leadership team will support the participants as they learn and use the lesson study process.   | SBLT   |
| Educators will present and/or participate in the Collier County Public Schools 2013 STEM conference.   | All grade<br>levels.   | Dr. Barcellino<br>(principal)          | All instructional staff.   | 2013   | SBLT will create and utilize a checklist that documents implementation of technology being infused in core curriculum and analyze frequency of usage. | SBLT   |
| Instructional Resource (IR) Teacher will participate in professional learning during quarterly meetings and obtain best practices through Edmodo collaboration | All grade levels       | Instructional<br>Resource<br>Teacher   | Instructional<br>Resource<br>Teacher   | Quarterly<br>District<br>Meetings  | Conduct walkthroughs and observations and provide feedback to teachers.   | SBLT   |

| Evidence-based Progra | am(s)/Material(s)        |                |                     |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Technology            |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Professional Developm | nent                     |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Other                 |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy              | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data               | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                       |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
|                       |                          |                | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of STEM Goal(s)

### Additional Goal(s)

Community partners, through the donation of time, goods and services, will be established to support the SIP goals. Goal:

|                                | I on the analysis of studeed of improvement for the   | ent achievement data, an<br>e following group:  | nd reference to "Gu                                    | uiding Questions", identif  | y and define areas                               |  |
|--------------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| time,<br>suppo<br>Comr<br>good | 3 1   | O   | encourage, and   | During the 2011/2012 school year, LES will establish, encourage, and foster community partnerships. |  |  |
| 2012                           | Current level:  |   | 2013 Expecte   | 2013 Expected level:  |  |  |
| N/A                            |   |   | 10   | 10  |  |  |
|                                | Prok  | olem-Solving Process t  | o Increase Stude                                       | nt Achievement  |  |  |
|                                | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy  | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy  | Evaluation Tool                                  |  |
| 1                              | Current economic conditions may prevent Community Partners from considering a partnership with LES. | Invite local business representatives to a variety of LES activities to build relationships with future Community Partners. | Administration   | Number of Community<br>Partners established<br>2012/2013 school year.                               | End of school<br>year Community<br>Partner list. |  |

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<br>Content /Topic<br>and/or PLC<br>Focus | Grade<br>Level/Subject | PD Facilitator<br>and/or PLC<br>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<br>Follow-<br>up/Monitoring | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible<br>for Monitoring |
|---|------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
|   |                        | Ν                                      | No Data Submitted  | d  |  |  |

Budget:

| Evidence-based Program | m(s)/Material(s)         |                |                     |
|------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy               | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |

| No Data                  | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
|                          | -                        |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Technology               |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy                 | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data                  | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                          |                          | •              | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Professional Development |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy                 | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data                  | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                          |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
| Other                    |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy                 | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data                  | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|                          |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |
|                          |                          |                | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of Community partners, through the donation of time, goods and services, will be established to support the SIP goals. Goal(s)

#### FINAL BUDGET

| Evidence-based Pr   | ogram(s)/Material(s)                     |  |                            |   |
|---------------------|--|--|----------------------------|---|
| Goal                | Strategy                                 | Description of Resources   | Funding Source             | Available Amount  |
| Reading             | Junior Great Books                       | These resources will challenge our advanced readers as they think critically using complex text.   | Internal Funds             | \$1,000.00  |
| Reading             | Informational Text                       | These resources will allow students to interact with a variety text.   | Internal Funds             | \$1,000.00  |
| Reading             | After school tutoring program.           | This resource will focus on specific literacy standards for the lowest quartile students in reading for grades 3, 4, and 5.  | Title I Basic Allocation   | \$25,000.00   |
| Reading             | Resource teacher                         | Intervention support for atrisk students.  | Title I Basic Allocation   | \$63,638.00   |
| Mathematics         | Student Math<br>Journals                 | 2nd-5th grade math<br>students to document<br>concept development  | Internal Funds             | \$648.00  |
|                     |  |  |                            | Subtotal: \$91,286.00                                     |
| Technology          |  |  |                            |   |
| Goal                | Strategy                                 | Description of Resources   | Funding Source             | Available Amount  |
| No Data             | No Data                                  | No Data  | No Data                    | \$0.00  |
|                     |  |  |                            | Subtotal: \$0.00  |
| Professional Develo | opment                                   |  |                            |   |
| Goal                | Strategy                                 | Description of Resources   | Funding Source             | Available Amount  |
| Reading             | Kagan Training                           | The participants will attend the cooperative learning training so their students can interact with new knowledge and deepen their understanding of the content and skills.   | Internal Funds             | \$1,500.00  |
| Reading             | Reading coach                            | Support for teachers, including coaching cycles, interventions, implementation of common core, including   | Title I Basic FSG<br>Funds | \$44,672.00   |
|                     |  | differentiated instruction.  |                            |   |
| Mathematics         | Math Coach                               |  | Title 1 Basic FSG<br>Funds | \$68,330.00   |
| Mathematics         | Math Coach                               | differentiated instruction.  Support for teachers, including coaching cycles, interventions, implementation of common core, including  |                            |   |
|                     | Math Coach                               | differentiated instruction.  Support for teachers, including coaching cycles, interventions, implementation of common core, including  |                            |   |
|                     | Math Coach Strategy                      | differentiated instruction.  Support for teachers, including coaching cycles, interventions, implementation of common core, including  |                            | \$68,330.00<br>Subtotal: \$114,502.00<br>Available Amount |
| Other               |  | differentiated instruction.  Support for teachers, including coaching cycles, interventions, implementation of common core, including differentiated instruction.  | Funds                      | Subtotal: \$114,502.00                                    |
| Other<br>Goal       | Strategy Instructional and miscellaneous | differentiated instruction.  Support for teachers, including coaching cycles, interventions, implementation of common core, including differentiated instruction.  Description of Resources  Copy paper and academic | Funding Source             | Subtotal: \$114,502.00 Available Amount                   |

# Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

| jn Priority | jn Focus | jn Prevent | jn NA |
|-------------|----------|------------|-------|
|             |          |            |       |

Are you a reward school: jn Yes jn No

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

# 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.

|                |                                     | T      |
|----------------|-------------------------------------|--------|
|                | Describe projected use of SAC funds | Amount |
| No data submit | tted                                |        |

## AYP DATA

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

### SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

| Collier School District<br>LELY ELEMENTARY SCH<br>2010-2011 | HOOL      |          |         |         |                           |   |
|---|-----------|----------|---------|---------|---------------------------|---|
|   | Reading   | Math     | Writing | Science | Grade<br>Points<br>Earned |   |
| % Meeting High<br>Standards (FCAT<br>Level 3 and Above)     | 82%       | 66%      | 46%     | 53%     | 247                       | 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<br>Learning Gains                      | 70%       | 49%      |         |         | 119                       | 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<br>Lowest 25% in the<br>School?        | 64% (YES) | 47% (NO) |         |         | 111                       | 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  |           |          |         |         | 477                       |   |
| Percent Tested =<br>100%                                    |           |          |         |         |                           | Percent of eligible students tested   |
| School Grade*   |           |          |         |         | С                         | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested  |

| LELY ELEMENTARY SCI<br>2009-2010                        | HOOL      |           |         |         |                           |   |
|---|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------------|---|
|   | Reading   | Math      | Writing | Science | Grade<br>Points<br>Earned |   |
| % Meeting High<br>Standards (FCAT<br>Level 3 and Above) | 79%       | 73%       | 78%     | 41%     | 271                       | 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<br>Learning Gains                  | 66%       | 63%       |         |         | 129                       | 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<br>Lowest 25% in the<br>School?    | 61% (YES) | 70% (YES) |         |         |                           | Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.  |
| FCAT Points Earned                                      |           |           |         |         | 531                       |   |
| Percent Tested = 100%                                   |           |           |         |         |                           | Percent of eligible students tested   |
| School Grade*   |           |           |         |         | А                         | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students<br>tested   |