# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: LAKE SYBELIA ELEMENTARY

District Name: Orange

Principal: Dr. Julie Paradise

SAC Chair: Sara Wilson

Superintendent: Dr. Barbara Jenkins

Date of School Board Approval: January 29, 2013

Last Modified on: 1/27/2013



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<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)  |
|-----------------|---------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| Assis Principal | Sheila M.<br>Holley | M.Ed.                          | 2.5                                   | 1.5                                  | 2011-12: B grade; 71% met high standards in reading; 69% met high standards in math; 74% met high standards in writing; 38% met high standards in science; 72% made learning gains in reading; 70% made learning gains in math; 57% of lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 52% of lowest 25% made learning gains in math.  |
|                 |                     |                                |                                       |                                      | 2011-12: B grade; 71% met high standards in reading; 69% met high standards in math; 74% met high standards in writing; 38% met high standards in science; 72% made learning gains in reading; 70% made learning gains in math; 57% of lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 52% of lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 52% of lowest 25% made learning gains in math.  2010-11: A grade; 89% met high standards in reading; 86% met high standards in writing; 78% met high standards in science; 71% of lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 50% of lowest 25% made learning gains in math. 90% of the criteria was met |

|           |                      |       |   |     | for AYP. All subgroups met reading proficiency. However; Black, Hispanic, and Economically Disadvantaged subgroups did not meet proficiency in Math.  |
|-----------|----------------------|-------|---|-----|---|
| Principal | Julie L.<br>Paradise | Ed.D. | 2 | 3.5 | 2009-10: A grade; 90% met high standards in reading; 90% met high standards in math; 94% met high standards in science; 74% of lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 68% of lowest 25% made learning gains in math. 85% of the criteria was met for AYP. Black, Economically Disadvantaged, and Students with Disabilities subgroups did not meet proficiency in reading or math.  2008-09 (Fern Creek): A grade; 77% met high standards in reading; 80% met high standards in math; 94% met high standards in writing; 47% met high standards in science; 63% of lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 65% of lowest 25% made learning gains in math. 97% of the criteria was met for AYP. All subgroups met proficiency in reading; however, the Black subgroup did not meet proficiency in math. |

### 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)   |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| Resource<br>Teacher,<br>Reading       | Rachel L<br>Noonan              | Elementary<br>Education;<br>Varying<br>Exceptionalities,<br>Elem/Secondary;<br>ESOL | 1                                     | 6   | 2011-12: B grade; 71% met high standards in reading; 69% met high standards in math; 74% met high standards in writing; 38% met high standards in science; 72% made learning gains in reading; 70% made learning gains in math; 57% of lowest 25% made learning gains in reading; 52% of lowest 25% made learning gains in math. |
| Resource<br>Teacher,<br>Instructional | Nancy<br>Demopoulos-<br>Roberts | Elementary<br>Education;<br>Reading; ESOL;<br>Educational<br>Leadership             |                                       |   | 2011-12 Dr. Demopoulos-Roberts was a 5th grade teacher at Dommerich Elementary. The grade and data for Dommerich are not available at this time.   |

### 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<br>explain why) |
|---|--|--|---------------------------------|--|
| 1 | Lake Sybelia is developing a Professional Learning<br>Community culture.                   | Principal,<br>Assistant<br>Principal and<br>CRT  | June 2013                       |  |
| 2 | District requires hiring of highly qualified candidates.                                   | Principal,<br>Assistant<br>Principal, CRT  | June 2013                       |  |
| 3 | A mentoring program and staff development also support new teachers.                       | Principal,<br>Assistant<br>Principal, CRT,<br>Reading Coach,<br>Grade Level<br>Chair, Mentor<br>teachers | June 2013                       |  |
| 4 | Lake Sybelia supports teachers new to the school by meeting regularly with those teachers. | Principal,<br>Assistant<br>Principal, CRT,<br>Reading Coach,<br>Mentor teacher                           | 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-of-field/ and who are not highly effective. | Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective |
|--|---|
| None   |   |

### Staff Demographics

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

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

| Total Number<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 |
|--|--------------------------------|---------|---|--|---|-----------------------------------|-----------|--|--------------------------------|
| 51   | 2.0%(1)                        | 9.8%(5) | 39.2%(20)   | 49.0%(25)  | 39.2%(20)                                       | 100.0%(51)                        | 15.7%(8)  | 25.5%(13)                                    | 23.5%(12)                      |

### 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  |
|----------------|----------------------|---|--|
| Suzanne Teague | Sarah<br>Gregory     | Master<br>teacher on<br>same grade<br>level | Planning meetings, as<br>needed; classroom<br>observations; weekly<br>professional learning<br>community meetings. |
|                | Meagan<br>Gaffney    | Master<br>teacher on<br>same grade<br>level | Planning meetings, as<br>needed; classroom<br>observations; weekly<br>professional learning<br>community meetings. |
| Barbara Kinson | Rochelle<br>Goldberg | Master<br>teacher on<br>same grade<br>level | Planning meetings, as<br>needed; classroom<br>observations; weekly<br>professional learning<br>community 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

| N I A  |  |  |
|--------|--|--|
| NA     |  |  |
| 1 47 1 |  |  |
|        |  |  |
|        |  |  |

Title I, Part C- Migrant

NA

Title I, Part D

| NA                                      |  |
|---|--|
| Title II                                |  |
| NA                                      |  |
| Title III                               |  |
| NA                                      |  |
| Title X- Homeless                       |  |
| NA                                      |  |
| Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) |  |
| NA                                      |  |
| Violence Prevention Programs            |  |
| NA                                      |  |
| Nutrition Programs                      |  |
| NA                                      |  |
| Housing Programs                        |  |
| NA                                      |  |
| Head Start                              |  |
| NA                                      |  |
| Adult Education                         |  |
| NA                                      |  |
| Career and Technical Education          |  |
| NA                                      |  |
| Job Training                            |  |
| NA                                      |  |
| Other                                   |  |
| NA                                      |  |

Multi-Hered System of Supports (MTSS)/Response to Instruction/Intervention (Rti)

School-based MTSS/Rtl Team-

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Rachael Noonan (VE-MTSS), Debbie McNeil (Media), Nancy Demopoulos-Roberts (CRT), Gail Garnetti (Staffing Specialist), Sheila Holley (Assistant Principal), Julie Paradise (Principal); representative from each grade level.

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 role of the MTSS Leadership Team is to ensure that high quality instruction and interventions are matched to students' needs. The team will do this by frequent progress monitoring of data to assist with making decisions for appropriate instruction and intervention. The MTSS team is responsible for overseeing the school-wide Tier 1, 2 and 3 curriculum, materials, resources and interventions. They will review both formative and summative assessment data in order to monitor student progress. There will be a 35 minute school-wide intervention/enrichment block utilizing all school staff. The Leadership Team will meet monthly. In addition, the Leadership Team will meet with each grade level every 6 weeks. A school-wide progress monitoring plan will be developed for each grade level and implemented.

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement

plan. Describe how the Rtl Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

The MTSS Leadership Team assisted in the development of the School Improvement Plan. The SIP incorporates the core principles of MTSS: early intervention; use of scientific, research-based materials; use of data to make decisions; and monitoring student progress to inform instruction.

#### MTSS Implementation

Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.

Data sources: FAIR, FCAT, Benchmark Exams, SAT (2nd), Renaissance Learning, Write Score. Data Management System: IMS, Educational Data Warehouse, Progress Book and SMS.

We will have monthly data meetings by grade level on all students; biweekly, we will meet by grade level on our lowest quartile in reading and math.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

We began MTSS training in the 2010-2011 school year and trained quarterly with our district coach. Training has continued with all teachers supported by our staff MTSS coach, Rachael Noonan, as well as the school Staffing Specialist and School Psychologist. The MTSS coach and selected MTSS Leadership Team members will continue to provide staff training and support. The MTSS team will also evaluate professional development needs in our monthly team meetings.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The plan to support MTSS includes grade level meetings before beginning the implementation of MTSS and quarterly follow up meetings with the MTSS team. Additionally, ongoing progress monitoring meetings will occur throughout the year in order to follow the progress of each student.

#### Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Our Literacy Leadership team consists of Debbie McNeil (Media Specialist), Nancy Demopoulos-Roberts(CRT), Rachael Noonan (Reading Coach), and one teacher from each grade level.

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

Led by our Media Specialist, the team will be working to continue to grow our successful literacy program. The LLT will meet on an as needed basis to address school-wide literacy issues, monitor reading data, provide parent activities and increase independent reading through a school-wide effort to teach students how to choose just-right books and to develop reading stamina.

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

Our major initiatives for this school year are increasing our guided reading library with an emphasis on nonfiction text, expanding the number of titles in our media center, achieving balance for all sections of the media center. A particular emphasis will be placed on science related nonfiction titles. In addition, titles will reflect the text complexity as described in common core standards.

Our instructional initiative will include an emphasis on increasing our comprehension strategies through tools such as Making Meaning and the Comprehension Toolkit. In addition, ongoing assessment in the areas of fluency and comprehension through FAIR, Benchmarks and Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) will be occurring.

#### Public School Choice

|  | *Elementar | v Title | I Schools | Only | : Pre-Sch | ool Transition |
|--|------------|---------|-----------|------|-----------|----------------|
|--|------------|---------|-----------|------|-----------|----------------|

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

NA

\*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.

NA

\*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?

NA

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?

NA

### Postsecondary Transition

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

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

NA

# PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

# Reading Goals

| * Whe | n using percentages, include  | the number of students the p  | percentage represents  | (e.g., 70% (35)).   |  |
|-------|---|---|--|---|--|
|       | d on the analysis of studen<br>provement for the following                                    |   | eference to "Guiding   | Questions", identify and o  | define areas in need   |
| 1a. F | CAT2.0: Students scoring  | g at Achievement Level 3  | 3 in   |   |  |
| read  | ing.  |   |  | g at Level 3 will increase t  | heir DSS or reading  |
| Read  | ling Goal #1a:  |   | level on the 201   | 13 FCAT.  |  |
| 2012  | Current Level of Perforn  | nance:  | 2013 Expected  | Level of Performance:   |  |
|       | ne 2012, 27% (75) of the sentary School scored Level  |   |  | 2% (97) of the students a ool will score Level 3 on Fo  |  |
|       | 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     | Students arrived unprepared to learn.   | Identify students who need extra support and provide MTSS as needed.  | Principal, Asst.<br>principal, CRT, RtI<br>coach, classroom<br>teacher   | FCAT scores will remain the same or increase.   | FCAT 2013  |
| 2     | Students must increase their reading stamina in order to improve comprehension.               | Teachers will gradually increase the amount of time students spend in independent reading on a daily basis.   | Principal,<br>Leadership team,<br>teachers   | Teachers will determine<br>baseline reading stamina<br>and help students set<br>individual goals. | Classroom visits,<br>student data<br>notebooks, and<br>comprehension<br>scores on school<br>and district<br>assessments. |
| 3     | Students lack academic vocabulary necessary to meet proficiency in reading, math and science. | Teachers will utilize interactive word walls to highlight academic vocabulary.  | Principal, classroom<br>teachers, CRT,<br>Reading Coach  | Students will increase reading comprehension scores.  | Classroom<br>observations,<br>school and district<br>assessments.  |
| 4     | Low levels of achievement in reading strategies.  | Identify the performance levels of all students, K-5, using FAIR assessment.  Maintain a school-based Progress Monitoring Committee to monitor the progess of all students in reading.  Maintain a school-wide reading intervention/enrichment plan where students are strategically placed into intervention/enrichment groups and carefully monitored.  Record student reading data in data notebooks and celebrate learning gains. | Principal, Asst. Principal, CRT, Reading Coach, Literacy Leadership Team, Classroom teachers, Media Specialist | Walkthroughs and monthly data meetings  | FCAT results, data notebooks, assessments  |

|      | ed on the analysis of studen<br>aprovement for the following                |   | eference to "Guiding                                    | Questions", identify and  | define areas in need  |  |
|------|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| Stud | Florida Alternate Assessr<br>dents scoring at Levels 4,<br>ding Goal #1b:   |   |   | In June 2012 no students at Lake Sybelia took Florida Alternate Assessment.                                     |   |  |
| 201  | 2 Current Level of Perforr  | mance:  | 2013 Expected   | Level of Performance:   |   |  |
|      | une 2012 there were no stu<br>Florida Alternate Assessme                    |   | Florida Alternate student's first ti                    | ne 3rd grade student at La<br>e Assessment. Although th<br>me taking this assessmer<br>in the supportive range. | nis will be the   |  |
|      | 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    | Student must increase reading stamina in order to improve comprehension.    | Teachers will gradually increase the amount of time student spends in independent reading on a daily basis. | Principal,<br>Leadership team,<br>teachers              | Teachers will determine baseline reading stamina and help student set individual goals.                         | Classroom visits,<br>student data<br>notebook, and<br>comprehension<br>scores on school<br>and district<br>assessments. |  |
| 2    | Student lacks academic vocabulary necessary to meet proficiency in reading. | Teachers will utilize interactive word walls to highlight academic vocabulary.                              | Principal, classroom<br>teachers, CRT,<br>Reading Coach | Student will increase reading comprehension scores.   | Classroom<br>observations,<br>school and district<br>assessments  |  |

| of in | nprovement for the following  | g group:   |  |   |   |  |  |
|-------|---|--|--|---|---|--|--|
| Leve  | FCAT 2.0: Students scoring 4 in reading.  ding Goal #2a:                | ng at or above Achievem  | Students scoring   | Students scoring at Level 4 or 5 will increase their DSS or reading level on the 2013 FCAT.                           |   |  |  |
| 201   | 2 Current Level of Perform  | mance:   | 2013 Expected  | Level of Performance:   |   |  |  |
|       | une 2012, 44% (122) of the<br>nentary School scored at Le               |  |  | In June 2013, 47% (143) of the students at Lake Sybelia Elementary School will score at Level 4 or 5 in FCAT Reading. |   |  |  |
|       | 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 Too  |  |  |
| 1     | Lack of time for enrichment activities.                                 | Maintain a school-wide reading intervention/enrichment plan where students are strategically placed into intervention/enrichment groups and carefully monitored. | Principal, Reading<br>Coach, CRT,<br>Literacy Leadership<br>Team, Classroom<br>Teachers, Media<br>Specialists, Gifted<br>teacher | Evaluation of projects through teacher created rubrics and scales. Classroom visits and observations.                 | FCAT results,<br>teacher created<br>rubrics and scales    |  |  |
| 2     | Lack of motivation  | Students set goals for reading, chart their progress in data notebooks, and celebrate their learning.  | Coach, CRT,<br>Classroom teachers  | ,   | FCAT results,<br>student data<br>notebooks.               |  |  |
| 3     | Students need to self-<br>select more challenging<br>reading materials. | Teachers will meet individually with students to set reading goals.  | CRT, Reading<br>Coach, Classroom<br>teachers   | Students will increase<br>their reading levels by<br>self-selecting challenging<br>reading materials.                 | Conferences,<br>classroom<br>observations,<br>Accelerated |  |  |

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 In June 2012 no students at Lake Sybelia took Florida reading. Alternate Assessment. Reading Goal #2b: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: In June 2013 only one student at Lake Sybelia will take In June 2012 no students at Lake Sybelia took Florida Florida Alternate Assessment and the expected level of Alternate Assessment. performance is not in this range. Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Responsible Anticipated Barrier Strategy **Evaluation Tool** Effectiveness of for Strategy Monitoring No Data Submitted

Reader

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.

Reading Goal #3a:

By June 2013 the students at Lake Sybelia Elementary will make learning gains in FCAT reading.

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

By June 2013 the students at Lake Sybelia Elementary will make learning gains in FCAT reading.

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

By June 2013, 73% (223) of all students taking the FCAT Reading test at Lake Sybelia Elementary School will make learning gains.

#### 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 | Lack of reading strategies | Maintain a school-wide reading intervention/enrichment plan where in students are strategically placed into intervention/enrichment groups and carefully monitored.  Maintain a school-based monitoring committee to monitor the progress of students identified by common formative assessments and/or students with an RtI plan. | Principal, CRT,  | Monitor formative and summative assessments monthly          | FCAT results, FAIR<br>test results,<br>Edusoft Benchmark<br>test results |
|   | Lack of Internet Access    | Utilize FCAT Explorer,   | Technology   | Monitor reports from   | FCAT results,  |

| 2 |  | Renaissance Learning,<br>Successmaker, and other<br>internet programs during<br>the school day to<br>prepare for FCAT. | Assistant Principal, | weekly   | FCAT Explorer<br>reports,<br>Renaissance<br>Learning reports,<br>Successmaker<br>reports                                |
|---|--|--|----------------------|--|---|
| 3 | Students must increase their reading stamina in order to improve comprehension | increase the amount of   | teachers             | baseline reading stamina<br>and help students set<br>individual goals. | Classroom visits,<br>student data<br>notebooks, and<br>comprehension<br>scores on school<br>and district<br>assessments |

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in In June 2012 no students at Lake Sybelia Elementary took reading. Florida Alternate Assessment. Reading Goal #3b: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: In June 2013 one third grade student at Lake Sybelia In June 2012 no students at Lake Sybelia Elementary took Elementary will take Florida Alternate Assessment. The Florida Alternate Assessment. expected level of performance is the student will make learning gains in reading. 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 Student must increase Teachers will gradually Principal, Teachers will determine Classroom visits, reading stamina in order increase the amount of Leadership team, baseline reading stamina student data to improve time students spend in teachers and help students set notebook, comprehension. independent reading on a individual goals. comprehension daily basis. scores on school assessments. Teachers will utilize Principal, classroom Student will increase Student lacks academic Classroom vocabulary necessary to interactive word walls to teachers, CRT, reading comprehension observations,

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: |                            |                                |         |  |  |                                  |
|--|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|--|--|----------------------------------|
| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.  Reading Goal #4:  |                            |                                |         | In June 2013 students in the lowest 25% at Lake Sybelia Elementary taking FCAT Reading will make learning gains. |  |                                  |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:   |                            |                                |         | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:  |  |                                  |
| In June 2012, 58% (23) of the lowest 25% of students taking the FCAT Reading test at Lake Sybelia Elementary made learning gains.                                  |                            |                                |         | By June 2013, 61% (30) of the lowest 25% of students at Lake Sybelia Elementary School will make learning gains. |  |                                  |
|  | Pr                         | oblem-Solving Process          | to I no | crease Studer  | nt Achievement   |                                  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier        | Strategy                       | Res     | Person or<br>Position<br>sponsible for<br>Monitoring   | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy | Evaluation Tool                  |
|  | Lack of reading strategies | Maintain a school-wide reading | 1       | ipal, Asst.<br>ipal, Reading   | Monitor data from FAIR and Edusoft, along with               | FCAT results, FAIR data, Edusoft |

Reading Coach

scores.

meet proficiency in

reading.

highlight academic

vocabulary.

school and district

assessments.

| 1 |   | intervention/enrichment plan where students are strategically placed into intervention/enrichment groups and carefully monitored.  Maintain a school-based Progress Monitoring Committee to monitor the progress of all students in reading based on formative assessments and/or students under an MTSS plan.  Establish fixed Tier 3 time slots for each grade level to provide additional targeted interventions for students who are not making learning gains. | Classroom<br>teachers, ESE<br>teachers      | ongoing formative<br>assessments monthly  | benchmark tests,<br>formative<br>assessments   |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 2 | Students must increase their reading stamina in order to improve comprehension. | Teachers will gradually increase the amount of time students spend in independent reading on a daily basis.   | Principal,<br>Leadership team,<br>teachers. | Teachers will determine<br>baseline reading stamina<br>and help students set<br>individual goals. | Classroom visits, student data notebooks, and comprehension scores on school and district assessments. |
| 3 | Students lack academic vocabulary necessary to meet proficiency in reading.     | Teachers will utilize interactive word walls to highlight academic vocabulary.  | teachers, CRT,                              | Students will increase reading comprehension scores.  | Classroom<br>observations,<br>school and district<br>assessments                                       |

| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target              |           |           |  |           |           |           |  |  |
|--|-----------|-----------|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|--|--|
| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. |           |           | Reading Goal #  By June 2017 Lake Sybelia Elementary will reduce the achievement gap by 50%.  Baseline Data 70%  5A: |           |           |           |  |  |
| Baseline data<br>2010-2011   | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014  | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |  |  |
|  | 72        | 76        | 78   | 81        | 83        |           |  |  |

| of improvement for the following s  | subgroup:  |  |  |                 |
|---|--|--|--|-----------------|
| 5B. Student subgroups by ethn<br>Hispanic, Asian, American India<br>satisfactory progress in readin<br>Reading Goal #5B:                                | ,  | By June 2013 all students in ethnic subgroups will make satisfactory progress in reading.  |  |                 |
| 2012 Current Level of Performa  | 2013 Expected  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:  |  |                 |
| In June 2012, the following group<br>on FCAT:<br>White: 84% (108)<br>Black: 54% (38)<br>Hispanic: 56% (32)<br>Asian: 80% (12)<br>Multi-racial: 100% (7) | higher on FCAT<br>White: 87% (11.<br>Black: 57% (40)<br>Hispanic: 59% (<br>Asian: 83% (13) | By June 2013, all subgroups will increase scores at Level 3 or higher on FCAT Reading by at least 3%. White: 87% (112) Black: 57% (40) Hispanic: 59% (34) Asian: 83% (13) Multi-Racial: 100% (7) |  |                 |
| Pro   | blem-Solving Process   | to Increase Studen   | t Achievement                                    |                 |
| Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy   | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for   | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of | Evaluation Tool |

|   |  |  | Monitoring  | Strategy  |  |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| 1 | Lack of reading practice   | Increase use of "Read to<br>Self" in order to build<br>stamina for independent<br>reading.<br>Increase use of "I Pick"<br>strategy so students<br>choose appropriate books<br>for their level. | Principal, CRT,<br>Reading Coach,<br>Classroom<br>teachers, ESE<br>teachers | teacher checklists weekly   | FCAT results,<br>Teacher<br>checklists, Reading<br>Logs                                    |
| 2 | Lack of reading<br>strategies  | monitor the progress of all students in reading  | Principal, CRT,<br>Reading Coach,<br>Classroom<br>teachers, ESE             | Monitor data from FAIR<br>and Edusoft along with<br>weekly assessments. | FAIR, Edusoft,<br>Teacher<br>assessments,<br>FCAT results.                                 |
| 3 | Students do not have background knowledge or vocabulary necessary to perform at grade level. | Teachers will use pre-<br>reading strategies and<br>interactive word walls to<br>strengthen vocabulary<br>and comprehension.   | Reading Coach and classroom teachers  |   | OCPS Benchmark<br>tests, Leveled<br>Literacy<br>Intervention,<br>classroom<br>observations |

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. By June 2013, ELL students at Lake Sybelia Elementary will make satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: In June 2012, 60% (18) of ELL students at Lake Sybelia By June 2013, 63% (19) of ELL students at Lake Sybelia will Elementary made satisfactory progress in reading. make satisfactory progress in reading. Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine **Anticipated Barrier** Strategy **Evaluation Tool** Responsible for Effectiveness of Monitoring Strategy Teachers will gradually Students must increase Principal, Teachers will determine Classroom visits, increase the amount of their reading stamina in Leadership team, baseline reading stamina student data Classroom teachers and help students set order to improve time students spend in notebooks, and comprehension. independent reading on a individual goals. comprehension daily basis. scores on school and district assessments. Students will increase Students lack academic Teachers will utilize Principal, CRT, Classroom interactive word walls to Reading coach, reading comprehension vocabulary necessary to observations. meet proficiency in highlight academic Classroom teachers scores. school and district reading. vocabulary. assessments.

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.

| Read   | ing Goal #5D:   |   | Elementary will   | Elementary will make satisfactory progress in reading.   |  |  |
|--|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| 2012   | Current Level of Perform  | nance:  | 2013 Expected   | Level of Performance:  |  |  |
| In June 2012, 25% (11) of students with disabilities at Lake Sybelia Elementary made satisfactory progress in reading. |   |   |   | By June 2013, 28% (12) students with disabilities at Lake Sybelia Elementary will make satisfactory progress in reading. |  |  |
|  | 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  | Students must increase their reading stamina in order to improve comprehension. | Teachers will gradually increase the amount of time students spend in independent reading on a daily basis. |   | Teachers will determine<br>baseline reading stamina<br>and help students set<br>individual goals.                        | Classroom visits,<br>student data<br>notebooks, and<br>comprehension<br>scores on school<br>and district<br>assessments. |  |
| 2  | Students lack academic vocabulary necessary to meet proficiency in reading.     | Teachers will utilize interactive work walls to highlight academic vocabulary.                              | Principal, CRT,<br>Reading Coach,<br>Classroom teachers | Students will increase reading comprehension scores.   | Classrom<br>observations,<br>school and district<br>assessments.   |  |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.  Reading Goal #5E:   | In June 2013, economically disadvantaged students at Lake Sybelia Elementary will make satisfactory progress in reading. |  |  |  |  |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:  |  |  |  |  |
| In June 2012, 51% (72) of Economically Disadvantaged students at Lake Sybelia Elementary made satisfactory progress in reading.                                       | In June 2013, 54% (76) of Economically Disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in reading.                |  |  |  |  |

# 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 | Lack of reading strategies | Maintain a school-wide reading intervention/enrichment plan where students are strategically placed into intervention/enrichment groups and carefully monitored.  Maintain a school-based Progress Monitoring Committee to monitor the progress of all students in reading based on | Principal, Asst.<br>Principal, CRT,<br>Reading Coach,<br>Classroom teachers | FAIR data, Edusoft<br>benchmark test data,<br>formative assessments | FAIR data, Edusoft<br>benchmark test<br>data, formative<br>assessments,<br>FCAT results |
|   |                            | formative assessments and/or students under an RtI plan.  Establish fixed Tier 3 time slots for each grade level to provide additional targeted interventions for students who are not  |   |   |   |

|   |                         | making learning gains.                           |                                    |  |   |
|---|-------------------------|--|------------------------------------|--|---|
| 2 |                         | 3 ,  | Coordinator,<br>Classroom teachers | reports, Renaissance<br>Learning reports, and                              | FCAT results, AYP<br>results, and<br>formative<br>assessments                               |
| 3 | perform at grade level. | reading strategies and interactive word walls to | Reading Coach and classroom        | demonstrate application of effective strategies for reading comprehension. | OCPS Benchmark<br>tests, Leveled<br>Literacy<br>Intervention,<br>Classroom<br>Observations. |
| 4 | meet proficiency in     | interactive word walls to                        | - I / - /                          | reading comprehension scores.  | Classroom<br>observations,<br>school and district<br>assessments.                           |

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 Focus | Grade<br>Level/Subject | PD Facilitator<br>and/or PLC<br>Leader   | PD Participants<br>(e.g. , PLC, subject,<br>grade level, or<br>school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g.,<br>early release) and<br>Schedules (e.g.,<br>frequency of<br>meetings) | Strategy for<br>Follow-<br>up/Monitoring | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring      |
|--|------------------------|--|---|--|--|---|
| Lesson Study                             | Reading                |  | All instructional teachers  | Lesson Study   | classroom                                | Principal, CRT,<br>Reading Coach                            |
| Common<br>Core<br>Standards              | Reading                | CRT, Reading<br>Coach,<br>Blackbelt Team | Kindergarten and<br>1st grade teachers                                      | Monthly beginning in   |  | Principal,<br>Assistant<br>Principal, Reading<br>Coach, CRT |

# Reading Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Ma  | terial(s)  |                |                      |
|-------------------------------|--|----------------|----------------------|
| Strategy                      | Description of Resources   | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount  |
| Leveled Literacy Intervention | Intervention materials for targeted instruction  | School Budget  | \$4,000.00           |
|                               |  |                | Subtotal: \$4,000.00 |
| 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  |
| Lesson Study                  | Teachers participate in at least 2 cycles of Lesson Study led by our Lesson Study Lead Teacher, CRT and District Reading Teacher | School Budget  | \$2,700.00           |
| Common Core Standards         | Professional Learning Communities meet with Black Belt team and CRT to discuss implementation of common core standards.          | School Budget  | \$0.00               |
|                               |  |                | Subtotal: \$2,700.00 |

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

End of Reading Goals

Grand Total: \$6,700.00

# 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. |   |   |   |   |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|
|   | udents scoring proficie<br>A Goal #1:                   | nt in listening/speakin   | By June 2013 a  | all ELL students will impro<br>erstand English based on   |  |
| 2012  | Current Percent of Stu                                  | dents Proficient in liste   | ening/speaking:   |   |  |
| In Jui  | ne 2012 23% (5) ELL stu                                 | dents scored at proficien   | t on CELLA in Liste   | ning/Speaking.  |  |
|   | Prob  | 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   |   | Teachers will use pre-<br>reading strategies and<br>interactive word walls<br>to strengthen<br>vocabulary and<br>comprehension.                 | Principal, CRT,<br>Reading Coach<br>and classroom<br>teachers | Students will<br>demonstrate application<br>of effective strategies<br>for reading<br>comprehension | OCPS Benchmark<br>tests, Leveled<br>Literacy<br>Intervention,<br>classroom<br>observations |
| 2   | Students need extra support to develop language skills. | Providing opportunities<br>for ELL students to<br>practice English<br>speaking and listening<br>skills during school-wide<br>intervention time. | ELL Resource<br>teacher, Principal,                           | ELL students will improve comprehension skills through the use of listening/speaking activities.    |  |

| Stude  | Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students. |                          |  |  |                 |
|--|---|--------------------------|--|--|-----------------|
| 2. Students scoring proficient in reading.  By June 2013 the percentage of ELL students scoring proficient in reading grade level text will increase by 39 |   |                          |  |  |                 |
| 2012   | Current Percent of Stu  | dents Proficient in read | ding:  |  |                 |
| In Jur   | In June 2012 5% (1) of ELL students scored proficient in reading on CELLA.            |                          |  |  |                 |
|  | 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 | background knowledge<br>or vocabulary<br>necessary to perform at | reading strategies and interactive word walls                                     | Reading Coach<br>and classroom<br>teachers | demonstrate application<br>of effective strategies<br>for reading<br>comprehension | OCPS Benchmark<br>tests, Leveled<br>Literacy<br>Intervention,<br>classroom<br>observations |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| 2 |  | for ELL students to practice reading skills during school-wide intervention time. | Paraprofessional,<br>ELL Resource          | improve comprehension skills through the use of                                    | '  |

| Stude  | Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.            |   |   |   |  |  |
|--------|--|---|---|---|--|--|
|        | udents scoring proficie<br>A Goal #3:  | nt in writing.  |   | By June 2013 the percentage of ELL students scoring proficient in writing on CELLA will increase by 3%. |  |  |
| 2012   | Current Percent of Stu   | dents Proficient in writ  | ing:  |   |  |  |
| In Jur | ne 2012, 9% (2) of ELL s   | tudents in grades K-5 ta  | king CELLA scored   | proficient in writing.  |  |  |
|        | Prol   | olem-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      | Students do not have background knowledge or vocabulary necessary to perform at grade level. | Teachers will use pre-<br>reading strategies and<br>interactive word walls<br>to strengthen<br>vocabulary and<br>comprehension. | Principal, CRT,<br>Reading Coach<br>and classroom<br>teachers                                 | Students will<br>demonstrate application<br>of effective strategies<br>for reading<br>comprehension     | OCPS Benchmark<br>tests, Leveled<br>Literacy<br>Intervention,<br>classroom<br>observations |  |
| 2      | Students need extra<br>support to develop<br>language skills.                                | Providing opportunities<br>for ELL students to<br>practice writing skills<br>during school-wide<br>intervention time.           | ELL Paraprofessional, ELL Resource teacher, Principal, Assistant Principal, and Reading Coach | ELL students will improve comprehension skills through the use of writing activities.                   |  |  |

# CELLA Budget:

| Evidence-based Progran | 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 Developme | nt                       |                |                     |
| 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**

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Students scoring at Level 3 on FCAT math will increase their DSS or math level on the 2013 FCAT. Mathematics Goal #1a: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: In June 2012, 29% (76) of the students taking FCAT Math at In June 2013, 32% (83) taking FCAT Math at Lake Sybelia Lake Sybelia Elementary school scored at level 3. Elementary will score Level 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 FCAT scores will remain FCAT 2013 Students arrived Identify students who Principal, Asst. principal, CRT, RtI unprepared to learn. need extra support and the same or increase. provide MTSS as needed. coach, classroom teacher Students must increase Teachers will gradually Principal, Teachers will determine Classroom visits. their reading stamina in increase the amount of Leadership team, baseline reading stamina student data and help students set order to improve time students spend in teachers notebooks, and independent reading on a 2 comprehension. individual goals. comprehension daily basis. scores on school and district assessments. Students lack academic Teachers will utilize Principal, classroom Students will increase Classroom vocabulary necessary to interactive word walls to teachers, CRT, reading comprehension observations. school and district 3 meet proficiency in highlight academic Reading Coach scores. reading, math and vocabulary. assessments. science. Gaps in learning while Use benchmark Teachers, Discussions at grade level Teacher reports, transitioning from Technology assessments and meetings, review student computer Everyday Math to common assessments to Coordinator, CRT generated reports, scores on common enVision Math monitor student progress assessments, review student work online reports from samples Implement a math computer programs, teacher observation, and intervention/enrichment time to target specific classroom observations. skills to meet student needs. 4 Utilize IXL Math, Successmaker and online components of enVision Math to reinforce math skills. Utilize small group instruction and math centers within the enVision math curriculum to reinforce learned skills at all grades. Students must improve Teachers will implement Principal, CRT, Students will record Student scores from math fact daily math fact practice assessment data math fact fluency in Technology 5 order to solve through one or more coordinator, practice and demonstrate and computer mathematical problems. methods. classroom teachers improved fact fluency. generated reports Students must be able to Students will keep a Instructional Students will OCPS Benchmark verbalize/explain their Coach, ESE math journal. demonstrate their ability Math. Envision process of problem Teachers, to explain the problem quick checks, Math

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

| solving in mathematics. | Classroom teachers | solving process in their | FCAT |
|-------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|------|
|                         |                    | math journals.           |      |

| 1  | on the analysis of studen<br>provement for the following                                 |  | eference to "Guidino                                   | g Questions", identify and   | define areas in need  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| 1b. F  | 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment:  |  |  |  |   |  |
|  | ents scoring at Levels 4, ematics Goal #1b:  | 5, and 6 in mathematics  | In June 2012 n<br>Florida Alternat                     | o students at Lake Sybelia<br>re Assessment.   | Elementary took   |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |   |  |
| 2012   | Current Level of Perforn   | nance:   | 2013 Expecte   | d Level of Performance:  |   |  |
| In June 2012 no students at Lake Sybella Elementary took |  |  | Elementary will  | In June 2013 one third grade student at Lake Sybelia Elementary will take Florida Alternate Assessment and the expected level of performance is in the Supportive range. |   |  |
|  | 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  | Student lacks academic vocabulary necessary to meet proficiency in math.                 | Teachers will utilize interactive word walls to highlight academic vocabulary. |  | Student will increase academic vocabulary scores.  | Classroom<br>observations,<br>school and district<br>assessments. |  |
| 2  | Student must improve<br>math fact fluency in<br>order to solve<br>mathematical problems. | Teachers will implement daily math fact practice through one or more methods.  | Principal, CRT,<br>classroom teachers                  | Student will track and record scores from math fact practice.  | Student assessment data and computer generated reports.           |  |

| 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:                      | Students scoring at Level 4 and 5 on FCAT math will increase their DSS or math level on the 2013 FCAT.                               |
|--|--|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:   | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:  |
| In June 2012, 41% (106) of students at Lake Sybelia Elementary School taking the FCAT Math test scored level 4 or level 5. | By June 2013, 44% (114) of students at Lake Sybelia<br>Elementary School taking the FCAT Math test will score level<br>4 or level 5. |

### 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 | Lack of motivation       | Utilize student data<br>notebooks to track<br>student progress and<br>celebrate learning gains.   | Students, teachers  |  | Student<br>assessment data<br>and notebooks                        |
| 2 |                          | Utilize enrichment components of enVision Math series, including enrichment center and practice.  Utilize enrichment opportunities through IXL Math computer program to challenge students. | Principal, Asst.<br>Principal, CRT,<br>Classroom<br>teachers, ESE<br>teachers | Teacher created rubrics<br>and scales, computer<br>generated reports | Student data on<br>rubrics and scales.<br>Computer<br>assessments. |
|   | Students must be able to | Students will keep a  | Principal, Assistant  | Students will  | OCPS Benchmark   |

| 3 | verbalize/explain their<br>process of problem<br>solving in mathematics. | ,                          | Classroom teachers                    | to record the process of solving math problems.     | Math, Envision quick checks, computer assessments. |
|---|--|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|--|
| 4 | charts, graphs and tables to solve real world problems.                  | nonfiction text containing | Principal, CRT,<br>Classroom teachers | proficiency in the use of charts, graphs and tables |  |

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 In June 2012 no students at Lake Sybelia Elementary took mathematics. Florida Alternative Assessment. Mathematics Goal #2b: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: In June 2013 one third grade student at Lake Sybelia In June 2012 no students at Lake Sybelia Elementary took Elementary will take Florida Alternate Assessment and the Florida Alternative Assessment. expected level of performance is below this level. Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier Responsible **Evaluation Tool** Strategy Effectiveness of Strategy Monitoring No Data Submitted

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #3a:  | In June 2012, 62% (182) of students at Lake Sybelia Elementary School taking the FCAT Math test made learning gains, a decrease of 17 percentage points. In June 2012, 65% ((190) of students at Lake Sybelia Elementary School taking the FCAT Math test will make learning gains. |  |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:   | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:   |  |
| In June 2012, 67% (125)of students at Lake Sybelia Elementary School taking the FCAT Math test made learning gains.  | By June 2013 70% (136) of students at Lake Sybelia Elementary School taking the FCAT Math test will make learning gains.  |  |

### 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 | Lack of mathematics<br>strategies and skills |          | Principal, MTSS<br>Leadership Team,<br>Teachers, CRT   | Monitor student progress                                     | Student<br>assessment data,<br>teacher reports |

|    |   | Develop and implement a MTSS plan for students who continue to struggle in math. |                                       |  |  |
|----|---|--|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| 2  | order to solve  | math fact practice   | Principal, CRT,<br>Classroom teachers |  | Math journals<br>Computer reports  |
| 13 | Students must increase knowledge of vocabulary for mathematics. | word walls.  | Instructional coach, Classroom        | demonstrate increased<br>understanding of<br>mathematical vocabulary | Classroom<br>observations,<br>Envision quick<br>checks, OCPS<br>Benchmark Math |

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 In June 2012 no students at Lake Sybelia Elementary took mathematics. Florida alternate Assessment. Mathematics Goal #3b: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: In June 2013 one third grade student at Lake Sybelia In June 2012 no students at Lake Sybelia Elementary took Elementary will take Florida Alternate Assessment and is Florida alternate Assessment. expected to make learning gains. 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 Lack of mathematics Maintain a school-based Classroom Scores on school Common strategies and skills MTSS Leadership Team teachers, ESE assessments, computer assessments, to monitor the math teachers, CRT, generated reports, computer generated reports, progress of the students Principal and student assessment data who are not making Assistant Principal student work learning gains. samples

|   | on the analysis of studen<br>provement for the following  | t achievement data, and reg group:  | eference to "Guiding                                   | Questions", identify and o   | define areas in need                     |  |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| makii   | 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #4: |   |  | by June 2013, 54% (25) of the lowest 25% of students at Lake Sybelia Elementary School taking the FCAT Math test will make learning gains. |  |  |
| 2012  | Current Level of Perforn  | nance:  | 2013 Expected  | d Level of Performance:  |  |  |
| In June 2012, 51% (24) of the lowest 25% of students taking FCAT math at Lake Sybelia Elementary made learning gains. |   |   | king<br>taking FCAT ma<br>learning gains.              | By June 2013, 54% (25) of the lowest 25% of students taking FCAT math at Lake Sybelia Elementary will make learning gains.                 |  |  |
|   | 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   | Lack of motivation  | Utilize Promethean boards<br>and technology<br>components to engage<br>students | Teachers,<br>Technology<br>Coordinator                 | Scores on common assessments   | FCAT results,<br>student work<br>samples |  |

| 2 | strategies and skills.   | MTSS Leadership Team to monitor the math progress of the students | Classroom<br>teachers, ESE<br>teachers, CRT,<br>Principal and Asst.<br>Principal | ' '  | Common<br>assessments,<br>computer<br>generated reports,<br>student work<br>samples, Star Math<br>assessment |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|
|   | Limited access to technology that will increase learning in math | Utilize computer labs all during the day and after school.        | · ·  | Monitor reports from utilized technology resources | Computer generated reports   |

| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target              |           |  |           |           |           |           |
|--|-----------|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. |           | Elementary School Mathematics Goal #  By June 2017 Lake Sybelia Elementary will reduce the achievement gap by 50%.  Baseline Data 67%  5A: |           |           |           |           |
| Baseline data<br>2010-2011   | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013  | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|  | 70        | 71   | 74        | 77        | 80        |           |

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making By June 2013, all students in ethnic subgroups taking FCAT satisfactory progress in mathematics. math at Lake Sybelia Elementary will make satisfactory progress. Mathematics Goal #5B: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: In June 2012, the following groups scored at level 3 or higher By June 2013, all subgroups will increase scores at Level 3 or on FCAT math: higher on FCAT math by at least 3%. White: 84% (110) White: 87% (113) Black: 49% (34) Black: 52% (36) Hispanic: 54% (31) Hispanic: 57% (33) Multiracial: 71% (5) Multiracial: 74% (5) Asian: 73% (11) Asian: 76% (11)

#### 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 | Limited access to<br>technology that will<br>increase mathematical<br>learning | Utilize computer labs and classroom computers so students have access to IXL Math, Successmaker and online components of enVision math to reinforce skills during and after school. | Technology<br>Coordinator, YMCA<br>director            | reports and common assessments                               | Computer<br>generated reports,<br>student<br>assessment data,<br>FCAT results |
|   | Lack of math strategies and skills   | Identify and monitor students in all subgroups.   | i i  | Discussions at grade level<br>meetings, review student       |   |

| 2 |  | Develop and use common formative assessments as well as benchmark assessments to monitor student progress.  Utilize IXL Math, Successmaker and online components of enVision math to reinforce skills.  Utilize math centers within the enVision math curriculum to reinforce learned skills. | , ,             | scores on common<br>assessments, reveiw<br>online reports from<br>various programs,<br>teacher observations | common formative<br>assessment<br>recording sheets,<br>computer<br>generated reports,<br>student work<br>samples |
|---|--|---|-----------------|---|--|
| 3 | Students must improve math fact fluency in order to solve mathematical problems. | Teachers will implement math fact practice through one or more methods.   | Principal, CRT, |   | Math journals<br>Computer reports  |
| 4 | Students must increase knowledge of vocabulary for mathematics.                  | Use of interactive math word walls.   |                 | demonstrate increased understanding of  | Classroom<br>observations,<br>Envision quick<br>checks, OCPS<br>Benchmark Math                                   |

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: | By June 2013, ELL students at Lake Sybelia Elementary will make satisfactory progress in math.             |
|---|--|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:  | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:  |
| In June 2013, 58% (17) of ELL students at Lake Sybelia Elementary made satisfactory progress in math.       | By June 2013, 61% (18) of ELL students at Lake Sybelia Elementary will make satisfactory progress in math. |

### 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 | Students lack reading skills needed to understand math word problems.            | fiction and fiction reading | Reading Coach,<br>Instructional<br>Coach, ESE<br>Teachers,<br>Classroom<br>Teachers | Students will gain confidence in decoding and understanding math problems independently.   | Classroom<br>observations,<br>enVisionMAATH<br>quick checks,<br>OCPS Benchmark<br>math, Resource<br>specific<br>assessments |
| 2 | Students must improve math fact fluency in order to solve mathematical problems. | ·                           | Principal, CRT,<br>Classroom teachers   | Students will record scores from math fact practice and demonstrate improved fact fluency. | Math journals,<br>computer reports.   |
| 3 | Students must increase knowledge of vocabulary for mathematics.                  |                             | Principal, Assistant<br>Principal,<br>Instructional<br>coach, Classroom<br>teachers | demonstrate increased understanding of   | classroom<br>observations,<br>enVisionMath quick<br>checks, OCPS<br>Benchmark Math  |

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:

| satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #5D:   |  |  | making satisfact  | By June 2013, the percentage of students with disabilities making satisfactory progress at Lake Sybelia Elementary will increase by 15%. |  |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| 2012   | Current Level of Perforn   | nance:   | 2013 Expected   | Level of Performance:  |  |  |
| In June 2012, 25% (11) of students with disabilities at Lake Sybelia Elementary made satisfactory progress in mathematics. |  |  | ,   | By June 2013, 40% (18) of students with disabilities at Lake Sybelia Elementary will make satisfactory progress in mathematics.          |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to I   |  |  | to Increase Studer  | it 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  | Students lack reading skills needed to understand math word problems.            | Teachers will use non-<br>fiction and fiction reading<br>selections that involve<br>math content as part of<br>small group reading<br>instruction. | Reading Coach,<br>Instructional<br>Coach, ESE<br>Teachers,<br>Classroom<br>Teachers | Students will gain confidence in decoding and understanding math problems independently.   | Classroom<br>observations,<br>enVisionMATH<br>quick checks,<br>OCPS Benchmark<br>Math, Resource<br>specific<br>assessments |  |
| 2  | Students must improve math fact fluency in order to solve mathematical problems. | Teachers will implement math fact practice through one or more methods.  | Principal, CRT,   | Students will record scores from math fact practice and demonstrate improved fact fluency.   | Math journals<br>Computer reports  |  |
| 3  | Students must increase knowledge of vocabulary for mathematics.                  | Use of interactive math word walls.  | Principal, Assistant<br>Principal,<br>Instructional<br>coach, Classroom<br>teachers | demonstrate increased understanding of   | Classroom<br>observations,<br>enVisionMATH<br>quick checks,<br>OCPS Benchmark<br>Math                                      |  |

|  | d on the analysis of studer<br>aprovement for the following                      | nt achievement data, and reg<br>g subgroup:   | eference to "Guiding   | g Questions", identify and o  | define areas in need          |
|--|--|---|--|---|-------------------------------|
| E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal E: |  |   |  | Ill students in the econominake satisfactory progress i   |                               |
| 2012   | 2 Current Level of Perforr   | mance:  | 2013 Expected  | d Level of Performance:   |                               |
| stude  | ne 2012, 50% (70) of ecorents taking FCAT math at L<br>factory progress in math. | nomically disadvantaged<br>ake Sybelia Elementary ma  | ade students taking  | 53% (74)of economically d<br>FCAT math at Lake Sybeli<br>ry progress in math.   |                               |
|  | Pı   | roblem-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  | Limited access to<br>technology that will<br>increase learning in<br>mathematics | Utilize computer labs and classroom computers during and after the school day.  | Teachers,<br>Technology<br>Coordinator, after-<br>school coordinator | Monitor reports from computer programs  | Computer<br>generated reports |
|  | Lack of mathematics<br>strategies and skills                                     | Identify students in subgroup who did not make satisfactory progress.  Develop and use common formative assessments as well as benchmark assessments to monitor student progress. | Teachers,<br>Technology<br>Coordinator, CRT                          | Progress monitoring subgroups, discussions at grade level meetings, review student scores on common assessments, review online reports from various programs, teacher observation | common formative              |

| 2 |   | Utilize IXL Math, Successmaker and online components of enVision math series to reinforce math skills.  Utilize math centers within the enVision math curriculum to reinforce learned skills.  Implement Math Investigations as a resource to enVision math. |   |  |   |
|---|---|--|---|--|---|
| 3 | Students lack reading skills needed to understand math word problems. | Teachers will use non-<br>fiction and fiction reading<br>selections that involve<br>math content as part of<br>small group reading<br>instruction.   | Reading Coach,<br>Instructional<br>Coach, ESE<br>Teachers,<br>Classroom<br>Teachers | Students will gain confidence in decoding and understanding math problems independently. | Classroom observations, Envision quick checks, OCPS Benchmark Math, Resource specific assessments |
| 4 | Students must increase knowledge of vocabulary for mathematics.       | Use of interactive math word walls.  | coach, Classroom  | demonstrate increased understanding of   | Classroom<br>observations,<br>Envision quick<br>checks, OCPS<br>Benchmark Math                    |

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

| PD Content /Top<br>and/or PLC Foci | ic Grade | and/or DLC                         | PD Participants (e.g.<br>, PLC, subject, grade<br>level, or school-<br>wide) | Target Dates (e.g.,<br>early release) and<br>Schedules (e.g.,<br>frequency of<br>meetings) | Strategy for<br>Follow-<br>up/Monitoring | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring |
|------------------------------------|----------|------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Interactive<br>word walls          | Math     | CRT, Reading<br>Coach,<br>Teachers | K-5  | Oct. 15  | Classroom visits<br>and observations     | Leadership team  |

### Mathematics 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 Development   |   |                |                      |
| Strategy                   | Description of Resources                      | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount  |
| Interactive word walls     | Word wall resources Word wall reference books | School Budget  | \$1,000.00           |
|                            |   |                | Subtotal: \$1,000.00 |
| Other                      |   |                |                      |

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount     |
|----------|--------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| No Data  | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00                  |
|          | •                        | •              | Subtotal: \$0.00        |
|          |                          |                | Grand Total: \$1,000,00 |

End of Mathematics Goals

# Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

|  | d on the analysis of stud<br>s in need of improvemen                                 |  |  | Guiding Questions", ide  | ntify and define                            |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|---|--|
| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement<br>Level 3 in science.<br>Science Goal #1a:   |  |  |  | In June 2012, 22% (16) of students taking FCAT science at Lake Sybelia Elementary scored at Level 3 or higher. |   |  |
| 2012   | 2 Current Level of Perf  | ormance:   | 2013 Expect  | ed Level of Performan  | ce:   |  |
| In June 2012, 22% (16) of the students taking FCAT science at Lake Sybelia scored at level 3 on the FCAT Science test.  By June 2013, 50% (36) of the students at Lake Sybelia Elementary will score a Level 3 or higher on the FCAT Science test. |  |  |  |  |   |  |
|  | Prob   | olem-Solving Process t   | o Increase Stud  | 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  | Lack of instructional<br>time for the<br>implementation of the<br>Science curriculum | Integrate science into reading and math whenever possible.  Utilize science materials to perform hands-on experiments. | Teachers, CRT  | Lesson plans<br>Benchmark tests and<br>mini assessments  | FCAT results,<br>Benchmark<br>results       |  |
| 2  | Lack of Science<br>vocabulary  | Interactive Science<br>word walls<br>Thinking maps   | Teachers, CRT,<br>Principal, Asst.<br>Principal        | Lesson plans<br>Teacher observations<br>Weekly Science<br>reviews  | FCAT results,<br>student<br>assessment data |  |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: |                       |                |   |  |                 |
|--|-----------------------|----------------|---|--|-----------------|
| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b:   |                       |                | In June 2012, no students at Lake Sybelia Elementary took Florida Alternate Assessment. |  |                 |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:   |                       |                | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:   |  |                 |
| In June 2012, no students at Lake Sybelia Elementary took Florida Alternate Assessment.  |                       |                | In June 2013, no 5th grade students will take Florida Alternate Assessment.             |  |                 |
|  | Problem-Solving Proce | ess to I       | ncrease S   | tudent Achievement   |                 |
| Anticipated Barrier  | Strategy              | Positi<br>Resp | on or<br>tion<br>oonsible<br>toring   | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy | Evaluation Tool |

### No Data Submitted

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:   | In June 2012, 16% (11) of students taking FCAT science at Lake Sybelia Elementary will score at Level 4 or higher. |  |  |  |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:   | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:  |  |  |  |
| In June 2012, 16% (11) students taking the FCAT Science test at Lake Sybelia Elementary scored a Level 4 or 5.   | By June 2013, 20% (21) students taking the FCAT Science test at Lake Sybelia Elementary will score a Level 4 or 5. |  |  |  |

# 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 | Lack of instructional<br>time for the<br>implementation of the<br>Science Curriculum | Integrate science into reading and math whenever possible.  Utilize science materials to perform hands-on experiments.  Common planning weekly to develop science unit plans. | Teachers, CRT   | Lesson plans<br>Benchmark tests and<br>mini assessments      | FCAT results,<br>Benchmark   |
| 2 | Lack of Science<br>vocabulary  | Interactive Science<br>word walls<br>Thinking maps  | Teachers, CRT,<br>Principal, Asst.<br>Principal                     | !  | FCAT results,<br>student<br>assessment data                                |
| 3 | Lack of hands-on<br>activities.  | Common planning weekly to develop science units that include hands-on activities and experiments.   | CRT, Classroom<br>teachers,<br>Principal,<br>Assistant<br>Principal | Unit plans<br>Classroom observations                         | FCAT results,<br>Benchmark<br>results, specific<br>resource<br>assessment. |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:   | In June 2012 no students at Lake Sybelia Elementary took Florida Alternate Assessment.                   |  |  |  |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:   | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:  |  |  |  |
| In June 2012 no students at Lake Sybelia Elementary took Florida Alternate Assessment.   | In June 2013 no 5th grade students at Lake Sybelia<br>Elementary will take Florida Alternate Assessment. |  |  |  |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  |  |  |  |  |

| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | tor | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy | Evaluation Tool |  |  |
|---------------------|----------|-----|--|-----------------|--|--|
| No Data Submitted   |          |     |  |                 |  |  |

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

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

| PD<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<br>Follow-<br>up/Monitoring            | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring |
|---|------------------------|---|--|---|---|--|
| Science<br>Fusion<br>implementation<br>and training | Science                | District<br>personnel                     | K-5  | Allaliet and  | Classroom<br>observations and<br>Science unit plans |  |

#### Science 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 Development  |                          |                |                       |
| Strategy                  | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount   |
| Science fusion training   | Workshops at district    | school budget  | \$400.00              |
|                           |                          |                | Subtotal: \$400.00    |
| Other                     |                          |                |                       |
| Strategy                  | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount   |
| No Data                   | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00                |
|                           |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00      |
|                           |                          |                | Grand Total: \$400.00 |

End of Science Goals

# Writing 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:

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

| 3.0 a  | nd higher in writing.                 |   |   | , 74% of students at Lake   |   |  |  |
|--|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| Writi  | ng Goal #1a:                          |   |   | Elementary School scored a Level 3.0 or higher on FCAT Writing and 23% scored Level 4.0 or higher.  |   |  |  |
| 2012   | 2012 Current Level of Performance:    |   |   | ted Level of Performanc   | e:                                      |  |  |
| In June 2012, 74% of students at Lake Sybelia<br>Elementary School scored a Level 3.0 or higher on FCAT<br>Writing and 23% scored Level 4.0 or higher. |                                       |   | AT Writes at Lak                                      | By June 2013, 77% of all students taking the FCAT Writes at Lake Sybelia Elementary School will socre at Level 3 or above and 26% will score Level 4.0 or higher. |   |  |  |
|  | Pro                                   | blem-Solving Process t  | o Increase Stud                                       | lent Achievement  |   |  |  |
|  | Anticipated Barrier                   | Strategy  | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible fo<br>Monitoring | Process Used to Determine r Effectiveness of Strategy   | Evaluation Too                          |  |  |
|  | Lack of writing skills                | Incorporate writing in all subject areas daily K-5.                 | Principal, Asst.<br>Principal, CRT                    | Review student writing samples, Write Score reports   | FCAT Writing                            |  |  |
| 1  |                                       | Monitor student work samples and instructional practices quarterly. |   |   |   |  |  |
|  |                                       | Begin to implement<br>"Being a Writer" at<br>selected grade levels. |   |   |   |  |  |
| 2  | Lack of grammar and convention skills | Incorporate convention practice into all curriculum areas           | Classroom<br>teachers                                 | Review student writing across the curriculum  | FCAT Writes,<br>student work<br>samples |  |  |
| 3  | Lack of organizational skills         | Utilize graphic organizers to help students plan their writing      | Classroom<br>teachers,<br>Principal                   | Review lesson plans,<br>classroom walkthroughs  | Lesson plans                            |  |  |
| Base   | d on the analysis of stud             | ent achievement data, ar  | nd reference to "(                                    | Guiding Questions", identif   | y and define area:                      |  |  |
|  | ed of improvement for th              | 3 3 1   |   |   |   |  |  |
| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.  Writing Goal #1b:   |                                       | In June 2012  | , no students at Lake Syb<br>Alternate Assessment.    | elia Elementary   |   |  |  |
| vviili   | g =501 // 15.                         |   |   |   |   |  |  |
| 2012   | 2 Current Level of Perfo              | rmance:   | 2013 Expec  | ted Level of Performanc   | e:                                      |  |  |
| بيا ما   | no 2012, no studente et               | Lake Syhelia Elementary   | In June 2012  | no 4th grade students a   | t Laka Syhalia                          |  |  |

| 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: |                        |   |  |  |                 |
|--|------------------------|---|--|--|-----------------|
|  |                        | In June 2012, no students at Lake Sybelia Elementary took Florida Alternate Assessment. |  |  |                 |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance:   |                        |   | 2013 Exp   | ected Level of Perform                                       | nance:          |
| In June 2012, no students at Lake Sybelia Elementary took Florida Alternate Assessment.  |                        |   | In June 2013, no 4th grade students at Lake Sybelia Elementary will take Florida Alternate Assessment. |  |                 |
|  | Problem-Solving Proces | s to I  | ncrease S  | tudent Achievement   |                 |
| Anticipated Barrier  | Strategy               | Positi<br>Respond   | on or<br>tion<br>oonsible<br>itoring   | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted  |                        |   |  |  |                 |

# (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<br>Follow-<br>up/Monitoring       | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring |
|--|------------------------|--|--|---|--|--|
| Focus on<br>level 4 and 5<br>strategies for<br>more<br>complex<br>writing. | 4th Grade              | Instructional<br>Coach,<br>Classroom<br>teachers | 4th Grade PLC  | October 2012  | Classroom<br>observations,<br>write score data | Principal,<br>Assistant<br>Principal, CRT              |

### Writing Budget:

| Strategy                                    | Description of Resources                                     | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount     |
|---|--|----------------|-------------------------|
| Implement practice prompts from Write Score | Practice prompts that are scored and discussed with students | School Budget  | \$2,500.00              |
|   |  |                | Subtotal: \$2,500.00    |
| 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: \$2,500.00 |

End of Writing Goals

# Attendance Goal(s)

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

| Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: |   |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| Attendance  Attendance Goal #1:   | For the 2012-2013 school year the average daily attendance rate at Lake Sybelia Elementary will meet or exceed 95% (598). |  |  |  |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate:   | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate:  |  |  |  |
| For the 2011-2012 school year the average daily attendance at Lake Sybelia Elementary was 95% (619) students.                     | For the 2012-2013 school year the average daily attendance rate at Lake Sybelia Elementary will meet or exceed 95% (598). |  |  |  |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive<br>Absences (10 or more)   | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)   |  |  |  |
|   |   |  |  |  |

| In 20   | 11-2012, 219 students                         | had 10 or more absences  |   | In 2012-2013, 197 students or less will have 10 or more absences, a reduction of 10%. |                       |  |  |
|---|---|--|---|---|-----------------------|--|--|
|   | 2 Current Number of St<br>ies (10 or more)    | udents with Excessive  |   | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)                  |                       |  |  |
| In June 2011-2012, 146 students had 10 or more tardies. |   |  | SAIL SAIL   | In 2012-2013, 131 students or less will have 10 or more tardies, a reduction of 10%.  |                       |  |  |
|   | Pro   | oblem-Solving Process  | to Increase Stude   | nt Achievement  |                       |  |  |
|   | Anticipated Barrier                           | Strategy   | Person or Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring   | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy                          | Evaluation Tool       |  |  |
| 1   | Personal family issues                        | School Messenger reminders; Counseling; Meeting tardies upon arrival and stressing on-time arrival; Meetings with families with excessive absences or tardies. | Principal, Assistant<br>Principal,<br>attendence clerk,<br>classroom<br>teachers, CHILL,<br>Staffing<br>coordinator | Monitor attendence<br>and tardiness on a<br>weekly basis with<br>registrar.           | SMS attendance report |  |  |
| 2   | Transportation                                | Work with bus drivers to ensure on time arrival.   | Assistant Principal,<br>PE teacher,<br>attendence<br>clerk; transportation<br>supervisor                            | delays  | SMS attendence report |  |  |
| 3   | Parents do not value being on time to school. | Calls to parents<br>questioning absence<br>and how school can be<br>of assistance in getting<br>students to school on  | Principal, Assistant<br>Principal, Registrar,<br>Office Staff,<br>Classroom teachers                                | tardies and absences from previous year   | SMS records           |  |  |

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

CRT, Registrar and

Coompare data on

from previous years.

Classroom teachers tardies and absences

SMS records

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

time.

tardies.

Students need to

school every day.

importance of being in

understand the

Students earn

certificates for no

absences and no

| PD<br>Content /Topic<br>and/or PLC<br>Focus | Grade<br>Level/Subject | PD<br>Facilitator<br>and/or PLC<br>Leader | (e.g., PLC, | Target Dates (e.g.,<br>early release) and<br>Schedules (e.g.,<br>frequency of<br>meetings) |            | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring |
|---|------------------------|---|-------------|--|------------|--|
| Parent communication                        | Attendance             | Team<br>Leaders                           | K-5         | Sentember 2012   | Attendance | Registrar and<br>Assistant<br>Principal                |

### Attendance Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/N | laterial(s)              |                |                     |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy                    | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| Prompt and Present awards   | Certificates             | School Budget  | \$150.00            |
|                             |                          |                | Subtotal: \$150.00  |
| Technology                  |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy                    | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |

| Monitor attendance       | SMS                      | District System | \$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: \$150.00 |

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)).

| l .   | d on the analysis of susp<br>provement:   | pension data, and refere   | ence <sup>-</sup>  | to "Guiding Ques  | tions", identify and defi                                    | ne areas in need             |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|------------------------------|
| Suspension Goal #1:   |   |  |  | By June 2012, the total number of students at Lake Sybelia Elementary receiving in-school or out-of-school suspensions will be reduced by 2%, from 13 to 11 students. |  |                              |
| 2012  | ? Total Number of In-S  | chool Suspensions  |  | 2013 Expected   | Number of In-Schoo   | l Suspensions                |
| In Ju<br>was 2  | ne 2011, the total numb<br>2.   | er of in-school suspension   | ons  | By June 2012, t<br>will be 0.   | he total number of in-s                                      | chool suspensions            |
| 2012  | 2 Total Number of Stud  | ents Suspended I n-Scl   | hool   | 2013 Expected<br>School   | Number of Students   | Suspended In-                |
| In June 2011, the total number of students receiving inschool suspensions was 2 students. |   |  | By June 2012, the total number of students receiving inschool suspensions will be 0. |   |  |                              |
| 2012  | Number of Out-of-Sch  | nool Suspensions   |  | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School<br>Suspensions  |  |                              |
|   | ne 2011, the total numb<br>ensions was 14 or 2% of  |  | tion.  | By June 2012, the total number of out-of-school suspensions will decrease by 2% from 14 to 12 out-of-school suspensions.  |  |                              |
| 2012<br>Scho  | 2 Total Number of Stud  | ents Suspended Out-o   | f-   | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-<br>of-School  |  |                              |
|   | ne 2011, the total numb<br>ol suspensions was 14 st<br>ents.  |  |  | By June 2012, the total number of students with out-of-<br>school suspensions will decrease by 2% from 14 students<br>to 12 students.                                 |  |                              |
|   | Pro   | blem-Solving Process   | to I   | ncrease Studer  | nt Achievement   |                              |
|   | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy   | Re   | son or Position<br>esponsible for<br>Monitoring   | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy | Evaluation Tool              |
|   | Lack of consistent<br>expectations and<br>consequences<br>regarding student<br>behavior school-wide | Build classroom<br>communities so the<br>expectations for<br>behavior are clear and<br>supported by all<br>members of the class. | Assi<br>Prin<br>BLT  | chers, Principal,<br>istant<br>icipal,CRT,CHILL,<br>Discipline<br>nmittee   | Review referrals quarterly                                   | Student discipline referrals |

| 1 |  | Continue to implement<br>Behavior Leadership<br>Team procedures which<br>is a positive approach<br>to student<br>management.<br>Engage parents in the<br>effort to improve the<br>behaviors of students<br>who are inconsistent in |  |   |                                       |
|---|--|--|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| 2 | Lack of self-discipline  | by school psychologist,<br>CHILL counselor, and  | School<br>Psychologist,<br>Staffing Specialist,<br>CHILL Counselor | Reduced number of referrals   | Student discipline referral report    |
| 3 | Students need to connect with an adult other than their teacher for support. | Staff members will mentor with students who show a need for extra support.   | School staff   | Students will show improved confidence and self-control as a result of mentoring. | Behavior<br>referrals, SMS<br>reports |

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

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

| PD<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 (e.g.,<br>early release) and<br>Schedules (e.g.,<br>frequency of<br>meetings) | Strategy for<br>Follow-<br>up/Monitoring | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring          |
|---|------------------------|---|--|--|--|---|
| School-wide<br>discipline<br>program        | Discipline             | Assistant<br>Principal                    | K-5  | September 2012   | Referrals                                | Assistant<br>Principal  |
| Mentoring                                   | Discipline             | Office Clerk,<br>Assistant<br>Principal   | K-5  | October 2012   | Referrals                                | Assistant<br>Principal  |
| CHILL<br>Program                            | Discipline             | CHILL<br>Counselor                        | K-5  | Ongoing 2012-<br>2013  | Referrals                                | Principal,<br>Assistant<br>Principal,<br>Staffing<br>Specialist |

### Suspension Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Ma          |                          |                | A                   |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| 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 |
| School-wide behavior program training | Behavior Leadership Team | School Budget  | \$0.00              |
| •                                     |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00    |

| Strategy      | tegy Description of Resources |               | Available<br>Amount   |
|---------------|-------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| CHILL Program | CHILL Counselor               | School Budget | \$20,000.00           |
|               |                               |               | Subtotal: \$20,000.00 |

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Grand Total: \$20,000.00

# Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

|  | d on the analysis of pare ed of improvement:  | nt involvement data, and  | d ref              | ference to "Guid   | ding Questions", identify                                    | and define areas                          |
|--|---|---|--------------------|--|--|---|
| 1. Pa  | rent Involvement  |   |                    |  |  |   |
| Pare   | nt I nvolvement Goal #  | 1:  |                    |  | PTA parent membership  |   |
| *Please refer to the percentage of parents who |   |   |                    | families enrolled at Lake Sybelia and we had attendance at evening functions (SAC, parent/family events, PTA events, parent teacher conferences) averaging 80%.  |  |   |
| 2012   | Current Level of Parer  | nt Involvement:   |                    | 2013 Expecte   | d Level of Parent Invo                                       | Ivement:                                  |
| famili<br>at ev                                | 11-2012, PTA parent ment<br>es enrolled at Lake Sybe<br>ening functions (SAC, pa<br>ss, parent teacher confer | lia and we had attendand rent/family events, PTA  |                    | In the 2012-2013 school year, we will increase our parent involvement by at least 3% at school sponsored activities. PTA Membership will increase to 98% or higher. Family participation will average 83% or higher. |  |   |
|  | Prol  | blem-Solving Process t  | to I i             | ncrease Stude  | nt Achievement   |   |
|  | Anticipated Barrier   | Strategy  |                    | Person or<br>Position<br>esponsible for<br>Monitoring  | Process Used to<br>Determine<br>Effectiveness of<br>Strategy | Evaluation Tool                           |
| 1  | Working parents   | Encourage parents to sign up to for evening activities  | vol                | Ditions<br>unteer<br>ordinator   | Monitor volunteer hours quarterly.                           | ADDitions<br>volunteer website            |
| 2  | Parents overwhelmed with responsibilities for their household   | Parent presentations on topics related to students being successful in school.                      | Sch<br>Psy<br>Prir | II Counselor,<br>nool<br>/chologist,<br>ncipal,<br>sistant Principal   | Parent surveys and feedback                                  | Parent sign in<br>sheets and<br>surveys   |
| 3  | Parents are working<br>more hours and have<br>less time for school<br>events.                                 | Ensure school events are well publicized and involve the children to increase parent participation. | Ass                | ncipal,<br>sistant<br>ncipal, faculty  | School Effectiveness<br>survey                               | Parent sign in sheets and parent surveys. |

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus  PD Facilitat and/or PL Level/Subject Leader | ( ) , | 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 for<br>Monitoring |
|---|-------|--|--|--|
|---|-------|--|--|--|

| Art and Music<br>Extravaganza | Art and Music | Strings<br>teacher, Music<br>teacher, Art<br>teacher | Parents, students,<br>staff | May 2013       | Parent survey         | Leadership<br>Team, Fine Arts<br>teachers |
|-------------------------------|---------------|--|-----------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|---|
| Waves of<br>Wonder            | All Subjects  | PTA,<br>Classroom<br>teachers                        | Parents, students,<br>staff | Jan. 2013      | Parent survey         | Leadership<br>Team                        |
| Parent<br>Conference<br>Night | All subjects  | Faculty  | Parents, faculty            | Oct. 24, 2012  | Parent sign in sheets | Leadership<br>Team, classroom<br>teachers |
| PTA Open<br>House             | All subjects  | Faculty  | Parents, faculty            | Sept. 20, 2012 | Parent sign in sheets | Leadership<br>Team,                       |
| PTA Book Fair                 | Reading       | PTA, Media<br>Specialist,<br>Faculty                 | Parents, students,<br>staff | Oct. 16, 2012  | Parent survey         | Leadership<br>Team                        |
| Winter<br>Holiday<br>concert  | Music         | Music teacher,<br>Strings<br>teacher                 | Parents, students,<br>staff | Dec. 2012      | Parent survey         | Music teachers                            |

### Parent Involvement 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 Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

| Base  | Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: |   |  |  |                         |  |  |  |
|-------|---|---|--|--|-------------------------|--|--|--|
| 1. ST | EM  |   |  | Teachers will become more familiar with the value of   |                         |  |  |  |
| STEN  | /I Goal #1:   |   | 3 3  | integrating math, science and technology in the classroom and will watch or teach a STEM lesson. |                         |  |  |  |
|       | 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         |  |  |  |
|       | Teachers are not familiar with STEM activities.   | Provide staff<br>development on STEM<br>information and | Principal, CRT   | O .  | Pre and post assessment |  |  |  |

| 1 | activities to faculty. Identify demonstration classrooms in which classroom teacher is using STEM activities | post assessment and introductory meeting |  |
|---|--|--|--|
|   | for other teachers to  |  |  |
|   | visit.   |  |  |

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 |
|---|------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
|   |                        | N                                      | lo Data Submitted  | d  |  |  |

# STEM Budget:

| Evidence-based Progr  | arri(3)/ Material(3)     |                | A ! ! - ! - ! - !   |
|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| 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 Developn | 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)

# Become Fluent in Math Operations. Goal:

|               | 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: |   |  |  |  |  |
|---------------|--|---|--|--|--|--|
|               | Become Fluent in Math Operations. Goal     Become Fluent in Math Operations. Goal #1:  |   |  | In June 2012, 70% (182) of the students taking FCAT Math at Lake Sybelia Elementary school scored at level 3 or above. |  |  |
| 2012          | Current level:   |   | 2013 Expecte   | ed level:  |  |  |
| FCAT<br>stude | ne 2012, 70% (182) stud<br>Math scored Level 3 or a<br>ents scored at level 3. Fo<br>ents scored level 4 or 5.   |   | By June 2013,  | By June 2013, 73% (190) of the students taking the FCAT Math at Lake Sybelia will score at level 3 or higher.          |  |  |
|               | Pro  | olem-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             | Students do not have speed and accuracy with simple calculations.  | Teachers will structure class time and/or homework time for students to memorize through repetition, core functions as developmentally appropriate. | Classroom<br>teachers, CRT,<br>Principal               | Students will show proficiency with math facts and accuracy in simple calculations.                                    | Classroom<br>assessments,<br>Math Benchmark<br>exams, FCAT<br>Math |  |

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<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 (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for<br>Follow-<br>up/Monitoring | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring |
|---|------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|
| Mathematical<br>shifts in<br>Common<br>Core |                        | Common<br>Core Black<br>Belt team         | Teachers and administrators   | ongoing  | observations,                            | Principal,<br>Assistant<br>Principal, CRT              |

#### 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 Developme | nt                       |                |                         |
| Strategy               | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount     |
| Lesson Study           | Lesson Study materials   | School Budget  | \$4,500.00              |
|                        | -                        | -              | Subtotal: \$4,500.00    |
| Other                  |                          |                |                         |
| Strategy               | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount     |
| No Data                | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00                  |
|                        |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.00        |
|                        |                          |                | Grand Total: \$4,500.00 |

End of Become Fluent in Math Operations. Goal(s)

# Increase college and career readiness. Goal:

|   | 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: |  |  |   |   |  |
|---|--|--|--|---|---|--|
| Increase college and career readiness. Goal     Increase college and career readiness. Goal #1: |  |  |  | In June 2012, 100% of the teachers for grades 3, 4 and 5 were trained in Destination College. |   |  |
| 2012  | : Current level:   |  | 2013 Expecte   | ed level:   |   |  |
| In June 2012, 100% of the teachers for grades 3, 4 and 5 were trained in Destination College.   |  |  | will implement   | 100% of the teachers in<br>Year 1 modules for Desti<br>ining in Year 2 modules.               |   |  |
|   | Pro  | olem-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   | Lack of time to implement Destination College.   | 3rd, 4th and 5th grade<br>teachers will select a<br>Leadership Team to<br>brainstorm<br>implementation ideas in<br>line with time frame. | Teachers, CRT,<br>Principal,<br>Assistant Principal    | Minutes and sign-in<br>sheets from Leadership<br>Team.  | Teacher<br>reflections,<br>Leadership Team<br>reflections |  |

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<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 (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for<br>Follow-<br>up/Monitoring | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring         |
|--|------------------------|---|--|--|--|--|
| Destination<br>College<br>training Year<br>2<br>implementation | Destination            | CRT, Reading<br>coach, Grade<br>Chairs    |  | June 2013  | Classroom<br>observations,               | Principal,<br>Assistant<br>Principal,<br>Reading Coach,<br>CRT |

#### 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 Increase college and career readiness. Goal(s)

Increase the percent of VPK students who will enter elementary school ready based on FLKRS data. Goal:

|                        | d on the analysis of studeed of improvement for the  |   | nd reference to "G  | uiding Questions", identif                                   | y and define areas     |  |
|------------------------|--|---|---|--|------------------------|--|
| enter<br>Goal<br>Incre | crease the percent of V<br>relementary school rea<br>ease the percent of VPK<br>entary school ready ba | ady based on FLKRS da   | In August 2011<br>Lake Sybelia El<br>higher.                          | 1, 70% (78) kindergarter<br>lementary with FLKRS sco         |                        |  |
| 2012                   | Current level:   |   | 2013 Expecte  | ed level:  |                        |  |
|                        | gust 2011, 70% (78) kin<br>Sybelia Elementary with<br>r.   |   |   | enter Lake Sybelia Elementary with FLKRS scores at 70%       |                        |  |
|                        | Prol   | olem-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                      | Pre-schools in the<br>surrounding area<br>unaware of Common<br>Core standards.                         | Invite instructors from pre-schools in the surrounding area to kindergarten orientation and other curriculum events during the school year. | Principal,<br>Assistant<br>Principal, CRT,<br>and Media<br>Specialist | Sign-in sheets at curriculum events                          | FLKRS data for 2013.   |  |
|                        | Lack of dialogue<br>between pre-schools in   | Invite instructors from pre-schools in the  | Principal, CRT,<br>kindergarten                                       | Log of observations and visits from pre-school               | FLKRS data for<br>2013 |  |

| 2 | the surrounding area | surrounding area to     | teachers | instructors. |  |
|---|----------------------|-------------------------|----------|--------------|--|
|   | and Lake Sybelia     | observe in kindergarten |          |              |  |
|   | teachers.            | classrooms.             |          |              |  |

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<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                           |                        |  |   |  |  |  |  |

#### 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 |

 $\textit{End of Increase the percent of VPK students who will enter elementary school ready based on \textit{FLKRS data}. \textit{Goal(s)}\\$ 

# Increase the number of students who read on grade level by age 9. Goal:

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: |                                   |  |  |  |
|--|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 1. Increase the number of students who read on grade level by age 9. Goal  Increase the number of students who read on grade level by age 9. Goal #1:              | Refer to reading goals 1a and 2a. |  |  |  |
|  |                                   |  |  |  |

| 2012 Current level:                                     |          |   | 2013 Expected level:              |  |                 |  |
|---|----------|---|-----------------------------------|--|-----------------|--|
| Refer to reading goals 1a and 2a.                       |          |   | Refer to reading goals 1a and 2a. |  |                 |  |
| 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 S   | Submitted                         |  |                 |  |

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

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

| PD<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      |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

#### 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 |

### Decrease the achievement gap for each identified subgroup. Goal:

| 3  | of student achievement data,<br>for the following group: | , and r   | reference  | to "Guiding Questions", i                                    | identify and define areas |
|--|--|---|--|--|---------------------------|
| Decrease the achievement gap for each identified subgroup. Goal  Decrease the achievement gap for each identified subgroup. Goal #1: |  |   | Refer to reading goals 5b, 5c, 5d, 5e. Refer to math goals 5b, 5c, 5d, 5e. |  |                           |
| 2012 Current level:  |  |   | 2013 Expected level:   |  |                           |
| Refer to reading goals 5b, 5c, 5d, 5e. Refer to math goals 5b, 5c, 5d, 5e.   |  |   | Refer to reading goals 5b, 5c, 5d, 5e. Refer to math goals 5b, 5c, 5d, 5e. |  |                           |
|  | Problem-Solving Proces                                   | s to I  | ncrease S  | 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 S  | Submitted  |  |                           |

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

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

| PD<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      |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

#### Budget:

| Strategy   | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
|------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| No Data    | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|            |                          |                | Subtotal: \$0.0     |
| Technology |                          |                |                     |
| Strategy   | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available<br>Amount |
| No Data    | No Data                  | No Data        | \$0.00              |
|            |                          |                |                     |

| 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 Decrease the achievement gap for each identified subgroup. Goal(s)

### Maintain high fine arts enrollment percentage. Goal:

|      | d on the analysis of stud<br>ed of improvement for th                              | ent achievement data, a<br>e following group:   | nd reference to "G                                     | uiding Questions", identi   | fy and define areas                             |  |
|------|--|---|--|---|---|--|
| Goal | aintain high fine arts er<br>tain high fine arts enro                              | nrollment percentage.<br>Illment percentage. Goa  | Flementary par   | In June 2012 100% (652) of the students at Lake Sybelia Elementary participated in Art and Music classes on a weekly basis. |   |  |
| 2012 | Current level:   |   | 2013 Expecte   | ed level:   |   |  |
| Elem | entary participated in Art<br>ly basis.  | 3   | Elementary par<br>weekly basis.                        |   |   |  |
|      | Anticipated Barrier  | Strategy  | Person or<br>Position<br>Responsible for<br>Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy   | Evaluation Tool                                 |  |
| 1    | Lack of resources to fund positions to continue weekly participation in fine arts. | Provide additional opportunities in fine arts outside the regular curriculum through PTA enrichment classes, strings, chorus, and art club. |  | Class rolls   | Student survey<br>and classroom<br>observations |  |

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.

| 11 | PD<br>ontent /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                          |                        |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

#### 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 Maintain high fine arts enrollment percentage. Goal(s)

# Decrease disproportionate classification in special education. Goal:

| 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: |                        |   |  |  |                 |  |
|--|------------------------|---|--|--|-----------------|--|
| Decrease disproportionate classification in special education. Goal  |                        |   | Refer to reading goal 5d and math goal 5d. |  |                 |  |
| Decrease disproportionate classification in special education. Goal #1:  |                        |   |  |  |                 |  |
| 2012 Current level:  |                        |   | 2013 Expected level:                       |  |                 |  |
| Refer to reading goal 5d and math goal 5d.   |                        |   | Refer to reading goal 5d and math goal 5d. |  |                 |  |
|  | Problem-Solving Proces | s to I  | ncrease S                                  | tudent 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      |   |  |  |                 |  |

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<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                           |                        |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

### 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 Decrease disproportionate classification in special education. Goal(s)

### FINAL BUDGET

| Evidence-based Program            | m(s)/Material(s)                            |  |                 |                          |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|-----------------|--------------------------|
| Goal                              | Strategy                                    | Description of<br>Resources  | Funding Source  | Available Amount         |
| Reading                           | Leveled Literacy<br>Intervention            | Intervention materials for targeted instruction  | School Budget   | \$4,000.00               |
| Writing                           | Implement practice prompts from Write Score | Practice prompts that<br>are scored and<br>discussed with<br>students  | School Budget   | \$2,500.00               |
| Attendance                        | Prompt and Present awards                   | Certificates   | School Budget   | \$150.00                 |
|                                   |   |  |                 | Subtotal: \$6,650.00     |
| Technology                        |   |  |                 |                          |
| Goal                              | Strategy                                    | Description of<br>Resources  | Funding Source  | Available Amount         |
| Attendance                        | Monitor attendance                          | SMS  | District System | \$0.00                   |
|                                   |   |  |                 | Subtotal: \$0.00         |
| Professional Developme            | ent   |  |                 |                          |
| Goal                              | Strategy                                    | Description of<br>Resources  | Funding Source  | Available Amount         |
| Reading                           | Lesson Study                                | Teachers participate in<br>at least 2 cycles of<br>Lesson Study led by<br>our Lesson Study Lead<br>Teacher, CRT and<br>District Reading<br>Teacher | School Budget   | \$2,700.00               |
| Reading                           | Common Core<br>Standards                    | Professional Learning<br>Communities meet with<br>Black Belt team and<br>CRT to discuss<br>implementation of<br>common core<br>standards.          | School Budget   | \$0.00                   |
| Mathematics                       | Interactive word walls                      | Word wall resources<br>Word wall reference<br>books  | School Budget   | \$1,000.00               |
| Science                           | Science fusion training                     | Workshops at district  | school budget   | \$400.00                 |
| Suspension                        | School-wide behavior program training       | Behavior Leadership<br>Team  | School Budget   | \$0.00                   |
| Become Fluent in Math Operations. | Lesson Study                                | Lesson Study materials   | School Budget   | \$4,500.00               |
|                                   |   |  |                 | Subtotal: \$8,600.00     |
| Other                             |   |  |                 |                          |
| Goal                              | Strategy                                    | Description of<br>Resources  | Funding Source  | Available Amount         |
| Suspension                        | CHILL Program                               | CHILL Counselor  | School Budget   | \$20,000.00              |
|                                   |   |  |                 | Subtotal: \$20,000.00    |
|                                   |   |  |                 | Grand Total: \$35,250.00 |

# Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: jn Yes jn No

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{A}}$  reward school is any school that improves their letter grade or any school graded  $\ensuremath{\mathsf{A}}.$ 

### School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

| Projected use of SAC Funds   | Amount |
|--|--------|
| SAC funds are no longer allocated by the state; therefore, there is no projected use of these funds. | \$0.00 |

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

The SAC will be hosting several parent presentations by our School Psychologist and teachers on school related issues and helping children be successful in school. Additionally, our CHILL Counselor provided through the Winter Park Health Foundation will be presenting on topics that impact student learning. The SAC will be monitoring the School Improvement Plan and meeting with local government officials.

### 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

| Orange School District<br>LAKE SYBELI A ELEMENTARY<br>2010-2011 |           |           |         |     |                           |   |
|---|-----------|-----------|---------|-----|---------------------------|---|
|   | Reading   | Math      | Writing |     | Grade<br>Points<br>Earned |   |
| % Meeting High<br>Standards (FCAT<br>Level 3 and Above)         | 89%       | 86%       | 95%     | 78% | 348                       | 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                          | 71%       | 62%       |         |     | 133                       | 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?            | 70% (YES) | 50% (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  |           |           |         |     | 601                       |   |
| Percent Tested = 99%  |           |           |         |     |                           | Percent of eligible students tested   |
| School Grade*   |           |           |         |     | А                         | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested  |

| Orange School District<br>LAKE SYBELI A ELEMENTARY<br>2009-2010 |         |           |         |         |                           |   |
|---|---------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------------|---|
|   | Reading | Math      | Writing | Science | Grade<br>Points<br>Earned |   |
| % Meeting High<br>Standards (FCAT<br>Level 3 and Above)         | 90%     | 89%       | 84%     | 76%     | 339                       | 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                          | 76%     | 79%       |         |         | 155                       | 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?            |         | 72% (YES) |         |         |                           | Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.  |
| FCAT Points Earned  |         |           |         |         | 636                       |   |
| Percent Tested = 100%   |         |           |         |         |                           | Percent of eligible students tested   |
| School Grade*   |         |           |         |         |                           | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested  |