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

School Name: ADVANTAGE ACAD MATH AND SCIENCE AT WATERSTONE

District Name: Dade

Principal: Nathaniel Grasch

SAC Chair: Estelle Strader

Superintendent: Alberto Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 10/25/2012

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

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

## PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

### STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

### ADMINISTRATORS

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

| Position | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | # of Years at Current School | # of Years as an Administrator | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Principal | Melissa Aguilar | BS Special Education<br>MS Reading Education K-12<br>Educational Leadership | 1 | 8 | 12 11 10 09 08<br>School Grades A A A A A<br>AYP N Y N N<br>High Stds Reading 69 79 76 70 67<br>High Stds in Math 64 77 72 66 64<br>Lrng Gains Read 79 69 73 68 67<br>Lrng Gains Math 71 71 66 69 69<br>Gains R 25 85 68 67 71 61<br>Gains M 25 64 64 63 73 73 |

### 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.

| | | | # of | # of Years as | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| Subject Area | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | Years at Current School | an Instructional Coach | Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Math | TeresitaNieves | Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education<br>Certification: ESOL<br>Reading Endorsement<br>Gifted Endorsement | 2 | 3 | 12 11 10 09 08<br>School Grades A A A A A<br>AYP N Y N N<br>High Stds Reading 69 79 76 70 67<br>High Stds in Math 64 77 72 66 64<br>Lrng Gains Read 79 69 73 68 67<br>Lrng Gains Math 71 71 66 69 69<br>Gains R 25 85 68 67 71 61<br>Gains M 25 64 64 63 73 73 |
| Reading | Pamela Picasso | Bachelor in Science in Political Science<br>Master in Science in Reading Education<br><br>Certification<br>Elementary Education K-6<br>ESOL K-12<br>Reading K-12 | 1 | 1 | 12 11 10 09 08<br>School Grades A A A A A<br>AYP N Y N N<br>High Stds Reading 69 79 76 70 67<br>High Stds in Math 64 77 72 66 64<br>Lrng Gains Read 79 69 73 68 67<br>Lrng Gains Math 71 71 66 69 69<br>Gains R 25 85 68 67 71 61<br>Gains M 25 64 64 63 73 73 |

## EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

| | Description of Strategy | Person Responsible | Projected Completion Date | Not Applicable (If not, please explain why) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Provide salaries commensurate with district pay scale. | Governing Board | August 2012 | |
| 2 | Employer will pay 90% of employee health costs. | Governing Board | August 2012 | |
| 3 | Ads are placed in local newspaper and applicants are screened prior to making an appointment for an interview. Applicants are interviewed by appropriate personnel including the Director, the Principal, the Assistant Principal, the ESE Specialist, the ESOL Director and the Reading Coach, where applicable. | Governing Board | August 2012, as needed | |
| 4 | Soliciting referrals from current employees. | Governing Board | August 2012 | |
| 5 | Working with local universities to provide opportunities for internships and service learning hours | Governing Board | September 14, 2012 | |

## Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

| Number of staff and paraprofessional 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 | N/A |

## Staff Demographics

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

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

| Total Number of Instructional Staff | % of First-Year Teachers | % of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience | % of Teachers with Advanced Degrees | % Highly Effective Teachers | % Reading Endorsed Teachers | % National Board Certified Teachers | % ESOL Endorsed Teachers |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 14 | 50.0%(7) | 35.7%(5) | 14.3%(2) | 0.0%(0) | 7.1%(1) | 100.0%(14) | 7.1%(1) | 0.0%(0) | 92.9%(13) |

## Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

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

| Mentor Name | Mentee Assigned | Rationale for Pairing | Planned Mentoring Activities |
|---|---|---|---|
| Loraine Ross | Elizabeth Gonzalez | Ms. Ross is an experienced Kindergarten teacher and the grade level Lead Teacher. | Lesson planning and data driven curriculum planning and instruction. Modeling of instruction. |
| Lindley Butler | Monica Guinart | Ms. Butler has successfully taught Kindergarten for 4 years and 2nd grade for 1 year. | Lesson planning and data driven curriculum planning and instruction. Modeling of instruction. |
| Patricia Marchand | Milagros Rodriguez | Ms. Marchand has successfully taught Kindergarten for 2 years and 1st grade for 1 year. | Lesson planning and data driven curriculum planning and instruction. Modeling of instruction. |
| Patricia Marchand | Elizabeth Guier | Ms. Marchand has successfully taught Kindergarten for 2 years and 1st grade for 1 year. | Lesson planning and data driven curriculum planning and instruction. Modeling of instruction. |
| Loraine Ross | Jessica Ferrare | Ms. Ross is an experienced Kindergarten teacher and the grade level Lead Teacher. | Lesson planning and data driven curriculum planning and instruction. Modeling of instruction. |

# 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/A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

N/A

Title I, Part D

N/A

Title II

N/A

Title III

N/A

Title X- Homeless

N/A

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

N/A

Violence Prevention Programs

N/A

Nutrition Programs

N/A

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

Other

N/A

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

### School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Principal, Reading Coach, Math Coach, Assistant Principals, Guidance Counselor, Dean of Students, Science Lead Teacher, Language Arts Department Head and the ESE Program Specialist.

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 following steps will be considered by the school's Leadership Team to address how we can utilize the RtI process to enhance data collection, data analysis, problem solving, differentiated assistance, and progress monitoring.

The Leadership Team will:
1. Monitor academic and behavior data evaluating progress by addressing the following important questions:
• What will all students learn? (curriculum based on standards)
• How will we determine if the students have learned? (common assessments)
• How will we respond when students have not learned? (Response to Intervention problem solving process and monitoring progress of interventions)
• How will we respond when students have learned or already know? (enrichment opportunities).
2. Gather and analyze data to determine professional development for faculty as indicated by student intervention and achievement needs.
3. Hold regular team meetings.
4. Maintain communication with staff for input and feedback, as well as updating them on procedures and progress.

5. Support a process and structure within the school to design, implement, and evaluate both daily instruction and specific interventions.
6. Provide clear indicators of student need and student progress, assisting in examining the validity and effectiveness of program delivery.
7. Assist with monitoring and responding to the needs of subgroups within the expectations for adequate yearly progress.

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

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

MTSS Implementation

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

1. Data will be used to guide instructional decisions and system procedures for all students to:
• adjust the delivery of curriculum and instruction to meet the specific needs of students
• adjust the delivery of behavior management system
• adjust the allocation of school-based resources
• drive decisions regarding targeted professional development
• create student growth trajectories in order to identify and develop interventions
2. Managed data will include:
Academic
• FAIR assessment/PMRN
• Baseline and Post Test Review
• EDUSOFT Managed data
• CELLA assessments
• In-house Reading, Writing, Math and Science assessments
• SESAT-2
• Student grades
Behavior
• Student Case Management System
• In-house behavior database using our school-wide discipline plan
• Detentions
• Suspensions/expulsions
• Referrals by student behavior, staff behavior, and administrative context
• Team climate surveys
• Attendance
• Referrals to special education programs

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The district professional development and support will include:
1. Training for all administrators in the RtI problem solving, data analysis process;
2. Providing support for school staff to understand basic RtI principles and procedures; and providing a network of ongoing support for RtI organized through feeder patterns.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Frequent needs assessments will take place so as to support any areas with needed professional development. A focus on the FCIM will allow the MTSS to implement plans of action, evaluate their effectiveness, and make any necessary changes and adjustments.

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

## School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Melissa Aguilar (Principal) , Vania Capote ( School Counselor) and Leila Ibanez (ESE Program Specialist), Pamela Picasso-Alarcon (Reading Coach), Marissa Muriel (Language Arts Department Head), Dominique Diaz (Science Lead Teacher), Virginia DiMichele (Dean of Students).

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

Our LLT meets during the summer to develop the reading pacing guide, thematic calendar and novels read per grade level. Throughout the year, our LLT meets to discuss student progress as evident by weekly school-wide assessments. The LLT analyzes the data, assists in changing curriculum to meet the needs of the students, and identifies students for remediation. Intervention is given to students whose scores indicate a need for remediation. Students who are in the bottom 25%, have significantly low FAIR scores, have been retained and/or demonstrate weakness in mastering grade level material are provided with intensive remediation and monitored on a monthly basis through assessments and progress monitoring.

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

School wide the students will be using Ticket to Read, FCAT Explorer, KidBiz, and Accelerated Reader to improve fluency and reading comprehension. School will provide incentives to students who reach predetermined individual goals.

## Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification

No Attachment

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

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

N/A

## *Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

N/A

## *High Schools Only

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

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

N/A

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

N/A

## Postsecondary Transition

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

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

| |
|---|
| N/A |

# PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

## Reading Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #1a: | The results of the 2011-2012 SESAT Reading Test indicate that 90% of the students achieved Level 5 or higher. Our goal for 2012-2013 school year is to increase the number of Level 5 or higher by 2 percentage point to 92%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 90% (96) | 92% (224) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Students will come into Kindergarten at various levels. A large majority of our students will not have complete letter recognition, letter-sound relationships and grade level appropriate vocabulary. | During pre-reading activities, students will utilize concept maps and word walls to help build their knowledge of word meanings and their relationships.<br><br>During Reading instruction students will participate in a variety of vocabulary development activities that would enhance their word knowledge. Students will dissect vocabulary through exploration activities.<br><br>Implement Reading Racer daily data driven decoding and fluency checks. | MTSS/RtI Team | Fluency Checks and Reading Racers will assist us in monitoring and tracking students letter-sound recognition and site word development. Reading Racers is done weekly. (FCIM) | Formative:<br>Pre and Post Test Weekly<br>Mini Assessments Weekly<br>Student Portfolio<br><br>Summative: 2012-2013 SESAT |
| 2 | | | | | |

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #2a: | The results of the 2011-2012 SESAT Reading Test indicate that 48% of the students achieved Levels 8 & 9 or higher. Our goal for 2013 school year is to increase the number of Level 8 & 9 by 1 percentage point to 49%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 48% (51) | 49% (119) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Students will come into Kindergarten at various levels. A large majority of our students will not have complete letter recognition, letter-sound relationships and grade level appropriate vocabulary. | During pre-reading activities, students will utilize concept maps and word walls to help build their knowledge of word meanings and their relationships.<br><br>During Reading instruction students will participate in a variety of vocabulary development activities that would enhance their word knowledge. Students will dissect vocabulary through exploration activities.<br><br>Implement Reading Racer daily data driven decoding and fluency checks. | MTSS/RtI Team | Fluency Checks and Reading Racers will assist us in monitoring and tracking students letter-sound recognition and site word development. Reading Racers is done weekly. (FCIM) | Formative:<br>Pre and Post Test<br>Mini Assessments<br>Weekly<br>Student Portfolio<br><br>Summative: 2012-2013 SESAT |

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

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #3a: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment:<br>Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #3b: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

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

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

| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #4: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | Reading Goal #<br><br>5A : |
|---|---|

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

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

| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #5B: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making | |
|---|---|

| | |
|---|---|
| satisfactory progress in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #5C: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.<br><br>Reading Goal #5E: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

| PD Content / Topic and / or PLC Focus | Grade Level / Subject | PD Facilitator and / or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up / Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Common Core Training | Kindergarten | Reading Coach | Reading and Language Arts Teachers | August 26, 2012 | Informal Classroom Observations Lesson Plans | Reading Coach Principal |
| Reading Racers | Kindergarten | Reading Coach | Reading and Language Arts Teachers | August 14, 2012 | Informal Classroom Observations Lesson Plans | Reading Coach Principal |

Reading Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s) / Material(s) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Review of reading strategies for fluency | Fluency passages & charts laminated and Sand Timers | School-based Budget | $200.00 |
| Implementation of vocabulary development lessons | Reading Racers | School-based Budget | $100.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $300.00 |
| **Technology** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Use of Mimio Board lesson | Mimio Board Lessons | School-Based Budget | $100.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $100.00 |
| **Professional Development** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Other** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: $400.00 |

*End of Reading Goals*

## Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | |
| 1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.<br><br>CELLA Goal #1: | Our goal is to increase the percentage of English Language Learners who are proficient in Oral Skills (listening and speaking) on CELLA by 3% in the 2012-2013 school year. |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking: | |
| 23% (7) | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | ELL students lack vocabulary to gain comprehension from listening. | English Language Learners will receive in-school intervention. This intervention will teach strategies that help students determine meanings of words by using context clues. | MTSS/RtI Team | Monthly classroom assessments/observations focusing on student's ability to complete assignments as the teacher becomes a facilitator guiding students to become independent learners. Rubrics will be developed to assess student learning. (FCIM) | Summative: CELLA 2013 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | |
| 2. Students scoring proficient in reading.<br><br>CELLA Goal #2: | Our goal is to increase the percentage of English Language Learners who are proficient in Reading on CELLA by 3% in the 2012-2013 school year. |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading: | |
| 6% (2) | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | ELL students lack vocabulary and the ability to use context clues, base words, and affixes, antonyms, synonyms, homographs, and homophones to determine the meanings of words. | English Language Learners will also receive in school reading intervention. This intervention will teach reading strategies that help students determine meanings of words by using context clues | MTSS/RtI Team | Monthly classroom assessments/observations focusing on student's ability to complete assignments as the teacher becomes a facilitator guiding students to become independent learners. Rubrics will be developed to assess student learning. (FCIM) | CELLA 2013 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | |
| 3. Students scoring proficient in writing.<br><br>CELLA Goal #3: | Our goal is to increase the percentage of English Language Learners who are proficient in Writing on CELLA by 3% in the 2012-2013 school year. |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing: | |
| 6% (2) | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | ELL students lack grammar and convention skills to write in simple complete sentences and paragraphs. | English Language Learners will also receive in school writing intervention. This intervention will teach grade level specific grammar and convention skills that will help students write following proper writing conventions. | MTSS/RtI Team | Monthly classroom assessments/observations focusing on student's ability to complete assignments as the teacher becomes a facilitator guiding students to become independent learners. Rubrics will be developed to assess student learning. (FCIM) | Formative: Baseline and Interim Assessments<br><br>Student work samples using rubrics, mini assessments and teacher observations<br><br>CELLA 2013 |

CELLA Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Implementation of vocabulary development lessons | ELL Vocabulary Cards | School based budget | $100.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $100.00 |
| **Technology** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Use of FCRR center activities | Paper and lamination | School based budget | $150.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $150.00 |
| **Professional Development** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Other** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: $250.00 |

*End of CELLA Goals*

## Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #1a: | The results of the 2011-2012 SESAT Math Test indicate that 65 % of the students achieved Levels 5 or higher. Our goal for 2012-2013 school year is to increase the number of Level 5 or higher by 3 percentage point to 68%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 65% (107) | 68% ( 165) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Many students come into kindergarten with little mathematical concepts number sense concepts | Provide the instructional support needed for students to develop quick recall of addition facts and related subtraction facts, and basic concepts of multiplication and Algebraic Thinking. The focus will be more on teaching the Mathematical Concept and assessing both students Math fluency and application. | MTSS/RtI Team | Monthly review of formative assessments to ensure that the students are showing progress and adjust teaching as necessary.<br>Conduct grade level and department meetings to gather information and feedback from the instructional staff and adjust instruction as necessary.<br>(FCIM) | Formative:<br>Pre Test and Post Test Monthly<br><br>Bi-weekly assessments<br><br>Summative: 2013 SESAT |

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #2a: | The results of the 2011-2012 SESAT Math Test indicate that 9% of the students achieved Levels 8 & 9 or higher. Our goal for 2012-2013 school year is to increase the number of Level 8 & 9 or higher 1 percentage point to 10%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 9% (10) | 10% (24) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Many students come into kindergarten with little mathematical concepts number sense concepts | Students will apply the math concepts learned to real-world problems. | MTSS/RtI Team | Monthly review of formative assessments to ensure that the students are showing progress and adjust teaching as necessary.<br>Conduct grade level and department meetings to gather information and feedback from the instructional staff and adjust instruction as necessary.<br>(FCIM) | Formative: Baseline and Interim Assessments<br><br>Bi-weekly assessments<br><br>Summative: 2013 SESAT |

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #3a: | |

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #4: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

No Data Submitted

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

| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | Elementary School Mathematics Goal # 5A : | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | | | | | | |

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

| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5B: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5D: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5E: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

*End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals*

## Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #1a: | |
| | |

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #2a: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #3a: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment:<br>Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #3b: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #4: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on 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%. | Middle School Mathematics Goal #<br>5A : |
|---|---|

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

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

| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5B: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5C: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5D: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.<br><br>Mathematics Goal #5E: | |

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

*End of Middle School Mathematics Goals*

## Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra.<br><br>Algebra Goal #1: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra.<br><br>Algebra Goal #2: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| 3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | Algebra Goal # 3A : | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | | | | | | |

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

| 3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.<br><br>Algebra Goal #3B: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| 3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.<br><br>Algebra Goal #3C: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.<br><br>Algebra Goal #3D: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Algebra.<br><br>Algebra Goal #3E: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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



## Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

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

| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry.<br><br>Geometry Goal #1: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry.<br><br>Geometry Goal #2: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| 3A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | Geometry Goal #<br>3A : |
|---|---|

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

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

| 3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.<br><br>Geometry Goal #3B: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| 3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.<br><br>Geometry Goal #3C: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| 3D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.<br><br>Geometry Goal #3D: | |
|---|---|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
|---|---|
| 3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.<br><br>Geometry Goal #3E: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

*End of Geometry EOC Goals*

---

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Effective Implementation of Math Manipulatives | Kindergarten | Math Coach | All Kindergarten Teachers | August 14, 2012<br>September 26, 2012 | Lesson Plans and Observations | Math Coach |

---

Mathematics Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Scoring High | Scoring High (K-2) for SESAT | EESAC Funds | $275.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $275.00 |
| **Technology** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Implementation of virtual Math Manipulatives | LCD and Procedures | EESAC Funds | $100.00 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Subtotal: $100.00 |
| **Professional Development** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Other** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: $375.00 |

*End of Mathematics Goals*

## Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.<br><br>Science Goal #1a: | AAMS has expanded the number of Kindergarten students. Based on an in-house Science Assessment 20% students demonstrated proficiency. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 20% | 25% |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | The area of deficiency as noted on the in-house Science Assessment was the Scientific Method. | Students will be engaged in activities and Science labs that allow them to apply the steps to the Scientific Method. | RTI Leadership team | Monthly review of formative assessments to ensure students are making adequate progress and adjust teaching as required as per FCIM. | Formative Bi-weekly Assessments.<br><br>Summative Post-Assessment. |

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.<br><br>Science Goal #2a: | AAMS has expanded the number of Kindergarten students. Based on an in-house Science Assessment 20% students demonstrated proficiency. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 20% | 25% |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | The area of deficiency Among students in the top 25% demonstrated weakness in creating a conclusion based a lab experiment. | Students will be engaged in lab activities specifically to identify the components which lead to a creating a conclusion. | RTI Leadership team | Monthly review of formative assessments to ensure students are making adequate progress and adjust teaching as required as per FCIM. | Formative Bi-weekly Assessments. Summative Post-Assessment. |

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Implementation of New Science Curriculum | Kindergarten | | Science Lead School-wide | October 2012 | Student Lab Journals Lesson Plans | Principal |

Science Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Implementation of hands-on, real-world Science lessons | Fusuion/AIMS Students and Teacher Kits (K) | School-based budget | $300.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $300.00 |
| **Technology** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Implementation of New Science Curriculum | Science Fusion | School-based budget | $2,000.00 |
| Implementation of virtual labs | Virtual manipulatives and LCD projectors | School-based budget | $100.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $2,100.00 |
| **Professional Development** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Data chats on Science Data | Data Chat sheets and Edusoft data | School-based budget | $100.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $100.00 |
| **Other** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: $2,500.00 |

*End of Science Goals*

## Writing Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.<br><br>Writing Goal #1a: | The results of the 2012 District Writing Post-test indicate that 5% of the students achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain 10% proficiency. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 5% | 10% |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | The area of deficiency as noted on the in-house Writing Assessment was being able write a complete sentence with a simple subject and predicate with grade level appropriate spelling conventions. | Students will be engaged in activities specifically to identify proper structure of a simple sentence. Students will be engaged in activities specifically to apply grade level appropriate spelling conventions such as phonics rules and basic spelling rules. | RTI Leadership team<br><br>Language Arts Department Head | Continuous administrative walk-through evaluations (formal & informal). Administer and score monthly writing prompts to monitor student progress and adjust instruction as indicated. (FCIM) | Formative<br>District Writing Pre-tests<br>Mini Assessments |

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

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

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Implementing the Common Core Writing Standards | Kindergarten | Department Chair | School-wide | August 15, 2012 | Lesson plans and Sample writing | Principal |

Writing Budget:

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

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|---|---|---|---|
| Implementing the Common Core Writing Standards | Common Core Writing Standards | School-based Budget | $100.00 |
| Implementing CraftPlus Daily Writing Lessons | CraftPlus Daily Writing Program | School-based budget | $4,000.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $4,100.00 |

**Technology**

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|---|---|---|---|
| Use of interactive boards for peer editing activities and writing lessons | LCD Projector Bulbs | School-based Budget | $200.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $200.00 |

**Professional Development**

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|---|---|---|---|
| Review how to implement Common Core Writing Standards | Common Core K Writing Standards | School-based budget | $50.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $50.00 |

**Other**

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|---|---|---|---|
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: $4,350.00 |

*End of Writing Goals*

## Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics.<br><br>Civics Goal #1: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | |
|---|---|
| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.<br><br>Civics Goal #2: | |
| | |

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

Civics Budget:

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

*End of Civics Goals*

## Attendance Goal(s)

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

| Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
|---|---|
| 1. Attendance<br><br>Attendance Goal #1: | The Average Daily Attendance Rate for 2011-2012 was 96.54 %. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the attendance rate to 97.02%.<br><br>In addition, our goal is to decrease the number of excessive absences (10 or more) and excessive tardies (10 or more) by 5%. |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: |
| 95.22% (103) | 95.72% (103) |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) |
| 37 | 35 |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) |
| 7 | 7 |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | New Arrival and dismissal procedures will take time for to acclimate and get adjusted | Continue to work with community to establish the new arrival and dismissal procedures that facilitate the flow of traffic reducing the number of tardies.<br>Use sign-in /check-out system to monitor tardies and recognize students with perfect attendance each quarter.<br><br>Issuance of parent letter that will inform parents of their child's attendance records and the district's attendance policies. | Leadership Team | Observation and monitoring of traffic and attendance records. | Attendance records<br>Parent Survey<br>Completion of evaluation charts |

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Parent Meetings | Kindergarten | Administration | School-wide | TBA | Attendance Reports | Administration |

Attendance Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Class 100% incentives per quarter & Information regarding new procedures | Paper for quarterly attendance goals coloring pages & arrival/dismissal procedures flyers | PTSO Funds | $100.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $100.00 |
| **Technology** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Scan ID badges in order to assist in the flow of tardies | ID badge and barcode reader | School-based budget | $300.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $300.00 |
| **Professional Development** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Parental Involvement = Success | Parent nights to discuss positive outcomes of parental involvement and strategies to be involved parents | PTSO funds | $100.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $100.00 |
| **Other** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| | | | **Grand Total: $500.00** |

*End of Attendance Goal(s)*

## Suspension Goal(s)

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

| Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
|---|---|
| 1. Suspension<br><br>Suspension Goal #1: | The number of in-school suspensions in the 2011-2012 school year was 2. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain the total number of in-school suspensions to 2.<br><br>The number of out-of- school suspensions in the 2011-2012 school year was 9. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease the total number of out-of-school suspensions to 8. |
| 2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions |
| 2 | 2 |

| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School |
|---|---|
| 2 | 2 |
| 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions |
| 9 | 8 |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School |
| 7 | 6 |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Due to the expansion of students, new students and parents may not be familiar with the Student Code of Conduct. | Parent Workshops to increase parental involvement.<br><br>Continuation of recognition programs such as Student of the Month, Do The Right Thing,<br><br>Lessons on Character Education in an effort to take a proactive approach to discipline using videos.<br><br>School-wide implementation of discipline plan. | Leadership Team | Review of suspension report | Suspension Report. |

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| School-wide Discipline Plan | Kindergarten | Dean of Students | Kindergarten teachers | August 16, 2012 | School-Wide Plan documentation Decrease in suspensions and detentions | Administration |

Suspension Budget:

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

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|---|---|---|---|
| School-wide implementation of: Do the Right Thing, Character Education and Students of the Month | Student rewards, recognition and incentives | SAC Funds | $200.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $200.00 |
| **Technology** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Show videos that pertain to character education | Purchase enough TVs and DVD players to ensure 1 per grade level | School-based budget | $100.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $100.00 |
| **Professional Development** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Classroom Management | School-wide discipline plan and procedures | School-based budget | $150.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $150.00 |
| **Other** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: $450.00 |

*End of Suspension Goal(s)*

## Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
|---|---|
| 1. Parent Involvement<br><br>Parent Involvement Goal #1:<br><br>**Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.* | 93% of the parents completed their volunteer hours by contributing time to the school. Our goal is that 94% of parents complete their volunteer hours. |
| 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement: | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: |
| 93% | 94% |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Parents are unfamiliar with the availability of opportunities for parental involvement. | Use the Black Board Connect call out system to invite parents to school sponsored activities.<br>Give incentives for parents to attend such activities.<br>Work closely with our PTSO to further | Leadership Team | Monthly review of volunteer Spreadsheet and sign in sheets for events.<br>Send updates on completed parent volunteer hours. | Volunteer Spreadsheet and data from Raptor. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | | enhance communication and participation of parents in school activities.<br>Parents received orientation packet to familiarize them with the school website.<br>Provide parents with options on volunteering as room parents | | | |

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

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

| PD Content / Topic and / or PLC Focus | Grade Level / Subject | PD Facilitator and / or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up / Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Homeroom Parent Procedures | Kindergarten | Administration | One designated parent per Homeroom | October 2012 | Parent Exit Survey | Principal & PSTO |

Parent Involvement Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s) / Material(s) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Implementation of Homeroom Parent | Homeroom Parent assists in communicating classroom needs, events and volunteer opportunities | PTSO Funds | $200.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $200.00 |
| **Technology** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Online Assessment Programs | In Student Portal MDCPS and pay for handout information | SAC Funds | $100.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $100.00 |
| **Professional Development** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Training of PTSO so that parents can hear from other parents | Handouts | SAC Funds | $100.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $100.00 |
| **Other** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| | | | **Grand Total: $400.00** |

*End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)*

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

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

| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
|---|---|
| 1. STEM<br><br>STEM Goal #1: | Increase the use of technology by<br><br>Increase the usage of the Mac labs within the instructional lessons.<br><br>Increase the understanding of the scientific process by promoting the Science Fair participation. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | The need for ongoing technology Professional Development. | Integrate technology to enhance lessons.<br><br>Use activities such as Science Fairs and weekly Science Labs to reinforce the Scientific Process and Scientific Thinking<br><br>Increase the implementation of virtual labs in science using manipulatives and LCD projectors.<br><br>Increase the implementation of virtual manipulatives in math by promoting the participation of Mathletics. | Leadership team. | Continuous administrative walk-through evaluations (formal & informal). | Science in-house assessment<br>SESAT Math 2013 |

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Integration of Mimio in the classroom | Kindergarten Cross Curricular | Hired Trainer | All Kindergarten Teachers | November 2012 | Lesson plans and walktroughs | Administrative Team |

STEM Budget:

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

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Professional Development** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Integrating Mimio in the classroom | Manuals and presentations | School based budget | $500.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $500.00 |
| **Other** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: $500.00 |

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

## Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

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

| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
|---|---|
| 1. CTE<br><br>CTE Goal #1: | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

CTE Budget:

| **Evidence-based Program(s) / Material(s)** | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Technology** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Professional Development** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| **Other** | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: $0.00 |

*End of CTE Goal(s)*

## Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

# FINAL BUDGET

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Review of reading strategies for fluency | Fluency passages & charts laminated and Sand Timers | School-based Budget | $200.00 |
| Reading | Implementation of vocabulary development lessons | Reading Racers | School-based Budget | $100.00 |
| CELLA | Implementation of vocabulary development lessons | ELL Vocabulary Cards | School based budget | $100.00 |
| Mathematics | Scoring High | Scoring High (K-2) for SESAT | EESAC Funds | $275.00 |
| Science | Implementation of hands-on, real-world Science lessons | Fusuion/AIMS Students and Teacher Kits (K) | School-based budget | $300.00 |
| Writing | Implementing the Common Core Writing Standards | Common Core Writing Standards | School-based Budget | $100.00 |
| Writing | Implementing CraftPlus Daily Writing Lessons | CraftPlus Daily Writing Program | School-based budget | $4,000.00 |
| Attendance | Class 100% incentives per quarter & Information regarding new procedures | Paper for quarterly attendance goals coloring pages & arrival/dismissal procedures flyers | PTSO Funds | $100.00 |
| Suspension | School-wide implementation of: Do the Right Thing, Character Education and Students of the Month | Student rewards, recognition and incentives | SAC Funds | $200.00 |
| Parent Involvement | Implementation of Homeroom Parent | Homeroom Parent assists in communicating classroom needs, events and volunteer opportunities | PTSO Funds | $200.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $5,575.00 |
| Technology | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Use of Mimio Board lesson | Mimio Board Lessons | School-Based Budget | $100.00 |
| CELLA | Use of FCRR center activities | Paper and lamination | School based budget | $150.00 |
| Mathematics | Implementation of virtual Math Manipulatives | LCD and Procedures | EESAC Funds | $100.00 |
| Science | Implementation of New Science Curriculum | Science Fusion | School-based budget | $2,000.00 |
| Science | Implementation of virtual labs | Virtual manipulatives and LCD projectors | School-based budget | $100.00 |
| Writing | Use of interactive boards for peer editing activities and writing lessons | LCD Projector Bulbs | School-based Budget | $200.00 |
| Attendance | Scan ID badges in order to assist in the flow of tardies | ID badge and barcode reader | School-based budget | $300.00 |
| Suspension | Show videos that pertain to character education | Purchase enough TVs and DVD players to ensure 1 per grade level | School-based budget | $100.00 |
| Parent Involvement | Online Assessment Programs | In Student Portal MDCPS and pay for handout information | SAC Funds | $100.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $3,150.00 |
| Professional Development | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Science | Data chats on Science Data | Data Chat sheets and Edusoft data | School-based budget | $100.00 |
| Writing | Review how to implement Common Core Writing Standards | Common Core K Writing Standards | School-based budget | $50.00 |
| Attendance | Parental Involvement = Success | Parent nights to discuss positive outcomes of parental involvement and strategies to be involved parents | PTSO funds | $100.00 |
| Suspension | Classroom Management | School-wide discipline plan and procedures | School-based budget | $150.00 |
| Parent Involvement | Training of PTSO so that parents can hear from other parents | Handouts | SAC Funds | $100.00 |
| STEM | Integrating Mimio in the classroom | Manuals and presentations | School based budget | $500.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $1,000.00 |
| Other | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | No Data | $0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: $0.00 |
| | | | | Grand Total: $9,725.00 |

## Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/14/2012)

## School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

| Projected use of SAC Funds | Amount |
|---|---|
| In an attempt to support the mission and vision of the school and increase student achievement, SAC funds may be used to purchase student incentives for attendance and demonstration of positive behavior. Incentives include supplies for pizza, pop corn and Snow Cone parties, stickers, pencils, goodie bags, certificates. | $200.00 |
| SAC funds may be used to purchase teacher resource materials and books and supplies to further develop our school library. Exemplar text books, more library books for students in grades K-1, one-year membership to Accelerated Reader. | $1,000.00 |
| Scoring High Scoring High (K-2) for SESAT EESAC Funds | $275.00 |
| Implementation of virtual Math Manipulatives LCD and Procedures EESAC Funds | $100.00 |
| School-wide implementation of: Do the Right Thing, Character Education and Students of the Month Student rewards, recognition and incentives SAC Funds | $200.00 |
| Online Assessment Programs In Student Portal MDCPS and pay for handout information SAC Funds | $100.00 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Training of PTSO so that parents can hear from other parents Handouts SAC Funds | $100.00 |

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

Monitor implementation of SIP Plan.
Monitor progress through review of assessment data.

## 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
No Data Found
No Data Found