Florida Department of Education



DRAFT School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

| School Name: Richey Elementary School | District Name: Pasco |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Principal: Ken Miesner | Superintendent: Heather Fiorantino |
| SAC Chair: Marisa Loiacono | Date of School Board Approval: |

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

School Grades Trend Data (Use this data to complete Sections 1-4 of the reading and mathematics goals and Sections 1 and 2 of the writing and science goals.)

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data (Use this data to inform the problem-solving process when writing goals.)

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) | Number of Years at Current School | Number 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 | Ken Miesner | BA, Exceptional | 6 | 11 | 10/11 Richey Elementary School |
|-----------|--------------|--------------------------------|---|----|--|
| Principal | Ken ivnesner | | 0 | 11 | |
| | | Student | | | Grade: A |
| | | Education, | | | AYP: No |
| | | University of | | | -Reading Proficient |
| | | South Florida | | | -Math Proficient |
| | | Masters, | | | -Reading Gains |
| | | Educational | | | -Math Gains |
| | | Leadership, | | | -Reading Lowest 25% with Gains |
| | | University of South Florida | | | -Math Lowest 25% with Gains |
| | | | | | 09/10 Richey Elementary School |
| | | | | | Grade: B |
| | | | | | AYP: No |
| | | | | | 74% Reading Proficient |
| | | | | | 69% Math Proficient |
| | | | | | 60% Reading Gains |
| | | | | | 62% Math Gains |
| | | | | | 46% -Reading Lowest 25% with Gains |
| | | | | | 63% -Math Lowest 25% with Gains |
| | | | | | 05/0 Madil Bowest 25/0 With Gains |
| | | | | | 08/09 Richey Elementary School |
| | | | | | Grade: A |
| | | | | | AYP: NO |
| | | | | | 82% -Reading Proficient |
| | | | | | 69% -Math Proficient |
| | | | | | 68% -Reading Gains |
| | | | | | 58% -Math Gains |
| | | | | | 60% -Reading Lowest 25% with Gains |
| | | | | | 71% -Math Lowest 25% with Gains |
| | | | | | , -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, |
| | | | | | 07/08 Richey Elementary School |
| | | | | | Grade: A |
| | | | | | AYP: A |
| | | | | | 78% -Reading Proficient |
| | | | | | 68% -Math Proficient |
| | | | | | 69% -Reading Gains |
| | | | | | 74% -Math Gains |
| | | | | | 74% -Reading Lowest 25% with Gains |
| | | | | | 73% -Math Lowest 25% with Gains |
| | | | | | 74% -Reading Lowest 25% with Gains |
| | | | | | 7470 -Reading Lowest 2370 with Gains |

| | | | 1 | | 73% -Math Lowest 25% with Gains |
|------------------------|----------------|--|---|---|---|
| Assistant Principal | Courtney Claud | BS, Elementary Education, University of South Florida Masters, Educational Leadership, University of South Florida | 3 | 3 | 10/11 Richey Elementary School Grade: A AYP: No -Reading Proficient -Math Proficient -Reading Gains -Math Gains -Reading Lowest 25% with Gains -Math Lowest 25% with Gains 09/10 Richey Elementary School Grade: B AYP: No 74% Reading Proficient 69% Math Proficient 60% Reading Gains 62% Math Gains 46% -Reading Lowest 25% with Gains 63% -Math Lowest 25% with Gains 08/09 Bardmoor Elementary School Grade: A AYP: Yes 07/08 Rawlings Elementary School Grade: A AYP: No 06/07 Rawlings Elementary School Grade: A AYP: Yes |

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 ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (AMO) progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

| Subject Area | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | Number of Years at Current School | Number of Years as an Instructional Coach | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year) |
|-----------------|----------------|---|---|---|--|
| Literacy | Courtney Lough | Bachelors, Elementary Education 1-6, Masters in Reading, Reading K-12 | 3 | 9 | 10/11 Richey Elementary School Grade: A AYP: No -Reading Proficient -Math Proficient -Reading Gains -Math Gains -Reading Lowest 25% with Gains -Math Lowest 25% with Gains 09/10 Richey Elementary School Grade: B AYP: No 74% Reading Proficient 69% Math Proficient 60% Reading Gains 62% Math Gains 46% -Reading Lowest 25% with Gains 63% -Math Lowest 25% with Gains Certification, ESOL Certification 08/09 Cotee River Elementary Grade: A AYP: No 07/08 Cotee River Elementary Grade: A AYP: No |
| | | | | | |

| 2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SII |
|--|
|--|

Highly Effective Teachers

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

| Description of Strategy | Person Responsible | Projected Completion Date |
|-------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------|
| 1. | | |
| 2. | | |
| 3. | | |
| 4. | | |

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who are NOT highly effective.

*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 |
|--|---|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

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 |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|---|--|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 54 | 1 (2%) | 41% (22) | 43% (23) | 15% (8) | 41% (22) | | 24% (13) | 6% (3) | 70% (38) |

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 | e Assigned | Rationale for Pairing | Planned Mentoring Activities |
|--------------------|------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|
|--------------------|------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|

| New Teachers | Veteran Teacher | Each teacher new to the profession is assigned a mentor who is selected based upon demonstration of sustained effective teaching practices. The mentor teacher is trained in Clinical Education. | This mentor works side by side with the New-to-Pasco teacher, providing support, resources, observation, and coaching sessions, and technical advise on an ongoing basis. New teacher support groups are provided monthly. Administrators routinely meet with mentors and mentees to provide coaching and support. In addition, all teachers receive support from team members, team leaders, specialists, administrators, and district staff. |
|--------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | | |
| | | | |

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

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

Title I, Part A

Title 1 funding will be used to provide professional development opportunities to teachers and administrators to address the specific academic achievement needs of the school.

In an effort to provide a comprehensible framework of services to better meet the needs of economically disadvantaged children and to give all children a greater chance for academic success, while reducing duplication of services, RIchey Elementary coordinates the utilization of federal, state, and local funds and integrates several programs in compliance with state and NCLB requirements.

• Title I funds will be used to expand the summer school program to all 3rd grade students who scored Level 2 and lower Level 3 on the Reading FCAT, and 1st and 2nd graders with a PMP in reading.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

- Title II, Part A funding will be used to provide professional development opportunities to teachers and administrators to address the specific academic achievement needs of the school
- IDEA funding will be used in conjunction with Title II funds to train teachers in the Response to Intervention (RTI) strategies that are proven to work with students with disabilities and students with behavior problems.

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

• SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school for Level 1 readers.

Violence Prevention Programs

| Nutrition Programs |
|---|
| Our food and nutrition services department is a self-funded department, using only federal funds, grants, and money generated from the sale of |
| school meals and catering to provide a nutritious, low cost school lunch and breakfast to Pasco County students. Our school provides free breakfast |
| to all of our students. |
| Housing Programs |
| |
| Head Start |
| Richey has two Head Start classrooms on our campus. Head Start provides early childhood development, health services, and family/community |
| partnerships. |
| Adult Education |
| |
| Career and Technical Education |
| Job Training |
| , voc samming |
| Other |
| |

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

School-Based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Principal, Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach, RtI Coach, School Psychologist, Guidance Counselor, ESE Team Leader, Reading Intervention Teacher, ESE Teacher, and 5 classroom teachers.

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 RtI team will have monthly meetings and attend the Year 3 Cadre 9 Trainings – 4 trainings through the year. Due to shared membership across the leadership teams, we will coordinate initiatives and facilitate communication. RtI Members co-facilitate weekly PLC/TBITmeetings. They make sure that Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) are developed, aligned and/or connected with RtI within grade level teams. Members of the RtI Leadership Team facilitate bi-weekly Intervention Conventions and ensure that the problem solving process is used effectively.

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

After analyzing our school-based data we determined we wanted to focus on developing an understanding of the Common Core Standards and effectively implement them to enhance instruction and student achievement. We are also working on data-driven and standards-driven collaborative planning. One of our goals of our MTSS/RtI team is to continue in our learning of how to effectively use the problem solving process and progress monitoring data during Monitoring for Achievement Days, Intervention Convention, Professional Learning Community (PLC) Meetings, and School Based Intervention Team (SBIT) Meetings.

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.

Reading: FAIR, FCAT, MMH Unit Assessments, MMH Weekly Assessments, Running Records, Fry Word Lists (primary), Phonics Screener

Math: FCAT, CORE K-12 (BOY, MOY, EOY), Pre/Post Unit Assessments

Science: FCAT, CORE K-12 (BOY, MOY, EOY), Pre/Post Unit Assessments

Writing: FCAT, Richey Writing Assessments (BOY, MOY, EOY), Classroom Writing Samples

Behavior: TERMS (referral info.), Minor Incidents Report data collection

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The PS/RtI Leadership team will attend 4 formal trainings throughout the year. The PS/RtI Leadership team members will infuse these ideas throughout the year at PLCs and MFAD/data days. Throughout the year, we will continue to build consensus and develop the compelling why by doing the following things:

- a. Presentations to communicate Tier I, II, & III data continue, separate meetings occur to discuss academic and behavior data; framework is expanded to additional grade levels/departments when appropriate.
- b. Opportunities to communicate data vertically occur at least twice a year
- c. Updated rationale is communicated to staff in small and large group presentations
- d. Administration makes connections and aligns with existing systems and initiatives, including school improvement efforts

We are going to learn by doing. Therefore RtI Knoweldge and the Problem-Solving Framework will be applied as a way of work in the following ways:

- a. Within SBLT, big ideas of RtI are more deeply understood, fluently communicated, and applied (e.g., definition, four steps of problem-solving, definition of RtI, "Every Ed" initiative, all students can learn, etc.)
- b. Problem-solving modules are introduced to all building stakeholders; current professional development content and problem-solving framework are integrated
- c. Facilitators begin applying the framework (e.g., leading department/grade level teams through the problem-solving cycle)
- d. Time is designated for team(s) to discuss Tier I issues for at least two grade levels/subjects areas. Richey's focus will be Kindergarten, 1st grade, 2nd grade, 3rd grade, and 4th grade.
- e. Tier I problem-solving meetings occur at least once after each benchmark assessment period (e.g., FAIR, unit assessments, other common assessments) for all grade levels. Tier 2 problem-solving meetings occur at least twice a month, in which teams of teachers analyze their progress monitoring data to make decisions about intervention effectiveness. Intervention Convention occurs approximately twice a month in which we utilize the problem solving process to determine interventions for students already receiving a minimum of 2 tiers of support.
- f. Teams engage in strategic planning, and small group problem solving occurs more frequently

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

- 1. We are going to continue to strengthen our Tier 1 Core Instruction by training the entire staff on Common Core State Standards and encouraging teachers to utilize collaborative planning.
- 2. All grade-levels will participate in quarterly Monitoring for Achievement Days (MFAD) in which they analyze common assessments to determine strengths and weaknesses within the Core instruction. Then they will develop action plans targeting a specific area so that at least 80% of students are meeting expectations.
- 3. Students that are not making adequate progress will also receive an additional skill-based targeted intervention during Tiger Time. Tiger Time is an additional 30 minutes of reading time at the end of the day. Teachers will progress monitor student performance bi-weekly. Students not participating in an intervention group, will be independently reading to self-selected "just right" text.
- 4. Students that are ¾ of year or more below grade level or students that have been retained will receive a Tier 3 level of targeted intervention during outside of the 120 minutes of reading mentioned above. This intervention will be delivered by an interventionist and will be progress monitored weekly/bi-weekly.
- 5. Teachers will collaborate bi-weekly during PLCs to determine how students are responding to Tier 2 and Tier 3 levels of intervention. Students not responding to these levels of intervention will be brought up for discussion at our bi-weekly Intervention Convention Meetings a problem solving meeting for a student or group of students with similar needs.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Assistant Principal, Literacy Coach, Media Specialist, 3 Reading Resource Teachers, 5 Classroom Teachers, 1 ESE teacher

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

The LLT meets on a monthly basis to analyze various types of data about literacy. They work together to develop and carry out their action plan. Each member of the LLT is responsible for co-facilitating the weekly literacy PLC's.

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

The LLT will be learning about Common Core State Standards. The LLT will also be supporting their colleagues through their professional development of CCSS during PLCs. They will facilitate conversations regarding standards driven planning and instruction.

Public School Choice

• Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification

Upload a copy of the SES Notification to Parents in the designated upload link on the "Upload" page.

*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.

At Richey Elementary, all incoming Kindergarten students are assessed prior to or upon entering Kindergarten in order to determine individual and group needs and to assist in the development of effective, rigorous instructional and intervention programs. All students are assessed within the areas of Basic Skills/School Readiness, Oral Language/Syntax, Print/Letter knowledge, and Phonological Awareness/Processing.

Screening data will be collected and aggregated by the middle of August 2010. Data will be used to plan daily academic and social/emotional instruction for all students and for groups or individual students who may need intervention beyond core instruction. Core Kindergarten academic and behavior instruction will include daily explicit instruction, modeling, guided practice and independent practice of all academic and/or social emotional skills identified by screening data.

Specific screening tools our school will use include: Gailileo and FLKR.

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

| | Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achievem ent | | | | | |
|---|---|----------|--|--|-----------------|--|
| 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: | | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |

| 1A. FCAT 2.0: | Students | Students | Teachers | Evaluate student | Reading Response | |
|---------------------------------|--|--|----------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| Students scoring at | struggle to | will be | | | Rubric | |
| Achievement Level 3 in reading. | write and | able to | | reading response rubric | | |
| in reading. | communi | explain | | | | |
| | cate their | how they | | | | |
| | | apply | | | | |
| | | reading | | | | |
| | | skills and | | | | |
| | | strategies | | | | |
| | | through | | | | |
| | | a reading | | | | |
| | | response | | | | |
| | | journal. | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Reading Goal #1A: | 2012 Current | 2013 Expected | | | | |
| By May 2013, students in | Level of Performance:* | Level of Performance:* | | | | |
| grades 3-5 scoring a level | | | | | | |
| 3 will increase by at least 10% | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | 3 rd : 25% [26] 4 th : 27% [22] | 3 rd : 28% [29] 4 th : 31% [24] | | | | |
| | 5 th : 29% [21] | 5 th : 32% [23] | | | | |

| an da p a re | nalyze NGSS analyze data to | chers will utilize the SSS/CCSS, reading series, lyze FAIR, weekly/unit a to collaboratively plan for erentiated instruction. | Administration | planning sessions, review of lesson plans, post-test data and graphs, Monitoring for Achievement Day (MFAD) Team discussions | Minutes from the planning sessions, submitted lesson plans, Reading Unit data, FAIR data, Observation data | |
|--|--|---|----------------|--|---|--|
| or to the transfer of the tran | Figuring but how to use the time within the reading block to differentiate to meet all students' needs. Students have gaps within their reading skills. | | | | | |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| | | | T | 1 | | ı | |
|--|----|--|--|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | | |
| | | Common Core State Standards are new, and the majority | begin to implement CCSS concepts within their reading instruction. K-1st grade teachers will understand and plan for instruction based on CCSS. | Administration Instructional Coaches | reflected in lesson plans and | Observations Student Work FAIR Data Running Record Data | |
| 1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. | NA | 1B.1. | IB.1. | 1B.1. | IB.1. | | |

| Reading Goal By May 2013, our s maintain their high rate. At least 95% of will meet proficience | Level of Performance proficiency of students | nt 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|--|---|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| | 3 rd : 0% [0] 4 th : 0% [0] 5 th : 0% [0] n/a | 3 rd : 0% [0] 4 th : 0% [0] 5 th : 0% [0] n/a | | | | | |
| | | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | |
| | | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | |

| 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: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
|---|--|--|--|--|------------------|--|
| | Students | Students | Teachers | Evaluate student | Reading Response | |
| Students scoring | struggle to | will be | | responses based on | Rubric | |
| at or above | | able to | | reading response rubric | | |
| Achievement Levels | | explain | | & | | |
| i ili i caailig. | | how they | | | | |
| | | apply | | | | |
| | 1 | reading | | | | |
| | | skills and | | | | |
| | | strategies | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | through | | | | |
| | | a reading | | | | |
| | | response | | | | |
| | | journal. | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Danding Coal #2A: | 2012 Current | 2013 Expected | | | | |
| Reading Goal #2A: | Level of | Level of | | | | |
| By 111ay 2013, Students in | Performance:* | Performance:* | | | | |
| grades 3-5 scoring a level 4 or higher will increase by | | | | | | |
| at least 10% | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | 3 rd : 20% [21] | 3 rd : 22% [23] | | | | |
| | 4 th : 28% [23] 5 th : 18% [13] | 4 th : 31% [25] 5 th : 20% [14] | | | | |
| | | | | i . | | |

| Time analy data a plan a tear reflection the data. | and asm, | Administration | planning sessions, review of lesson plans, post-test data and graphs, Monitoring for Achievement Day (MFAD) Team discussions | Minutes from the planning sessions, submitted lesson plans, Reading Unit data, FAIR data, Observation data | |
|---|---|----------------|--|--|--|
| readi block differ tiate meet stude needs | now se se sime in the ing k to eren to t all ents' ls. ents gaps in ing | | | | |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| Common Core State Standards are new, and the majority | Administration Instructional Coaches | lesson plans and | Observations Student Work FAIR Data Running Record Data | |
|--|--------------------------------------|------------------|---|--|

| 2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in reading. | struggle to write and communi cate their | able to | | Reading Response Rubric | |
|--|--|-----------------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|
| | | a reading response journal. | | | |
| Reading Goal #2B: By May 2013, our students will maintain their high proficiency rate. At least 95% of students will meet proficiency | | | | | |
| | 3 rd :100% [1] 4 th :100% [6] 5 th : 100% [6] | 95% or higher across grades. | | | |

| an da pl: a t re: on | nalyze NGSSS analyze | ners will utilize the SS/CCSS, reading series, ze FAIR, weekly/unit o collaboratively plan for entiated instruction. | Administration | planning sessions, review of lesson plans, post-test data and graphs, Monitoring for Achievement Day (MFAD) Team discussions | Minutes from the planning sessions, submitted lesson plans, Reading Unit data, FAIR data, Observation data | |
|--|---|--|----------------|--|--|--|
| ou to the wi re ble di tia me stu | iguring ut how o use he time hithin the heading lock to hifferen hate to heet all hudents' heeds. | | | | | |
| ha wi the rea | tudents ave gaps ithin aeir eading kills. | | | | | |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| Common Core State Standards are new, and the | begin to implement CCSS concepts within their reading instruction. K-1st grade teachers will understand and plan for instruction based on CCSS. | Administration Instructional Coaches | lesson plans and | Observations Student Work FAIR Data Running Record Data | |
|--|---|--------------------------------------|------------------|--|--|

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
|---|---|--|--|--|----------------------------|--|
| 3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of | struggle to write and communi cate their ideas. | | | | Reading Response Rubric | |
| Reading Goal #3A: By May 2013, the number of students making learning gains will increase by 10% | Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |

| Time to analyze data and plan as a team, reflecting on the data. | Teachers will utilize the NGSSS/CCSS, reading series, analyze FAIR, weekly/unit data to collaboratively plan for differentiated instruction. | Teachers Administration | lesson plans, post-test data and graphs, Monitoring for Achievement Day (MFAD) Team discussions | Minutes from the planning sessions, submitted lesson plans, Reading Unit data, FAIR data, Observation data | |
|--|--|----------------------------|--|--|--|
| Figuring out how to use the time within the reading block to differen tiate to meet all students' needs. | | | | | |
| Students have gaps within their reading skills. | | | | | |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| S S a a n o s u | Common Core State Standards are new, and the majority | Administration Instructional Coaches | lesson plans and | Observations Student Work FAIR Data Running Record Data | |
|--------------------------------------|--|---|------------------|--|--|

| 3B. Florida | Students | Students | Teachers | Evaluate student | Reading Response | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| Alternate | struggle to | will be | | responses based on | Rubric | |
| Assessment: Percentage of | write and | able to | | reading response rubric | | |
| students making | communi | explain | | | | |
| learning gains in | cate their | how they | | | | |
| reading. | ideas. | apply | | | | |
| | | reading | | | | |
| | | skills and | | | | |
| | | strategies | | | | |
| | | through | | | | |
| | | a reading | | | | |
| | | response | | | | |
| | | journal. | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| D 11 G 1 1/4 D | 2012 G | 2012 F / 1 | | | | |
| Reading Goal #3B: | 2012 Current Level of | 2013 Expected Level of | | | | |
| TBD | Performance:* | Performance:* | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | TBD | TBD | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| analyze | Administration | Observation of instruction and planning sessions, review of lesson plans, post-test data and graphs, Monitoring for Achievement Day (MFAD) Team discussions | Minutes from the planning sessions, submitted lesson plans, Reading Unit data, FAIR data, | |
|---|----------------|---|---|--|
| Figuring out how to use the time within the reading block to differen tiate to meet all students' needs. Students have gaps within their reading skills. | | | | |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| Common Core State Standards are new, and the majority | Administration Instructional Coaches | lesson plans and | Observations Student Work FAIR Data Running Record Data | |
|--|--------------------------------------|------------------|--|--|

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
|---|---|---|--|--|----------------------------|--|
| 4A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. | struggle to write and communi cate their ideas. | Students will be able to explain how they apply reading skills and strategies through a reading response journal. | | | Reading Response Rubric | |
| Reading Goal #4A: By May 2013, at least 56% of our lowest quartile will make learning gains in reading | Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |

| Time to analyze data and plan as a team, reflecting on the data. | Teachers will utilize the NGSSS/CCSS, reading series, analyze FAIR, weekly/unit data to collaboratively plan for differentiated instruction. | Administration | lesson plans, post-test data and graphs, Monitoring for Achievement Day (MFAD) Team discussions | Minutes from the planning sessions, submitted lesson plans, Reading Unit data, FAIR data, Observation data | |
|---|--|----------------|--|--|--|
| Figuring out how to use the time within the reading block to differen tiate to meet all students needs. Students have gaps | | | | | |
| within their reading skills. | | | | | |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| C C S S a a n o s s u | Administration Instructional Coaches | lesson plans and | Observations Student Work FAIR Data Running Record Data | |
|---|---|------------------|---|--|

| 4B. Florida Alternate | struggle to | | responses based on | Reading Response Rubric | |
|--|------------------------------|--|-------------------------|----------------------------|--|
| Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. | write and communi cate their | able to | reading response rubric | | |
| | | journal. | | | |
| Reading Goal #4B: TBD | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | |
| | TBD | TBD | | | |

| Time analy data a plan a tear reflection the data. | and asm, | Administration | planning sessions, review of lesson plans, post-test data and graphs, Monitoring for Achievement Day (MFAD) Team discussions | Minutes from the planning sessions, submitted lesson plans, Reading Unit data, FAIR data, Observation data | |
|---|---|----------------|--|--|--|
| readi block differ tiate meet stude needs | now se se sime in the ing k to eren to t all ents' ls. ents gaps in ing | | | | |

2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

| Common Core State Standards are new, and the | begin to implement CCSS concepts within their reading instruction. K-1st grade teachers will understand and plan for instruction based on CCSS. | Administration Instructional Coaches | lesson plans and | Observations Student Work FAIR Data Running Record Data | |
|--|---|--------------------------------------|------------------|--|--|

| Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | |
|---|---|-----------------|--|--|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| 5A. In six years | Baseline data | | <mark>59</mark> | <mark>63</mark> | <mark>68</mark> | <mark>73</mark> | <mark>77</mark> |
| school will reduce | 2010-2011 | <mark>54</mark> | | | | | |
| their achievement gap by 50%. | <u>NA</u> | | | | | | |
| Reading Goal #5A: The 2011-2012 year will serve as our Baseline Data. By 2016-2017 we will decrease our levels 1 & 2 by 50%. That is factored by 46% x 1/2 = 23%. The AMO target will increase | | | | | | | |
| by 4.6% points each year over 5 years. | | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, | White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | | |

| Readin TBD | Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|---------------|---|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| | level of performance in this box. White: TBD Black: NA Hispanic: NA Asian: NA | Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: | | | | | |
| | | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | |
| | | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | |

| 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 | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy 5C.1. | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring 5C.1. | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy 5C.1. | Evaluation Tool 5C.1. | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|------------------------|-------|--|
| Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. | | | | | | | |
| Reading Goal #5C: | Level of | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. | Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. | | | | | |
| | | | | 5C.2. | | 5C.2. | |
| | | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | |
| 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: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. | | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | | |

| Reading Goal #5D: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|-------------------|--|--------------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| TBD | - CITOI III MICC. | - CHAMMANOC. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | data for current level of performance in | | | | | | |
| | | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | |
| | | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | |

| 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: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|-----------------|-------|--|
| | 5E.1. | 5E.1. | 5E.1. | 5E.1. | 5E.1. | | |
| Disadvantaged | | | | | | | |
| students not making | | | | | | | |
| satisfactory progress | | | | | | | |
| in reading. | 2012 G | 2012 F | | | | | |
| Reading Goal #5E: | 2012 Current Level of | 2013 Expected Level of | | | | | |
| TBD | Performance:* | Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | Enter numerical | | | | | |
| | data for current level of | data for expected level of | | | | | |
| | performance in | performance in | | | | | |
| | this box. | this box. 5E.2. | 5E.2. | 5E.2. | 5E.2. | 5E.2. | |
| | | DE.2. | DE.Z. | DE.2. | DE.2. | JE.2. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 5E.3. | 5E.3. | 5E.3. | 5E.3. | 5E.3. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | l | | | |

Reading Professional Development

| Professional | | | |
|--------------------|--|--|--|
| Development | | | |
| (PD) aligned with | | | |
| Strategies through | | | |
| Professional | | | |
| Learning | | | |
| Community (PLC) | | | |

| or PD Activities 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) | | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Common Core State Standards | Pre-K – 5 th | Literacy Coach Assistant Principal | School wide | All year @ bi-weekly meetings | Planned activities that cause teachers to implement lessons that are based on CCSS and reflect on implementation. | Literacy Coach Assistant Principal |
| Monitoring for Achievement Days | Pre-K – 5 th | Literacy Coach Assistant Principal | Pre-K – 5 th Grade, ESE teachers, Interventionists, Guidance | October, January, May | Discussion of implementation of action plan & progress monitoring at PLCs. | RtI Leadership Team Members |
| Collaborative Planning | $K-5^{th}$ | Literacy Coach Assistant Principal | K – 5 th grade teachers, ESE teachers, Interventionists | September, October, December, February, April | Discussion of Tier II and Tier III data analysis and progress monitoring to inform differentiated instruction. | Literacy Coach, Interventionists |

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| Include only school funded activities/ | | | |
|---|---------------------------|------------------------------------|----------|
| Include only school funded activities/ | | | |
| materials and exclude district funded activities/materials. | | | |
| | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| K & 1 Common Core Implementation | K & 1 MMH CCSS Flipcharts | Title 1 – Professional Development | \$240.00 |
| Subtotal: \$240.00 | | | |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: 0 | | | |
| | | | |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| MFAD Days – Data Analysis & planning | Substitute Pay | Title 1 – Professional Development | \$7650 |
| Data Analysis & Collaborative Planning | Stipend Pay | Title 1 – Professional Development | \$6640 |
| Subtotal: \$ 14,290 | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: 0 | | | |
| Total: \$14,530 | | | |

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

| CELLA Goals | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|---|------|
| Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| 1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. | Language Limited access to native language support (both at home and in school) Limited opportunities to practice during the day Limited prior formal schooling | Students will be engaged in the Imagine Learning Software at least 90 minutes per week. | | Administrative Walk- throughs Teacher Evaluations/ Observations Student data from language learning software programs Student data from FCAT, CELLA and other classroom assessments AMAO data (growth and proficiency) Lesson Plans | CELLA (Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing) FCAT (Reading and Writing) Florida Writes Imagine Learning reports. | |
| CELLA Goal #1: By May 2012, the students scoring proficiency will increase by 10%. | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking: | | | | | |
| | Ist: 80% (8) 2nd: 57% (4) 3rd: 9% 4th: 50% (1) | 1.2. | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 | 1.2 |
| | | 11.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |

| | 1 | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |
|---|--|----------------------|--|--|---|------|
| | | | 1.5. | 1.3. | | 1.5. |
| Students read grade- level text in English in a manner similar to non- ELL students. | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| 2. Students scoring proficient in reading. | Language to native language support (both at home and in school) Limited opportunities to practice during the day Limited prior formal schooling | 90 minutes per week. | Teacher Administration ESOL Resource Teacher | Administrative Walk- throughs Teacher Evaluations/ Observations Student data from language learning software programs Student data from FCAT, CELLA and other classroom assessments AMAO data (growth and proficiency) Lesson Plans | CELLA (Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing) FCAT (Reading and Writing) Florida Writes Imagine Learning reports. | |
| | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Reading: | | | | | |
| | K: 0% 1st: 50% (5) 2nd: 43% (3) 3rd: 0% 4th: 50% (1) | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. |

| Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
|---|--|---|--|---|---|------|
| 3. Students scoring proficient in writing. | Language Limited access to native language support (both at home and in school) Limited opportunities to practice during the day Limited prior formal schooling | Students will be engaged in the Imagine Learning Software at least 90 minutes per week. | ESOL Resource Teacher | Administrative Walk- throughs Teacher Evaluations/ Observations Student data from language learning software programs Student data from FCAT, CELLA and other classroom assessments AMAO data (growth and proficiency) Lesson Plans | CELLA (Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing) FCAT (Reading and Writing) Florida Writes Imagine Learning reports. | |
| | | | | | | |
| | K: 0% I st : 40% (4) 2 nd : 43% (3) 3 rd : 0% 4 th : 50% (1) | | | | | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. |
| | | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. |

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| Chilit budget (moet tows as not | i eaca) | | | |
|---|--------------------------|----------------|--------|--|
| Include only school-based funded | | | | |
| activities/materials and exclude district | | | | |
| funded activities/materials. | | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount | |
| | | | | |
| Subtotal: 0 | | | | |
| Technology | | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount | |
| | | | | |
| Subtotal: 0 | | | | |
| Professional Development | | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount | |
| | | | | |
| Subtotal: 0 | | | | |
| Other | | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount | |
| ESOL Instructional Assistant | | | | |
| Subtotal: 0 | | | | |
| Total: 0 | | | | |
| T I CONTINUE I | | | | |

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

| | Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achievem ent | | | | | |
|---|---|----------|--|--|-----------------|--|
| 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: | | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |

| | | • | | | | |
|--|------------|------------------------------|----------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|
| 1A. FCAT 2.0: | Time to | Teachers will | 11 Cacifors | Observation of instruction and | Observation Checklist (Domain | |
| Students scoring at | analyze | utilize the NGSSS/CCSS, | Administration | planning sessions, review of lesson plans, post-test data and graphs, | sessions, submitted lesson plans, | |
| Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics | data and | curriculum | | Monitoring for Achievement Day | Reading Unit data | |
| | | maps, weekly/ | | (MFAD) Team discussions | | |
| | plan as | unit data to collaboratively | | | | |
| | a team, | plan for | | | | |
| | reflecting | differentiated | | | | |
| | on the | instruction. | | | | |
| | data. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Figuring | | | | | |
| | out how | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | to use | | | | | |
| | the time | | | | | |
| | within the | | | | | |
| | reading | | | | | |
| | block to | | | | | |
| | differen | | | | | |
| | tiate to | | | | | |
| | meet all | | | | | |
| | students' | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | needs. | | | | | |
| | G. 1 | | | | | |
| | Students | | | | | |
| | have gaps | | | | | |
| | within | | | | | |
| | their | | | | | |
| | reading | | | | | |
| | skills. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| #1 A · | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| By May 2013, students in grades 3-5 scoring a level 3 will increase by at least 10% | | | | | |
| | 3 rd :24% [24] 4 th :23% [19] 5 th : 32% [23] | 3 rd :26% [26] 4 th :25% [21] 5 th : 35% [25] | | | |

| critical thinking skills and the ability to analyze problems. Allocate time for problem- | Mathematical Practice, which are found in the Common Core State | Administration | Students will improve on word problems on post-test and unit test. | Post-test Data | |
|---|---|----------------|--|----------------|--|
|---|---|----------------|--|----------------|--|

| Students | iviainematician for the quarter. | | Increase the number of mathematicians each quarter | Unit Post-tests | |
|----------|----------------------------------|--|--|-----------------|--|
|----------|----------------------------------|--|--|-----------------|--|

| | -1 | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------------|------------------------------|----------------|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| 1B. Florida | Time to | Teachers will | | | Observation Checklist (Domain | |
| Alternate | analyze | utilize the | Administration | planning sessions, review of lesson | 2), Minutes from the planning | |
| Assessment: | | NGSSS/CCSS | | plans, post-test data and graphs, | sessions, submitted lesson plans, | |
| Students scoring at | data and | access points, Curriculum | | Monitoring for Achievement Day (MFAD) Team discussions | Reading Unit data | |
| Levels 4, 5, and 6 in | plan as | maps, weekly/ | | (MFAD) Team discussions | | |
| | a team, | unit data to | | | | |
| mathematics. | | collaboratively | | | | |
| | reflecting | plan for | | | | |
| | on the | differentiated | | | | |
| | data. | instruction. | | | | |
| | data. | | | | | |
| | L | | | | | |
| | Figuring | | | | | |
| | out how | | | | | |
| | to use | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | the time | | | | | |
| | within the | | | | | |
| | reading | | | | | |
| | block to | | | | | |
| | differen | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | tiate to | | | | | |
| | meet all | | | | | |
| | students' | | | | | |
| | needs. | | | | | |
| | ficcus. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Students | | | | | |
| | have gaps | | | | | |
| | within | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | their | | | | | |
| | reading | | | | | |
| | skills. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| #1B: Enter narrative for the | Level of | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| goal in this box. | | | | | |
| | 3 rd :0% [0] 4 th : 0% [0] 5 th : 17% [1] | 3 rd : 0% 4 th : 0% 5 th : 0% | | | |

| the ability | Students will use the 8 Standards for Mathematical Practice when solving word problems. | Administration | Students will improve on word problems on post-test and unit test. 1B.3. | Post-test Data 1B.3. | |
|-------------|---|----------------|---|-----------------------|--|
| 113.3. | 11.5. | 10.5. | 10.3. | 115.5. | |

| Based on the analysis | Anticipated | Strategy | Person or Position | Process Used to Determine | Evaluation Tool | |
|---------------------------|-------------|----------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|--|
| of student achievement | Barrier | | Responsible for Monitoring | Effectiveness of Strategy | | |
| data and reference to | | | | | | |
| "Guiding Questions," | | | | | | |
| identify and define areas | | | | | | |
| in need of improvement | | | | | | |
| for the following group: | | | | | | |

| e | | | m 1 ::: | | loi e e e | lot at at the man | |
|-----|---------------------|------------|---------------------------|----------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|
| | 2A. FCAT 2.0: | Time to | Teachers will utilize the | Teachers | Observation of instruction and | Observation Checklist (Domain | |
| 5 | | analyze | NGSSS/CCSS, | Administration | planning sessions, review of lesson plans, post-test data and graphs, | sessions, submitted lesson plans, | |
| í | | | curriculum | | Monitoring for Achievement Day | Reading Unit data | |
| | Acmevement | data and | maps, weekly/ | | (MFAD) Team discussions | reduing omit data | |
| | Levels 4 and 5 in | plan as | unit data to | | (ivii i iii) i cuiii uiscussions | | |
| | Bevers . while e in | a team, | collaboratively | | | | |
| ľ | | l ~ . | plan for | | | | |
| - 1 | | | differentiated | | | | |
| | | on the | instruction. | | | | |
| | | data. | | | | | |
| - 1 | | | | | | | |
| | | Eiguring | | | | | |
| | | Figuring | | | | | |
| - 1 | | out how | | | | | |
| | | to use | | | | | |
| - 1 | | the time | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | within the | | | | | |
| | | reading | | | | | |
| | | block to | | | | | |
| | | differen | | | | | |
| | | tiate to | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | meet all | | | | | |
| | | students' | | | | | |
| | | needs. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | C4-14- | | | | | |
| - 1 | | Students | | | | | |
| - 1 | | have gaps | | | | | |
| - 1 | | within | | | | | |
| | | their | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | reading | | | | | |
| | | skills. | | | | | |
| | | I | | | | | |
| | | I | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| - 1 | | | | | | | |

| #2 A · | Level of | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | |
|--------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | 3 rd : 19% [19] 4 th : 16% [13] 5 th : 15% [11] | 3 rd : 21% [21] 4 th : 18% [14] 5 th : 17% [12] | | | |

| Students lack critical thinking skills and the ability to analyze problems. Allocate time for problem- solving process and discussion. | ards for cal Practice, cound in the core State fill use ards for cal Practice | Students will improve on word problems on post-test and unit test. | Post-test Data | |
|---|--|--|----------------|--|
|---|--|--|----------------|--|

| Brudents | Mathematician for the quarter. | Increase the number of mathematicians each quarter | Unit Post-tests | |
|----------|--------------------------------|--|-----------------|--|
| | | | | |

| | | | i . | | 1 | |
|---------------------|-------------|------------------------------|----------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|
| 2B. Florida | Time to | Teachers will | Teachers | | Observation Checklist (Domain | |
| Alternate | analyze | utilize the | Administration | planning sessions, review of lesson | 2), Minutes from the planning | |
| Assessment: | | NGSSS/CCSS | | plans, post-test data and graphs, Monitoring for Achievement Day | sessions, submitted lesson plans, | |
| Students scoring at | data and | access points, Curriculum | | (MFAD) Team discussions | Reading Unit data | |
| or above Level 7 in | plan as | maps, weekly/ | | (MI-AD) Team discussions | | |
| | F | unit data to | | | | |
| mathematics. | a team, | collaboratively | | | | |
| | reflecting | plan for | | | | |
| | on the | differentiated | | | | |
| | | instruction. | | | | |
| | data. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Figuring | | | | | |
| | out how | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | to use | | | | | |
| | the time | | | | | |
| | within the | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | reading | | | | | |
| | block to | | | | | |
| | differen | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | tiate to | | | | | |
| | meet all | | | | | |
| | students' | | | | | |
| | needs. | | | | | |
| | nieeus. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Students | | | | | |
| | have gaps | | | | | |
| | Luiste gaps | | | | | |
| | within | | | | | |
| | their | | | | | |
| | reading | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | skills. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| #2B: | Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | |
|------|---|--|--|--|--|
| | 3 rd :100% [1] 4 th :100% [6] 5 th : 83% [5] | 5 th : 91% [6] | | | |

| the ability to analyze problems. Allocate time for | Teachers will learn the 8 Standards for Mathematical Practice, which are found in the Common Core State Standards. Students will use the 8 Standards for Mathematical Practice when solving word problems. | Administration | Students will improve on word problems on post-test and unit test. | Post-test Data | |
|--|---|----------------|--|----------------|--|
| 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | |

| Based on the analysis | Anticipated | Strategy | Person or Position | Process Used to Determine | Evaluation Tool | |
|---------------------------|-------------|----------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|--|
| of student achievement | Barrier | | Responsible for Monitoring | Effectiveness of Strategy | | |
| data and reference to | | | | | | |
| "Guiding Questions," | | | | | | |
| identify and define areas | | | | | | |
| in need of improvement | | | | | | |
| for the following group: | | | | | | |

| Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Time to analyze data and plan as a team, Teachers and planning sessions, review of lesson plans, post-test data and graphs, Monitoring for Achievement Day (MFAD) Team discussions Observation of instruction and planning sessions, review of lesson plans, Monitoring for Achievement Day (MFAD) Team discussions Observation Checklist (Domain 2), Minutes from the planning sessions, submitted lesson plans, Reading Unit data | |
|--|--|
| Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Administration Administration Plans, post-test data and graphs, Monitoring for Achievement Day unit data to collaboratively | |
| students making learning gains in mathematics. Monitoring for Achievement Day maps, weekly/ unit data to collaboratively Collaborativ | |
| learning gains in maps, weekly/ plan as unit data to collaboratively (MFAD) Team discussions | |
| mathematics. plan as unit data to a team collaboratively | |
| a team collaboratively | |
| la team. Condourdivery | |
| plan for | |
| reflecting differentiated leaves leav | |
| on the instruction. | |
| on the | |
| data. | |
| | |
| Figuring | |
| | |
| out how | |
| to use | |
| the time | |
| | |
| within the | |
| reading | |
| block to | |
| | |
| differen | |
| tiate to | |
| meet all | |
| students' | |
| | |
| needs. | |
| | |
| Students | |
| | |
| have gaps | |
| within | |
| their | |
| | |
| reading | |
| skills. | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

| #2 A · | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | |
|--|----------|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| By May 2013, students making learning gains will increase by at least 10%. | | r criormance. | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | 48% [65] | 53% [72] | | | |

| the ability to analyze problems. Students will use the 8 Standards for Mathematical Practice when solving process and discussion. Students will use the 8 Standards for Mathematical Practice when solving word problems. | | thinking skills and the ability to analyze problems. Allocate time for problem-solving process and | Standards. Students will use the 8 Standards for Mathematical Practice when solving word problems. | Administration | Students will improve on word problems on post-test and unit test. | Post-test Data | |
|---|--|---|---|----------------|--|----------------|--|
|---|--|---|---|----------------|--|----------------|--|

| Students are not motivated to be successful on the Math Unit tests. Students will be recceive by being honored Rim Mathematician for the Math Unit tests. | hey mathematicians | |
|--|--------------------|--|
|--|--------------------|--|

| | | _ | | | | |
|-------------------|------------|-----------------------------|----------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|
| 3B. Florida | Time to | Teachers will | Teachers | Observation of instruction and | Observation Checklist (Domain | |
| Alternate | analyze | utilize the | Administration | planning sessions, review of lesson | 2), Minutes from the planning | |
| Assessment: | | NGSSS/CCSS | | plans, post-test data and graphs, Monitoring for Achievement Day | sessions, submitted lesson plans, | |
| Percentage of | data and | acces points, curriculum | | (MFAD) Team discussions | Reading Unit data | |
| students making | plan as | maps, weekly/ | | (WIT AD) Team discussions | | |
| learning gains in | a team, | unit data to | | | | |
| mathematics. | | collaboratively | | | | |
| mathematics. | reflecting | plan for | | | | |
| | on the | differentiated instruction. | | | | |
| | data. | msu uction. | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Figuring | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | out how | | | | | |
| | to use | | | | | |
| | the time | | | | | |
| | within the | | | | | |
| | reading | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | block to | | | | | |
| | differen | | | | | |
| | tiate to | | | | | |
| | meet all | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | students' | | | | | |
| | needs. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Students | | | | | |
| | have gaps | | | | | |
| | within | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | their | | | | | |
| | reading | | | | | |
| | skills. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| Mathematics Goal #3B: TBD | Level of Performance:* | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| | | data for expected level of performance in this box. | | | | | |
| | | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | |
| | | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | |

| Based on the analysis | Anticipated | Strategy | Person or Position | Process Used to Determine | Evaluation Tool | |
|---------------------------|-------------|----------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|--|
| of student achievement | Barrier | | Responsible for Monitoring | Effectiveness of Strategy | | |
| data and reference to | | | | | | |
| "Guiding Questions," | | | | | | |
| identify and define areas | | | | | | |
| in need of improvement | | | | | | |
| for the following group: | | | | | | |

| | | DD 1 111 | 1 . | lor a or a r | lot it of the open | |
|--------------------|------------|------------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|
| 4A. FCAT 2.0: | Time to | Teachers will | Teachers | Observation of instruction and | Observation Checklist (Domain | |
| Percentage of | analyze | utilize the | Administration | planning sessions, review of lesson | 2), Minutes from the planning | |
| students in lowest | | NGSSS/CCSS, | | plans, post-test data and graphs, | sessions, submitted lesson plans, | |
| 25% making | data and | curriculum | | Monitoring for Achievement Day | Reading Unit data | |
| | plan as | maps, weekly/ | | (MFAD) Team discussions | | |
| learning gains in | r | unit data to collaboratively | | | | |
| mathematics. | a team, | plan for | | | | |
| | reflecting | differentiated | | | | |
| | on the | instruction. | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | data. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Figuring | | | | | |
| | 1 15011115 | | | | | |
| | out how | | | | | |
| | to use | | | | | |
| | the time | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | within the | | | | | |
| | reading | | | | | |
| | block to | | | | | |
| | differen | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | tiate to | | | | | |
| | meet all | | | | | |
| | students' | | | | | |
| | needs. | | | | | |
| | needs. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Students | | | | | |
| | have gaps | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | within | | | | | |
| | their | | | | | |
| | reading | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | skills. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| #4A: | Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | |
|--|---------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| By May 2013, students in lowest 25% making learning gains will increase by at least 10% | | | | | |
| | 65% | 69% | | | |

| critical the 8 thinking skills and whice the ability Com to analyze problems. Studies Allocate the 8 time for mather problem- when | Teachers will learn 8 Standards for thematical Practice, ich are found in the mmon Core State indards. dents will use 8 Standards for thematical Practice in solving word blems. | Students will improve on word problems on post-test and unit test. | Post-test Data | |
|---|---|--|----------------|--|
|---|---|--|----------------|--|

| Students are not motivated to be successful on the Math Unit tests. Students will be recognized by being honored Richey Mathematician for the quarter. Teachers Administration Teachers Administration Unit Post-tests Unit Post-tests | |
|---|--|
|---|--|

| | | les 1 | i | | | |
|--------------------|------------|---------------------------|----------------|---|--|--|
| 4B. Florida | Time to | Teachers will | Teachers | | Observation Checklist (Domain | |
| Alternate | analyze | utilize the | Administration | planning sessions, review of lesson | 2), Minutes from the planning | |
| Assessment: | | NGSSS/CCSS access points, | | plans, post-test data and graphs, Monitoring for Achievement Day | sessions, submitted lesson plans, Reading Unit data | |
| Percentage of | data and | curriculum | | (MFAD) Team discussions | Reading Onit data | |
| students in lowest | plan as | maps weekly/ | | (MI-AD) Team discussions | | |
| | r | unit data to | | | | |
| 25% making | a team, | collaboratively | | | | |
| learning gains in | reflecting | plan for | | | | |
| mathematics. | on the | differentiated | | | | |
| | | instruction. | | | | |
| | data. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Figuring | | | | | |
| | 1 19411119 | | | | | |
| | out how | | | | | |
| | to use | | | | | |
| | the time | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | within the | | | | | |
| | reading | | | | | |
| | block to | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | differen | | | | | |
| | tiate to | | | | | |
| | meet all | | | | | |
| | students' | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | needs. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | Students | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | have gaps | | | | | |
| | within | | | | | |
| | their | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | reading | | | | | |
| | skills. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| - | | | | | | |
|---|------------------|------------------|-------------------|--|--|--|
| - | | | | | | |
| - | | | | | | |
| - | | | | | | |
| - | | | | | | |
| - | | | | | | |
| - | | | | | | |
| - | | | | | | |
| - | | | | | | |
| - | | | | | | |
| ŀ | | 2012 (| 2012 F 4 1 | | | |
| | | | 2013 Expected | | | |
| 7 | 4 4B: | Level of | Level of | | | |
| - | | Performance:* | Performance:* | | | |
| | TBD | | | | | |
| - | | | | | | |
| - | | | | | | |
| - | | | | | | |
| - | | | | | | |
| ŀ | | Enter numerical | Enter numerical | | | |
| - | | data for | data for | | | |
| - | | current level of | expected level of | | | |
| | | performance in | performance in | | | |
| L | | this box. | this box. | | | |

| Students lack critical thinking skills and the ability to analyze problems. Students which are f Common C Standards. Students withe 8 Stand the solving problems solving process and discussion. | ards for cal Practice, cound in the core State ill use ards for cal Practice | |
|--|---|--|
|--|---|--|

| Students are not motivated to be successful on the Math Unit tests. | Mainematician for the quarter. | Increase the number of mathematicians each quarter | Unit Post-tests | |
|---|--------------------------------|--|-----------------|--|
| | | | | |

| Based on ambitious | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| but achievable Annual | | | | | | | |
| Measurable Objectives | | | | | | | |
| (AMOs), identify | | | | | | | |
| reading and mathematics | | | | | | | |
| performance target for | | | | | | | |
| the following years | | | | | | | |
| · · | Baseline data 2010-2011 | <mark>48</mark> | <mark>53</mark> | <mark>58</mark> | <mark>64</mark> | <mark>69</mark> | <mark>74</mark> |
| school will reduce | | | | | | | |
| their achievement | | | | | | | |
| gap by 50%. | | | | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal | | | | | | | |
| #5A: | | | | | | | |
| 77511. | | | | | | | |
| The 2011-2012 year will | | | | | | | |
| serve as our Baseline Data. | | | | | | | |
| By 2016-2017 we will | | | | | | | |
| decrease our levels 1 & 2 | | | | | | | |
| by 50%. That is factored | | | | | | | |
| by $52\% \times 1/2 = 74\%$. The | | | | | | | |
| AMO target will increase | | | | | | | |
| by 5.2% points each year | | | | | | | |
| over 5 years. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position | Process Used to Determine | Evaluation Tool | | |
| of student achievement | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Responsible for Monitoring | Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation 1001 | | |
| data and reference to | | | responsible for Montering | Effectiveness of Strategy | | | |
| "Guiding Questions," | | | | | | | |
| identify and define areas | | | | | | | |
| in need of improvement | | | | | | | |
| for the following | | | | | | | |
| subgroups: | | | | | | | |
| 5B. Student | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | | |
| subgroups by | White: | | | | | | |
| 41 | Black: | | | | | | |
| | Hispanic: | | | | | | |
| | Asian: | | | | | | |
| | American Indian: | | | | | | |
| Indian) not making | | | | | | | |
| satisfactory progress | | | | | | | |
| in mathematics. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

| Mathematics Goal #5B: NA | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| | | | | | | | |
| | Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: | Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: | | | | | |
| | | 5B.2. | | | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | |
| | | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | |

| Based on the analysis | Anticipated | Strategy | Person or Position | Process Used to Determine | Evaluation Tool | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-------|--|
| of student achievement | Barrier | | Responsible for Monitoring | Effectiveness of Strategy | | | |
| data and reference to | | | | | | | |
| "Guiding Questions," | | | | | | | |
| identify and define areas | | | | | | | |
| in need of improvement | | | | | | | |
| for the following | | | | | | | |
| subgroup: | | | | | | | |
| | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | | |
| Language Learners | | | | | | | |
| (ELL) not making | | | | | | | |
| satisfactory progress | | | | | | | |
| in mathematics. | | | | | | | |
| | 2012 Current | 2013 Expected | | | | | |
| TYTERETITE COURT | Level of | Level of | | | | | |
| <u>#5C:</u> | Performance:* | Performance:* | | | | | |
| NA | | | | | | | |
| 1 V 2 1 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Enter numerical | Enter numerical | | | | | |
| | data for | data for | | | | | |
| | current level of | expected level of | | | | | |
| | performance in this box. | performance in this box. | | | | | |
| | | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | |
| | | 50.2. | 50.2. | JC.2. | 36.2. | JC.2. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis | Anticipated | Strategy | Person or Position | Process Used to Determine | Evaluation Tool | | |
| of student achievement | Barrier | | Responsible for Monitoring | Effectiveness of Strategy | | | |
| data and reference to | | | | | | | |
| "Guiding Questions," | | | | | | | |
| identify and define areas | | | | | | | |
| in need of improvement | | | | | | | |
| for the following | | | | | | | |
| subgroup: | | | | | | | |
| 5D. Students | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | | |
| with Disabilities | | | | | | | |
| (SWD) not making | | | | | | | |
| satisfactory progress | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| in mathematics. | | | | | | | |

| Mathematics Goal #5D: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| TBD | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | data for current level of | Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. | | | | | |
| | | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | |
| | | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | |

| 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: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|-----------------|-------|--|
| 5E. Economically | 5E.1. | 5E.1. | 5E.1. | 5E.1. | 5E.1. | | |
| Disadvantaged | | | | | | | |
| students not making | | | | | | | |
| satisfactory progress | | | | | | | |
| in mathematics. | | | | | | | |
| | 2012 Current | 2013 Expected | | | | | |
| | Level of Performance:* | Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | r criormance. | r criormance. | | | | | |
| TBD | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Enter numerical | Enter numerical | | | | | |
| | data for current level of | data for expected level of | | | | | |
| | performance in | performance in | | | | | |
| | this box. | this box. | 5E 2 | 65.2 | 55.2 | 5E 2 | |
| | | 5E.2. | 5E.2. | 5E.2. | 5E.2. | 5E.2. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 5E.3. | 5E.3. | 5E.3. | 5E.3. | 5E.3. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

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]).

| | Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achievem ent | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|-----------------|-------|--|
| 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: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. | | IA.1. | 1A.1. | 1A.1. | 1A.1. | | |
| Mathematics Goal #1A: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | Level of | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. | data for expected level of performance in this box. | | | | | |
| | | 1A.2. | 1A.2. | 1A.2. | 1A.2. | 1A.2. | |
| | | 1A.3. | 1A.3. | 1A.3. | 1A.3. | 1A.3. | |

| 1B. Florida | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | 1B.1. | | |
|---|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| Alternate | | | | | | | |
| Assessment: | | | | | | | |
| Students scoring at | | | | | | | |
| Levels 4, 5, and 6 in | | | | | | | |
| mathematics. | | | | | | | |
| | | 2013 Expected | | | | | |
| #1B: | Level of Performance:* | Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| F4 | r criormanec. | r criormance. | | | | | |
| Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | | | | | | | |
| gour in inis oom | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Enter numerical | Enter numerical | | | | | |
| | data for | data for | | | | | |
| | current level of performance in | expected level of performance in | | | | | |
| | this box. | this box. | | | | | |
| | | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | 1B.2. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | 1B.3. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

| Based on the analysis | Anticipated | Strategy | Person or Position | Process Used to Determine | Evaluation Tool | | |
|---------------------------|------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-------|--|
| of student achievement | Barrier | | Responsible for Monitoring | Effectiveness of Strategy | | | |
| data and reference to | | | | | | | |
| "Guiding Questions," | | | | | | | |
| identify and define areas | | | | | | | |
| in need of improvement | | | | | | | |
| for the following group: | | | | | | | |
| | 2A.1. | 2A.1. | 2A.1. | 2A.1. | 2A.1. | | |
| Students scoring | | | | | | | |
| at or above | | | | | | | |
| Achievement | | | | | | | |
| Levels 4 and 5 in | | | | | | | |
| mathematics. | | | | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal | 2012 Current | 2013 Expected | | | | | |
| #2 ∆ · | Level of | Level of | | | | | |
| <i></i> | Performance:* | Performance:* | | | | | |
| Enter narrative for the | | | | | | | |
| goal in this box. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Enter numerical | Enter numerical | | | | | |
| | data for | data for | | | | | |
| | current level of | expected level of | | | | | |
| | performance in | performance in | | | | | |
| | this box. | this box. | | | | | |
| | | 2A.2. | 2A.2. | 2A.2. | 2A.2. | 2A.2. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 24.2 | 2 4 2 | 2A.3. | 2A.3. | 2A.3. | |
| | | 2A.3. | 2A.3. | ZA.3. | ZA.3. | ZA.3. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| 2B. Florida | 2B.1. | 2B.1. | 2B.1. | 2B.1. | 2B.1. | | |
| Alternate | | | | | | | |
| | I | 1 | | | | | |
| Assessment: | | | | | | | |
| Students scoring at | | | | | | | |
| or above Level 7 in | | | | | | | |
| mathematics. | | | | | | | |
| mathematics. | | | l . | | ļ | | |

| | 2B. | Level of | 2013 Expected Level of | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| E | Enter narrative for the oal in this box. | Performance:* | Performance:* | | | | | |
| ŀ | | Enter numerical | Enter numerical | | | | | |
| | | data for current level of performance in | data for expected level of performance in this box. | | | | | |
| | | | 2B.2. | 2B.2. | 2B.2. | 2B.2. | 2B.2. | |
| | | | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | |

| 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: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|-----------------|-------|--|
| 3A. FCAT 2.0: | 3A.1. | 3A.1. | 3A.1. | 3A.1. | 3A.1. | | |
| Percentage of | | | | | | | |
| students making learning gains in | | | | | | | |
| mathematics. | | | | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal | | 2013 Expected | | | | | |
| #3A: | Level of Performance:* | Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| Enter narrative for the | r criormanec. | r crromance. | | | | | |
| goal in this box. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. | Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. | | | | | |
| | | 3A.2. | 3A.2. | 3A.2. | 3A.2. | 3A.2. | |
| | | 3A.3. | 3A.3. | 3A.3. | 3A.3. | 3A.3. | |
| 3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. | 3B.1. | 3B.1. | 3B.1. | 3B.1. | 3B.1. | | |

| 1 | #3B. | Level of | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|---|------|--|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| | | data for current level of performance in | Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. | | | | | |
| | | | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | |
| | | | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | |

| Based on the analysis | Anticipated | Strategy | Person or Position | Process Used to Determine | Evaluation Tool | | |
|---------------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-------|--|
| of student achievement | Barrier | | Responsible for Monitoring | Effectiveness of Strategy | | | |
| data and reference to | | | | | | | |
| "Guiding Questions," | | | | | | | |
| identify and define areas | | | | | | | |
| in need of improvement | | | | | | | |
| for the following group: | | | | | | | |
| | 4A.1. | 4A.1. | 4A.1. | 4A.1. | 4A.1. | | |
| Percentage of | | | | | | | |
| students in lowest | | | | | | | |
| 25% making | | | | | | | |
| learning gains in | | | | | | | |
| mathematics. | | | | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal | 2012 Current | 2013 Expected | | | | | |
| #4A: | Level of | Level of | | | | | |
| 11-1/1. | Performance:* | Performance:* | | | | | |
| Enter narrative for the | | | | | | | |
| goal in this box. | | | | | | | |
| Sour in inis box. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Enter numerical | Enter numerical | | | | | |
| | data for | Enter numericai data for | | | | | |
| | current level of | expected level of | | | | | |
| | performance in | performance in | | | | | |
| | this box. | this box. | | | | | |
| | | 4A.2. | 4A.2. | 4A.2. | 4A.2. | 4A.2. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 4A.3. | 4A.3. | 4A.3. | 4A.3. | 4A.3. | |
| | | | | | | "" | |
| | | | | | | | |
| .2.101144 | 4B.1. | 4B.1. | 4B.1. | 4B.1. | 4B.1. | | |
| Alternate | | 1 | | | | | |
| Assessment: | | | | | | | |
| Percentage of | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| students in lowest | | | | | | | |
| 25% making | | | | | | | |
| learning gains in | | | | | | | |
| mathematics. | | 1 | | | | | |
| mathematics. | | | | | | | |

| | 4R· | | 2013 Expected Level of | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| E | Inter narrative for the oal in this box. | renormance. | renormance. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| L | | | | | | | | |
| | | data for current level of performance in | Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. | | | | | |
| | | | 4B.2. | 4B.2. | 4B.2. | 4B.2. | 4B.2. | |
| | | | 4B.3. | 4B.3. | 4B.3. | 4B.3. | 4B.3. | |

| Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | |
|---|---|-----------|--|--|-----------------|-----------|--|
| 5A. In six years, school will reduce | Baseline data 2010-2011 | | | | | | |
| their achievement gap by 50%. | | | | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #5A: | | | | | | | |
| Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, | White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | 5B.1. | | |

| Mathematics Goal #5B: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|--|--|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| | Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: | Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: | | | | | |
| | | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | 5B.2. | |
| | | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | 5B.3. | |

| | | | • | | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-------|--|
| Based on the analysis | Anticipated | Strategy | Person or Position | Process Used to Determine | Evaluation Tool | | |
| of student achievement | Barrier | | Responsible for Monitoring | Effectiveness of Strategy | | | |
| data and reference to | | | | | | | |
| "Guiding Questions," | | | | | | | |
| identify and define areas | | | | | | | |
| in need of improvement | | | | | | | |
| for the following | | | | | | | |
| subgroup: | | | | | | | |
| 5C. English | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | 5C.1. | | |
| Language Learners | | | | | | | |
| (ELL) not making | | | | | | | |
| satisfactory progress | | | | | | | |
| in mathematics. | | | | | | | |
| | 2012 Current | 2013 Expected | | | | | |
| THE COURT OF THE COURT | Level of | Level of | | | | | |
| #5C: | Performance:* | Performance:* | | | | | |
| | i citormance. | r criormance. | | | | | |
| Enter narrative for the | | | | | | | |
| goal in this box. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | 27 | F 4 | | | | | |
| | Enter numerical data for | Enter numerical data for | | | | | |
| | current level of | expected level of | | | | | |
| | performance in | performance in | | | | | |
| | this box. | this box. | | | | | |
| | | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | 5C.2. | |
| | | 1 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | 5C.3. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis | Anticipated | Strategy | Person or Position | Process Used to Determine | Evaluation Tool | | |
| of student achievement | Barrier | | Responsible for Monitoring | Effectiveness of Strategy | | | |
| data and reference to | | | | | | | |
| "Guiding Questions," | | | | | | | |
| identify and define areas | | | | | | | |
| in need of improvement | | | | | | | |
| for the following | | | | | | | |
| subgroup: | | | | | | | |
| subgroup: | | | | | | | |

| 5D. Students | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | 5D.1. | | |
|---|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| with Disabilities | | | | | | | |
| (SWD) not making | | | | | | | |
| satisfactory progress | | | | | | | |
| in mathematics. | | | | | | | |
| | 2012 Current | 2013 Expected | | | | | |
| #5D: | Level of Performance:* | Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | r criormance. | r criormance. | | | | | |
| Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | | | | | | | |
| gour in inis oom | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Enter numerical | Enter numerical | | | | | |
| | | data for | | | | | |
| | current level of performance in | expected level of performance in | | | | | |
| | this box. | this box. | | | | | |
| | | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | 5D.2. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | 5D.3. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | ļ | | | | | | |

| 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: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
|--|------------------------------|---|--|--|-----------------|-------|--|
| Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. | | | 5E.1. | 5E.1. | 5E.1. | | |
| #5E: | Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | data for current level of | Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. | | | | | |
| | | 5E.2. | 5E.2. | 5E.2. | 5E.2. | 5E.2. | |
| | | | | 5E.3. | 5E.3. | 5E.3. | |

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

| ool Mathemat | Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achievem ent | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|-----------------|------|--|
| 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: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. | | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | | |
| Mathematics Goal #1: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | Level of | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. | Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |

| 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: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|-----------------|------|--|
| 2. Florida Alternate Assessment: | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | | |
| Students scoring at | | | | | | | |
| or above Level 7 in | | | | | | | |
| mathematics. | | | | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #2: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | data for current level of performance in this box. | data for expected level of performance in this box. | | | | | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | |
| | | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | |

| 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: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|-----------------|------|--|
| Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. | | 3.1. | 3.1. | 3.1. | 3.1. | | |
| in in the contract of the cont | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. | Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | 3.2. | |
| | | | | | | 3.3. | |
| | | | | | | J.J. | |
| 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: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

| 4. Florida Alternate | 4.1. | 4.1. | 4.1. | 4.1. | 4.1. | | |
|---|---------------------------|-----------------------------|------|---------------|------------------|-------------------|--|
| Assessment: | | | | | | | |
| Percentage of | | | | | | | |
| students in lowest | | | | | | | |
| 25% making | | | | | | | |
| learning gains in | | | | | | | |
| mathematics. | | | | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #4: | 2012 Current | 2013 Expected | | | | | |
| | Level of Performance:* | Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | r criormance. | r criormance. | | | | | |
| goai in inis vox. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | Enter numerical data for | | | | | |
| | current level of | expected level of | | | | | |
| | performance in this box. | performance in this box. | | | | | |
| | inis DOX. | | 4.2. | 4.2. | 4.2. | 4.2. | |
| | | | | ·· <u>-</u> - | l . . | ·· - - | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 4.3. | 4.3. | 4.3. | 4.3. | 4.3. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

Algebra 1 End-of-Course (EOC) Goals (this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Algebra I EOC)

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

| | | | - | • | | · | |
|--|------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|------|--|
| Algebra 1 EOC | Problem- | | | | | | |
| Goals | Solving | | | | | | |
| Goals | | | | | | | |
| | Process to | | | | | | |
| | Increase | | | | | | |
| | Student | | | | | | |
| | Achievem | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | ent | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis | Anticipated | Strategy | Person or Position | Process Used to Determine | Evaluation Tool | | |
| of student achievement | Barrier | | Responsible for Monitoring | Effectiveness of | | | |
| data and reference to | | | | Strategy | | | |
| "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas | | | | | | | |
| in need of improvement | | | | | | | |
| for the following group: | | | | | | | |
| 1. Students scoring | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | | |
| at Achievement | | | | | | | |
| Level 3 in Algebra 1. | | | | | | | |
| Algebra 1 Goal #1: | 2012 Current | 2013 Expected | | | | | |
| | Level of | Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| Enter narrative for the | Performance:* | Performance: * | | | | | |
| goal in this box. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | Enter numerical | | | | | |
| | data for current level of | data for expected level of | | | | | |
| | performance in | performance in | | | | | |
| | this box. | this box. | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

| | | | i | | • | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|------|--|
| Based on the analysis | Anticipated | Strategy | Person or Position | Process Used to Determine | Evaluation Tool | | |
| of student achievement | Barrier | | Responsible for Monitoring | Effectiveness of Strategy | | | |
| data and reference to | | | | | | | |
| "Guiding Questions," | | | | | | | |
| identify and define areas | | | | | | | |
| in need of improvement | | | | | | | |
| for the following group: | | | | | | | |
| 2. Students scoring | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | | |
| at or above | | | | | | | |
| Achievement Levels | | | | | | | |
| 4 and 5 in Algebra 1. | | | | | | | |
| Algebra Goal #2: | | 2013 Expected | | | | | |
| 1 | | Level of | | | | | |
| Enter narrative for the | Performance:* | Performance:* | | | | | |
| goal in this box. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Enter numerical | Enter numerical | | | | | |
| | data for | data for | | | | | |
| | current level of | expected level of | | | | | |
| | performance in this box. | performance in this box. | | | | | |
| | | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | |
| | | L.2. | <u> </u> | 2.2. | | ۷.2. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

| Based on ambitious | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | |
|---|--------------------------|-----------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|-----------|--|
| but achievable Annual | | | | | | | |
| Measurable Objectives | | | | | | | |
| (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics | | | | | | | |
| performance target for | | | | | | | |
| the following years | | | | | | | |
| 3A. In six years, | Baseline data 2010-2011 | | | | | | |
| school will reduce | Basciiiie data 2010-2011 | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| their achievement | | | | | | | |
| gap by 50%. | | | | | | | |
| Algebra 1 Goal #3A: | | | | | | | |
| Entan namatina fon 41- | | | | | | | |
| Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | | | | | | | |
| Sou in inis oon. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position | Process Used to Determine | Evaluation Tool | | |
| of student achievement | | | Responsible for Monitoring | Effectiveness of Strategy | | | |
| data and reference to "Guiding Questions," | | | | | | | |
| identify and define areas | | | | | | | |
| in need of improvement | | | | | | | |
| for the following | | | | | | | |
| subgroups: | | | | | | | |
| | | 3B.1. | 3B.1. | 3B.1. | 3B.1. | | |
| subgroups by | White: | | | | | | |
| - 41 2 24 (3371- 14 | Black: | | | | | | |
| | Hispanic: Asian: | | | | | | |
| | American Indian: | | | | | | |
| Indian) not making | | | | | | | |
| satisfactory progress | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| in Algebra 1. | | | ļ | l | l | | |

| | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|-------------------------|--|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| Enter narrative for the | | | | | | | |
| goal in this box. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. | Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. | | | | | |
| | White: | White: | | | | | |
| | | Black: | | | | | |
| | | Hispanic: | | | | | |
| | | Asian: | | | | | |
| | | American Indian: | | | | | |
| | | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | 3B.2. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | |
| | | | | | | | |

| 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: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|-----------------|-------|--|
| | 3C.1. | 3C.1. | 3C.1. | 3C.1. | 3C.1. | | |
| Language Learners | | | | | | | |
| (ELL) not making | | | | | | | |
| satisfactory progress | | | | | | | |
| in Algebra 1. | | | | | | | |
| Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for europerted level of performance in this box. 3C.2. | 3C.2. | 3C.2. | 3C.2. | 3C.2. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 3C.3. | 3C.3. | 3C.3. | 3C.3. | 3C.3. | |
| 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: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

| 3D. Students | 3D.1. | 3D.1. | 3D.1. | 3D.1. | 3D.1. | | |
|---|--|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| with Disabilities | | | | | | | |
| (SWD) not making | | | | | | | |
| satisfactory progress | | | | | | | |
| in Algebra 1. | | | | | | | |
| | | 2013 Expected | | | | | |
| | | Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | <u>r orrormanco.</u> | l contonianco. | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | data for current level of performance in | Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. | | | | | |
| | | | 3D.2. | 3D.2. | 3D.2. | 3D.2. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | |
| | | | | | | | |

| 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: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
|--|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|-----------------|-------|--|
| o z v z comonimentij | 3E.1. | 3E.1. | 3E.1. | 3E.1. | 3E.1. | | |
| Disadvantaged | | | | | | | |
| students not making | | | | | | | |
| satisfactory progress in Algebra 1. | | | | | | | |
| | 2012 Current | 2013 Expected | | | | | |
| | Level of | Level of | | | | | |
| Zitter ittirition of or the | Performance:* | Performance:* | | | | | |
| goal in this box. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Enter numerical data for | Enter numerical data for | | | | | |
| | current level of | expected level of | | | | | |
| | performance in this box. | performance in this box. | | | | | |
| | | | 3E.2. | 3E.2. | 3E.2. | 3E.2. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 3E.3. | 3E.3. | 3E.3. | 3E.3. | 3E.3. | |
| | | 51.5. | DE.3. | 55.5. | 50.5. | on.s. | |
| | | | | | | | |

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course Goals (this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Geometry EOC)

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

| | | | | <i>C</i> 1 (<i>C</i>) E | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|-----------------|------|--|
| Geometry EOC Goals | Solving Process to Increase Student Achievem ent | | | | | | |
| 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: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. | | | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | | |
| Geometry Goal #1: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. | Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. | | | | | |
| | | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |

| 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: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|-----------------|------|--|
| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. | | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | | |
| Geometry Goal #2: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. | Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. | | | | | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | |
| | | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | |

| their achievement | 2012-2013 Baseline data 2011- 2012 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | |
|---|--|-----------|--|--|-----------------|--|
| gap by 50%. | | | ĺ | | | |
| Geometry Goal #3A: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| 3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, | White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian: | 3B.1. | 3B.1. | 3B.1. | 3B.1. | |

| Level of | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
|---|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| current level of performance in this box. White: Black: | data for expected level of | | | | | |
| | | | | | 3B.2. | |
| | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | 3B.3. | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|-----------------|-------|--|
| for the following subgroup: | | | | | | | |
| | 3C.1. | 3C.1. | 3C.1. | 3C.1. | 3C.1. | | |
| Language Learners | | | | | | | |
| (ELL) not making | | | | | | | |
| satisfactory progress | | | | | | | |
| in Geometry. | | | | | | | |
| Stomeny Commercia | Level of | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| goal in this box. | | | | | | | |
| | Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. | Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. | | | | | |
| | | 3C.2. | 3C.2. | 3C.2. | 3C.2. | 3C.2. | |
| | | 3C.3. | 3C.3. | 3C.3. | 3C.3. | 3C.3. | |
| 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: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |

| 3D. Students | 3D.1. | 3D.1. | 3D.1. | 3D.1. | 3D.1. | | |
|---|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| with Disabilities | | | | | | | |
| (SWD) not making | | | | | | | |
| satisfactory progress | | | | | | | |
| in Geometry. | | | | | | | |
| Geometry Goal #3D: | | 2013 Expected | | | | | |
| E | | Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | Enter numerical | | | | | |
| | | data for expected level of | | | | | |
| | performance in this box. | performance in this box. | | | | | |
| | | | 3D.2. | 3D.2. | 3D.2. | 3D.2. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | 3D.3. | |
| | | | | | | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
|---|------------------------|---|--|--|-----------------|-------|--|
| for the following subgroup: | | | | | | | |
| 3E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in Geometry. | | | 3E.1. | 3E.1. | 3E.1. | | |
| | Level of | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | data for | Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. | | | | | |
| | | 3E.2. | 3E.2. | 3E.2. | 3E.2. | 3E.2. | |
| | | 3E.3. | 3E.3. | 3E.3. | 3E.3. | 3E.3. | |

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

| Professional | | | | |
|--------------------|---|--|--|--|
| Development | | | | |
| (PD) aligned with | | | | |
| Strategies through | ı | | | |
| Professional | | | | |

| Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activities 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) | | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| Monitoring for Achievement Days | Pre-K – 5 th | Literacy Coach Assistant Principal | Pre-K – 5 th Grade, ESE teachers, Interventionists, Guidance | October, January, May | Discussion of implementation of action plan & progress monitoring at PLCs. | Rtl Leadership Team Members |
| Standards for Mathematical Practice | K-5 th / Math | Julie Dixon | All K-5th Teachers | September 2012 | Discussion of Standards of Mathematical Practice implementation during PLCs | Administration |
| PLC: Book Study of Common Core Mathematics in a PLC at Work | | Literacy Coach Assistant Principal | All K-5 teachers, ESE teachers, Interventionists, Guidance | Ongoing | PLC discussion of concepts & CCSS implementation | Administration |

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| Include only school-based funded | | | |
|--|--|------------------------------------|------------|
| activities/materials and exclude district | | | |
| funded activities /materials. | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: 0 | | | |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: 0 | | | |
| Professional Development | | | |
| | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Juli Dixon - Standards for Mathematical Practice PD | Stipends | Title 1 – Professional Development | \$1,330.00 |
| Mathematical Practice | Substitute Pay | Title 1 – Professional Development | \$1800.00 |
| | Book: Common Core Mathematics in a PLC at Work | Title 1 – Professional Development | \$1320.00 |
| Subtotal: \$4450.00 | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Subtotal: 0 | | | |
| Total: \$4450.00 | | | |

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]).

| Elementary and Middle Science Goals | Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achievem ent | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|---------------------------------|--|
| 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: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| 1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. | struggle reading non-fiction text. | Increase the opportunities for students to read non-fiction text. Have students read science leveled-readers during the reading block. | Teachers | Students are able to apply non- fiction reading strategies when reading text independently. | Assessments of non-fiction text | |
| Science Goal #1A: By May 2013, students scoring a level 3 will increase by 10% | Level of | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
| | 5 th : 29% [21] | 5 th : 32% | | | | |

| | | summarize scientific concepts. | Students are engaged in interactive notebooking at least weekly. 1A.3. | Teachers 1A.3. | Students are able to clearly summarize scientific concepts. 1A.3. | Science Post-tests 1A.3. |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|---------------------------|
| Alternate S | struggle reading non-fiction text. | opportunities for students to read non-fiction text. Have students read science leveled-readers during the reading block. | | Students are able to apply non- fiction reading strategies when reading text independently. | Assessments of non-fiction text | |
| By May 2013, students will P maintain their high level of proficiency | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |
| | | summarize scientific concepts. | Students are engaged in interactive notebooking at least weekly. 1B.3. | | Students are able to clearly summarize scientific concepts. 1B.3. | Science Post-tests 1B.3. |

| 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: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
|---|---------------------------|---|---|---|---------------------------------|---------------------------|--|
| at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science. | | for students to read non-fiction text. Have students read science leveled-readers during the reading block. | Teachers | Students are able to apply non- fiction reading strategies when reading text independently. | Assessments of non-fiction text | | |
| By May 2013, students scoring a 4 or 5 will increase by 10% | Level of Performance:* | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | summarize scientific concepts. | Students are engaged in interactive notebooking at least weekly. 2A.3. | | summarize scientific concepts. | Science Post-tests 2A.3. | |

| 2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science. | | Increase the opportunities for students to read non-fiction text. Have students read science leveled-readers during the reading block. | | Students are able to apply non- fiction reading strategies when reading text independently. | Assessments of non-fiction text | | |
|--|---------------------------|--|--|---|---------------------------------|--------------------|--|
| Science Goal #2B: By May 2013, our students will maintain their high proficiency rate. At least 95% of students will meet proficiency | Level of Performance:* | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | Students struggle to summarize scientific concepts. | Students are engaged in interactive notebooking at least weekly. | | summarize scientific concepts. | Science Post-tests | |
| | | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | 2B.3. | |

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

| | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | | _ | | | • | · |
|---|---|---|--|--|-----------------|------|---|
| High School Science Goals | Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achievem ent | | | | | | |
| 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: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | | |
| Science Goal #1: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | data for current level of performance in this box. | Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |

| 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: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|-----------------|------|--|
| 2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science. | | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | | |
| | Level of Performance:* | 2013Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. | Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. | | | | | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | |
| | | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | |

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

Biology 1 End-of-Course (EOC) Goals (this section needs to be completed by all schools that have students taking the Biology I EOC)

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

| Biology 1 EOC | Problem- | | | |
|---------------|-------------------|--|--|--|
| Goals | Solving | | | |
| | Process to | | | |
| | Increase | | | |
| | Student | | | |
| | Achievem | | | |

| | ent | | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|-----------------|------|--|
| 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: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | | |
| Biology 1 Cour w 1: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. | Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |
| 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: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | | |

| Biology 1 Goal #2: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | Level of Performance:* | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|------|------|------|------|--|
| | current level of performance in | data for expected level of | | | | | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | |
| | | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | |

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

Science Professional Development

| 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 |
| Interactive Notebooking PD | K-5 th | Lauren Burdick | K-5 th Teachers | Fall 2012 | Observe Interactive Notebooking. Discuss implementation strategies during PLC. | Administration |
| | | | | | | |

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials. Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
|---|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: 0 | | | |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |

| Subtotal: 0 | | | |
|----------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Interactive Notebooking PD | Pay for Teachers' Substitutes | Title 1 Professional Development | \$1800.00 |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: \$1800.00 | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: 0 | | | |
| Total: \$1800.00 | | | |

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

| Writing Goals | Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achievem ent | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|---|--|
| 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: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| 1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. | is difficult for a teacher to individually conference with all students. | Every 4th grade teacher will receive an additional instructional person during the writing block to conference with students about their writing. | Instructional Staff Administration Literacy Coach | Analyze student work Review conferencing logs Observations Coaching cycle | Richey Writes Data Observation Data FCAT Data | |
| Writing Goal #1A: By May 2013, students scoring a level 3.0 or higher will increase by 10% | 2012 Current Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | |

| | | understanding of new expectations for Writing FCAT Lack of understanding of CCSS | Provide training and engage teachers in an analysis of expectations for the writing FCAT. Teachers will create lessons that enable students to meet the new expectations. The Common Core State Standards are new, and the majority of the staff are unfamiliar with the new standards. | Instructional Staff Literacy Coach Administration 2nd – 5th grade teachers will understand and begin to implement CCSS concepts within their writing instruction. K-1st grade teachers will understand and plan for instruction based on CCSS. | Instructional Coaches | Richey Writes Data Observation Data FCAT data CCSS will be reflected in lesson plans and observations. Student Collaboration Student Writing | |
|--|--|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| 1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. | understanding of CCSS and Writing Expectations. | Core State Standards are new, and the majority of | 2 nd – 5 th grade teachers will understand and begin to implement CCSS concepts within their writing instruction. K-1 st grade teachers will understand and plan for instruction based on CCSS. | Staff Administration Instructional Coaches | CCSS will be reflected in lesson plans and observations. Student Collaboration Student Writing | | |
| Writing Goal #1B: By May 2013, our students will maintain their high proficiency rate. At least 95% of students will meet proficiency | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | | | 1B.2. 1B.3. | 1B.2. 1B.3. | 1B.2. 1B.3. | 1B.2. 1B.3. | |

Writing Professional Development

| 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 State Standards | Pre-K – 5 th | Literacy Coach Assistant Principal | School wide | All year @ bi-weekly meetings | Planned activities that cause teachers to implement lessons that are based on CCSS and reflect on implementation. | Literacy Coach Assistant Principal |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities/materials. Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
|---|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: 0 | | | |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |

| Subtotal: 0 | | | |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------|
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: 0 | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| Celebrate Student Writing | Incentives for Writers | Title 1 | 1000.00 |
| Subtotal: \$1000.00 | | | |
| Total: \$1000.00 | | | |

End of Writing Goals

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) Goals (required in year 2014-2015)

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

| | | | | <i>E</i> 1 (<i>E</i>) E | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|-----------------|------|--|
| Civics EOC Goals | Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achievem ent | | | | | | |
| 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: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| at Achievement Level 3 in Civics. | | | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | | |
| Civics Goal #1: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. | Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |

| 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: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|-----------------|------|--|
| 2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | | |
| 4 and 5 in Civics. | | | | | | | |
| | Level of Performance:* | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* | | | | | |
| | Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. | Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. | | | | | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | |
| | | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | |

Civics Professional Development

| 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., | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| | | FLC Leader | school-wide) | frequency of meetings) | | |
| | | | | | | |

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials. Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
|--|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |

| Subtotal: | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Total: | | | |

End of Civics Goals

U.S. History End-of-Course (EOC) Goals (required in year 2013-2014)

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

| TIO TI | D 11 | | | | · T | T | |
|---|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|------|--|
| U.S. History | Problem- | | | | | | |
| EOC Goals | Solving | | | | | | |
| | Process to | | | | | | |
| | Increase | | | | | | |
| | Student | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Achievem | | | | | | |
| | ent | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis | Anticipated | Strategy | Person or Position | Process Used to Determine | Evaluation Tool | | |
| of student achievement data and reference to | Barrier | | Responsible for Monitoring | Effectiveness of Strategy | | | |
| "Guiding Questions," | | | | | | | |
| identify and define areas | | | | | | | |
| in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | | | |
| | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | | |
| at Achievement | | | | | | | |
| Level 3 in U.S. | | | | | | | |
| History. | | | | | | | |
| | | 2013 Expected | | | | | |
| | Level of | Level of | | | | | |
| Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | Performance:* | Performance:* | | | | | |
| goat in ints box. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Enter numerical | | | | | | |
| | data for | data for | | | | | |
| | current level of performance in | expected level of performance in | | | | | |
| | this box. | this box. | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | <u> </u> | L | | | Į | l . | |

| 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: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
|---|------------------------|--|--|--|-----------------|------|--|
| 2. Students scoring | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | 2.1. | | |
| at or above | | | | | | | |
| Achievement Levels | | | | | | | |
| 4 and 5 in U.S. | | | | | | | |
| History. | | | | | | | |
| U.S. History Goal #2: | Level of | 2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in | | | | | |
| | this box. | this box. | | | | | |
| | | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | 2.2. | |
| | | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | 2.3. | |

U.S. History Professional Development

| 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 |
| | | | ŕ | | | |
| | | | | | | |

U.S. History Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials. Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
|--|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |

| Subtotal: | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | • |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Total: | | | |

End of U.S. History Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

| Attendance Goal(s) | Problem- solving Process to Increase Attendan ce | | | | | |
|---|---|----------|--|--|-----------------|--|
| Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |

| | ir a : | 1. | 0 1 1 7 1 | lm | m | |
|--|---------------------------------|---------------------|---|--|--|--|
| 1. Attendance | -Low Socio- economic status | Atten | Social worker, Teacher, Administration | Terms attendance Reports Star attendance Reports | Terms attendance Reports Star attendance Reports | |
| | of population | dance | Administration | Star attendance Reports | Star attendance Reports | |
| | causes issues of | | | | | |
| | pasic needs to | | | | | |
| | take precedence | ment on | | | | |
| | over school attendance. | morning | | | | |
| | -Poorly | news, | | | | |
| | educated, | monthly | | | | |
| | working poor adult | newsletter. | | | | |
| | | 1 | | | | |
| | has created a | marquis. | | | | |
| | decreased value | | | | | |
| | of educationTransportation | Parent | | | | |
| | unavailable | contact on | | | | |
| | when bus is | going for | | | | |
| | missed. -Children who | | | | | |
| | do not want to | with sub- | | | | |
| | attend school | standard | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | -Challenges in | attendance | ; | | | |
| | locating parents | ļ. | | | | |
| | to provide | | | | | |
| | interventionsPoor access | Referrals to | | | | |
| | to modical | community | | | | |
| | neatment – lack | services as needed. | | | | |
| | of insurance/ transportation | incoucu. | | | | |
| Attendance Goal #1: | | 2013 Expected | | | | |
| Attendance Goal #1. | Attendance | Attendance | | | | |
| Richey's student | Rate:* | Rate:* | | | | |
| attendance rate will be | | | | | | |
| 95% for the 2012-2013 school year. | | | | | | |
| school yeur. | | | | | | |
| We will reduced the | | | | | | |
| number of students with excessive absences by 10%. | | | | | | |
| excessive absences by 10%. | | | | | | |
| | | | 1 | | | |
| | | | 1 | | | |
| | | | | | | |

| 93.6% | 95% | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|--|---|---|--|
| Number of | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | | | | |
| 263 | 237 | | | | |
| Number of Students with Excessive | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | | | | |
| | 2012 had worst attendance rate of 92.8% Children who do not want to | Monthly classroom attendance reinforcementSuccessful 5th graders will share with students in lower gradesMonthly incentive for 98% attendancePosting Weekly % of attendance in each classroom. | Terms attendance Reports Star attendance Reports | Terms attendance Reports Star attendance Reports | |
| | 104 students had 20 or more absences throughout the school year. See barriers listed above. | Social worker will mail home a letter informing them of their excessive number of absences. Social worker will progress monitor student attendance of those with excessive absences. Parents will be required to submit a doctor's note for excused absences. Contact parents on a regular basis to discuss solutions to resolve attendance concerns. | Terms attendance Reports Star attendance Reports | Terms attendance Reports Star attendance Reports | |

Attendance Professional Development

| 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 |
| NA | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| Include only school-based funded | | | |
|---|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| activities/materials and exclude district | | | |
| funded activities /materials. | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| Subtotal: | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|----------------|--------|--|
| Professional Development | | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | | |
| Other | | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount | |
| Rewards for 5th graders for attendance | Incentives | Title 1 | 500.00 | |
| Subtotal: 500.00 | | | | |
| Total: 500.00 | | | | |

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

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

| | | the hamber of s | I | represents next to the po | | (33)). | |
|--|---------------|---|----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------|--------|--|
| Suspension | Problem- | | | | | | |
| Goal(s) | solving | | | | | | |
| | Process to | | | | | | |
| | Decrease | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Suspension | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis | Anticipated | Strategy | Person or Position | Process Used to Determine | Evaluation Tool | | |
| of suspension data, and | Barrier | | Responsible for Monitoring | Effectiveness of | | | |
| reference to "Guiding | | | | Strategy | | | |
| Questions," identify and define areas in need of | | | | | | | |
| improvement: | | | | | | | |
| 1. Suspension | Teachers will | Create and post | Discipline | Compile and | Referral and | | |
| | | school-wide behavior | | - | suspension data | | |
| | | expectations. Recognize students | | • | suspension data | | |
| | | that are following | Administration | suspension data. | | | |
| | | the school-wide | | | | | |
| | | expectations, which | | Discipline Committee | | | |
| | | will ultimately | | will regularly | | | |
| | | decrease referrals, in- school suspension, | | | | | |
| | | and out-of-school | | communicate with | | | |
| | | suspensions. | | teachers about the | | | |
| | | | | effectiveness. | | | |
| Suspension Goal #1: | | 2013 Expected | | | | | |
| | | Number of | | | | | |
| Our goal is to reduce the | Suspensions | <u>In- School</u> Suspensions | | | | | |
| suspensions by at least 10% for the 2012/2013 | | <u>Odspensions</u> | | | | | |
| school year. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | 0 | <i>V</i> | | | | | |
| | | 2013 Expected Number of Students | | | | | |
| | | Suspended Students | | | | | |
| | In-School | In -School | | | | | |
| | 0 | 0 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

| 2012 Total Number of Out-of- | 2013 Expected Number of | | | | | |
|--|--|---|------|---|------|--|
| School Suspensions | Out-of-School Suspensions | | | | | |
| 18 | 16 | | | | | |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out- of- School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School | | | | | |
| 12 | 10 | | | | | |
| | from different classes might not get along. When kids register late, students are placed in a class without knowing the student. | lists to evenly distribute students with negative behaviors. Teachers will also work together to separate students that did not get along, which will ultimately decrease referrals, in-school suspension, and out-of-school suspensions. | | Compile and analyze referral and suspension data. Students that repeatedly receive referrals will be referred to the Graduation-Enhancement Teacher. | | |
| | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |

Suspension Professional Development

| Suspension 1 Total | 991911001 2 0 1 | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|--|---|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 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. | | DD Engilitator | DD Participants | Towart Dates (a.g. Fowly) | | |
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/ | PD Facilitator and/or | PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or | Target Dates (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for |
| and/of 1 LC 1 ocus | Subject | PLC Leader | school-wide) | frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Monitoring |
| NA | | | · | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| Include only school-based funded activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials. Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
|--|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |

| Subtotal: | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Total:0.00 | | | |

End of Suspension Goals

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Note: Required for High School- F.S., Sec. 1003.53

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

| when using percen | mages, menude | the number of s | tudents the percentage | represents next to the p | ciccinage (c.g. 707) | (<i>33))</i> . | |
|---|-----------------------------|--|--|---|----------------------|-----------------|--|
| Dropout | Problem- | | | | | | |
| Prevention | solving | | | | | | |
| Goal(s) | Process to | | | | | | |
| | Dropout | | | | | | |
| | Prevention | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of | Evaluation Tool | | |
| and reference to "Guiding | Daniel | | Responsible for Wontoring | Strategy | | | |
| Questions," identify and define areas in need of | | | | | | | |
| improvement: | | | | | | | |
| 1. Dropout | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | | |
| Prevention | 2012 G | 2012 7 | | | | | |
| | 2012 Current Dropout Rate:* | 2013 Expected Dropout Rate:* | | | | | |
| Dropout Prevention Goal #1: | - | | | | | | |
| <u>Goal #1.</u> | | | | | | | |
| 37.4 | | | | | | | |
| NA *Please refer to the | | | | | | | |
| percentage of students | | | | | | | |
| who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school | | | | | | | |
| year. | | | | | | | |
| , | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Enter numerical | Enter numerical data | | | | | |
| | | for expected dropout rate in this box. | | | | | |
| | 2012 Current | 2013 Expected | | | | | |
| | | Graduation Rate:* | | | | | |
| | Enter numerical data for | Enter numerical data for expected | | | | | |
| | graduation rate in | graduation rate in | | | | | |
| | this box. | this box. | | | | | |

| | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
|--|------|------|------|------|------|--|
| | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

| 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 |
| NA | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| Include only school-based funded | | | |
|---|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| activities/materials and exclude district | | | |
| funded activities /materials. | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Total:0.00 | | | |

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Upload Option-For schools completing the Parental Involvement Policy/Plan (PIP) please include a copy for this section. Online Template- For schools completing the PIP a link will be provided that will direct you to this plan.

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

| * When using percentage | s, include the | e number of s | tudents the percentage | represents next to the po | ercentage (e.g. 70%) | 0 (33)). | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|----------|--|
| Parent Involvement | Problem- | | | | | | |
| Goal(s) | solving | | | | | | |
| | Process | | | | | | |
| | to Parent | | | | | | |
| | Involveme | | | | | | |
| | nt | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of parent | Anticipated | Strategy | Person or Position | Process Used to Determine | Evaluation Tool | | |
| involvement data, and reference | Barrier | | Responsible for Monitoring | Effectiveness of | | | |
| to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of | | | | Strategy | | | |
| improvement: | | | | | | | |
| 1. Parent Involvement | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | | |
| Demont Investment Conf | 2012 Current | 2013 Expected | | | | | |
| Parent Involvement Goal #1: | Level of Parent | Level of Parent | | | | | |
| π1. | Involvement:* | Involvement:* | | | | | |
| Please refer to our PIP on DOE website. | | | | | | | |
| *Please refer to the | | | | | | | |
| percentage of parents who | | | | | | | |
| participated in school | | | | | | | |
| activities, duplicated or | | | | | | | |
| unduplicated. | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | Enter numerical | Enter numerical | | | | | |
| | data for current level of parent | data for expected level of parent | | | | | |
| | involvement in this box. | involvement in this | | | | | |
| | | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | |
| | | | | | | | |

Parent Involvement Professional Development

| 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 |
| NA | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

Parent Involvement Budget

| Include only school-based funded | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------|----------------|-------------|--|
| activities/materials and exclude district | | | | |
| funded activities /materials. | | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount | |
| | | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | | |
| Technology | | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount | |
| | | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | | |
| Professional Development | | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount | |
| | | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | | |
| Other | | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount | |
| Parent Involvement | Parent Involvement Coordinator | Title 1 | \$27,824.52 | |
| Subtotal: \$27,824.52 | | | | |
| Total: \$27,824.52 | | | | |

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

| STEM Goal(s) | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|---|---|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| STEM Goal #1: | | | | | 1.1. |
| | 1.2. | | | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

STEM Professional Development

| 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 |
| NA | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| Include only school-based funded | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|----------------|--------|--|
| activities/materials and exclude district funded activities /materials. | | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | | |
| Technology | | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | | |
| Professional Development | | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | | |
| Other | | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | | |
| Total: 0.00 | | | | |
| , | | | • | |

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

| CTE Goal(s) | Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|--|
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| CTE Goal #1: Our students will engage in presentations of various careers during the Great American Teach-In. | of understanding of the wide variety of jobs and career paths. | 1.1. During the Great American Teach – In, students will engage in presentation of various careers. | Coordinator Teachers Administration | a deeper understanding of career options. | 1.1. Class discussion of Great American Teach-In. |
| | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. |
| | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. | 1.3. |

CTE Professional Development

| 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 |
| NA | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
|--------------------------|--|--|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | Description of Resources Description of Resources | Description of Resources Funding Source Description of Resources Funding Source |

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

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

| when using percentage | | liumoer or s | tudents the percentage | represents next to the p | creentage (e.g. 707) | (<i>33))</i> . | |
|---|---|---|--|---|----------------------|-----------------|--|
| Additional Goal(s) | Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achieveme nt | | | | | | |
| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | |
| 1. Additional Goal | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | 1.1. | | |
| Additional Goal #1: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. | | 2013 Expected Level :* | | | | | |
| | Enter numerical data for current goal in this box. | Enter numerical data for expected goal in this box. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | 1.2. | |
| | | 1.3. | | | 1.3. | 1.3. | |

Additional Goals Professional Development

| 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 | PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or | Target Dates (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| | yee | PLC Leader | school-wide) | frequency of meetings) | | |
| | | | | | | |

Additional Goal(s) Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| Include only school-based funded | | | |
|---|--------------------------|----------------|--------|
| activities/materials and exclude district | | | |
| funded activities /materials. | | | |
| Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s) | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amount |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| Subtotal: | | | |
| Total: | | | |
| | | · | |

End of Additional Goal(s)

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

| That Duget (fisert fows as needed) | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Please provide the total budget from each section. | |
| Reading Budget | |
| | Total: \$14,530.00 |
| CELLA Budget | |
| | Total: (|
| Mathematics Budget | |
| | Total: \$4450.00 |
| Science Budget | |
| | Total: \$1800.00 |
| Writing Budget | |
| | Total: 1000.00 |
| Civics Budget | |
| Civies Dauget | Total: 0 |
| U.S. History Budget | Total. 0 |
| U.S. History Budget | Total: 0 |
| 144 1 D 1 4 | 1 Otal: 0 |
| Attendance Budget | |
| | Total: \$500.00 |
| Suspension Budget | |
| | Total: 0 |
| Dropout Prevention Budget | |
| | Total: 0 |
| Parent Involvement Budget | |
| | Total: \$27,824.52 |
| STEM Budget | |
| | Total: 0 |
| CTE Budget | Totali |
| C1L Duuget | Total: 0 |
| Additional Cook | 1 otar: 0 |
| Additional Goals | |
| | Total: 0 |
| | |

| 2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP |
|--|
|--|

Grand Total: \$50,104.52

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

Please choose the school's DA Status. (To activate the checkbox: 1. Double click the desired box; 2. When the menu pops up, select *Checked* under "Default value" header; 3. Select *OK*, this will place an "x" in the box.)

| School Differentiated Accountability Status | | |
|---|--------|----------|
| □Priority | □Focus | □Prevent |
| | | |

• Upload a copy of the Differentiated Accountability Checklist in the designated upload link on the Upload page

School Advisory Council (SAC)

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 members 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 □ No

If No, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements.

Describe the activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year.

The Student Advisory Council (SAC) meets once a month and consists of administrators, teachers, staff, parents and community members. During these meetings we have presenters from Richey Elementary School and/or district to provide the council with information about what is going on within the school community. At this time the members of the council can ask questions and gain a deeper understanding of what is happening in education today. We have used members in the past to assist in fundraisers, classroom volunteers and as business partners. Here at Richey Elementary School we find our SAC to be a large asset to our academic success.

| Describe the projected use of SAC funds. | Amount |
|---|--------|
| Create a memory wall in the administration building of Richey Elementary of pictures and mementos commemorating Richey's history. | TBD |
| | |
| | |