# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: SUWANNEE PRIMARY SCHOOL

District Name: Suwannee

Principal: Amy Boggus

SAC Chair: Jennifer Kuyrkendall

Superintendent: Jerry Scarborough

Date of School Board Approval: October 2012

Last Modified on: 11/15/2012



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

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

### PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

#### STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

School Grades Trend Data

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data

High School Feedback Report

K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

#### **ADMINISTRATORS**

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Assis Principal	Marsha Tedder	Masters in Educational Leadership  BA Elementary Education  Certifications: Educational Leadership/All Levels ESOL Endorsement and ESOL for Administrators  Elementary Education 1-6  Clinical Educator	9	2	Taught 2nd grade 11 years Taught 3rd grade Summer Reading Camp for 2 years Third year as Assistant Principal
		Masters of Education			

Principal	Amy Boggus	BA Communication Science  Certifications: Educational Leadership/All Levels ESOL Endorsement and ESOL for Administrators  Pre-K/Primary Education Age 3-Grade 3  Speech Language Impaired K-12  Exceptional Student Education K-12  Clinical Educator	8	5	Served as a Speech/Language Pathologist 10 years Taught 1st grade 3 years, 1st grade Inclusion 2 years Assistant Principal 3 years Third year as Principal
-----------	------------	---	---	---	---

#### INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide assessment performance (Percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)		
Math	Renee Bass	MA. in Teaching and Learning Certified Math 6- 12, ESE K-12, Business 6-12	2 5		Math Coach since 2007, serving Suwannee Intermediate School District Math Coach since 2009		
Reading Susan Hurst 1-6		Education/Grades	31	10	I began my teaching career in 1979. I taught a 5th grade class my 1st year. In 1980 was moved to 3rd grade and taught in that capacity.		

#### EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	New teacher orientation with school administration  A  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N  N		On- going/Monthly	
2	Year long mentor program with new teachers, mentors have clinical education training.		On-going	
3	Required monthly meeting with new teachers and administration.		On-going	
4	Frequent informal and formal classroom visits.	Adminstration	On-going	

### Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Provide the Number of strategies staff and that are paraprofessional being that are implemented teaching outto support of-field/ and the staff in who are not becoming highly highly effective. effective No data submitted

### Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Nu of Instruct Staf	% of First-Ye		% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers		% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
55	7.3%(4)	20.0%(11)	47.3%(26)	25.5%(14)	18.2%(10)	14.5%(8)	3.6%(2)	1.8%(1)	70.9%(39)

### Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

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

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities	
Jennifer Bonds	Hannah Johnson	new teacher	Team planning	
Kim Mott	Shannon Rodriguez	new teacher	Team Planning	
Shannon Daniel	Deeanna Sardina	new teacher	Team planning	
Cindy Crowell Jennifer Gregory		new teacher	Team planning	

### ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

#### Coordination and Integration

#### Note: For Title I schools only

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

#### Title I, Part A

Title 1, will be utilized to provide Reading Coaches at three Title 1 schools. Funds will also provide paraprofessional at the Title 1 school to given additional help to students a level 1 or 2 on FCAT. Title 1, Title 1 Part A is also used to provide a District Wide Parent Liaison, Math Coach, Curriculum Specialist and a teacher for the Opportunity School to serve all schools in the District.

#### Title I, Part C- Migrant

School based administrators will observe the use of "The Essential Six" reading strategies from the Florida Reading Initiative (FRI) in all classrooms. This initiative is funded by Title I Part C and district professional development funds. ALL activities funded by Title I Part C will be supplementary and will not supplant existing State- and District-funded and required services. Reading First and FRI strategies will be monitored by administrators and reading coaches to ensure successful opportunities for Non-ELL and LEP (ELL) students. Title I Part C funds are used for a Migrant Coordinator, Migrant Tutors, Migrant paraprofessional and to purchase license for Accelerated Reading Enterprise-English in a Flash, additional computers and other supplies needed for migrant students.

Title I, Part D

Title I Part D (neglected and delinquent) funds will be used to provide a uniform curriculum throughout all the district's secondary schools, including the residential juvenile facility and the district's opportunity program. The funds will also provide two paraprofessionals.

Title II

School based administrators will observe the use of "The Essential Six" reading strategies from the Florida Reading Initiative (FRI) in all classrooms. This initiative is funded by Title II Part A funds are used to fund three Reading Coaches, travel, consultants and the district's professional development funds. ALL activities funded by Title III will be supplementary and will not supplant existing State- and District-funded and required services. Reading First and FRI strategies will be monitored by administrators and reading coaches to ensure successful opportunities for Non-ELL and LEP (ELL) students.

Title III

Funds from Title III Part A are used to provide tutors for ELL students, purchased instructional materials and software for ELL students. All activities funded by Title III will be supplementary and will not supplant existing State and District funded and required services. Reading First and FRI strategies will be monitored by administrators and reading coaches to ensure successful opportunities for Non-ELL and LEP (ELL) students.

Title X- Homeless

Title X Homeless funds are used to provide supplies, dues, fieldtrip fund and other needs for Homeless students.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

N/A

Violence Prevention Programs

N/A

**Nutrition Programs** 

Free and reduced lunch

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team-

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The Principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing RtI, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation ensures adequate professional

development to support RtI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities. The Assistant Principal works with the Principal to accomplish the plans set forth above.

Select General Education Teacher: Provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.

The Reading Coach evaluates school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum assessment and intervention approaches; assists in the design and implementation of progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring; and supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention plans.

The Counselor provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students, and links child-serving community agencies to the schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.

School Psychologist: Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation; and facilitates data-based decision making activities. Exceptional Student Education Teacher: Collaborates with general education teachers to integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction.

Speech Language Pathologist: Educates the team in the role language plays in curriculum, assessment, and instruction, as a basis for appropriate program design; assists in the selection of screening measures; and helps identify systemic patterns of student need with respect to language skills.

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 Principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing RtI, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities. The Assistant Principal works with the Principal to accomplish the plans set forth above.

Select General Education Teacher: Provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.

The Reading Coach evaluates school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum assessment and intervention approaches; assists in the design and implementation of progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring; and supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention plans.

The Counselor provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students, and links child-serving community agencies to the schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.

School Psychologist: Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation; and facilitates data-based decision making activities. Exceptional Student Education Teacher: Collaborates with general education teachers to integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction.

Speech Language Pathologist: Educates the team in the role language plays in curriculum, assessment, and instruction, as a basis for appropriate program design; assists in the selection of screening measures; and helps identify systemic patterns of student need with respect to language skills.

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

The Principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing RtI, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities. The Assistant Principal works with the Principal to accomplish the plans set forth above.

Select General Education Teacher: Provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.

The Reading Coach evaluates school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum assessment and intervention approaches; assists in the design and implementation of progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring; and supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention plans.

The Counselor provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and

intervention with individual students, and links child-serving community agencies to the schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.

School Psychologist: Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation; and facilitates data-based decision making activities. Exceptional Student Education Teacher: Collaborates with general education teachers to integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction.

Speech Language Pathologist: Educates the team in the role language plays in curriculum, assessment, and instruction, as a basis for appropriate program design; assists in the selection of screening measures; and helps identify systemic patterns of student need with respect to language skills.

#### 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.

The Principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing RtI, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities. The Assistant Principal works with the Principal to accomplish the plans set forth above.

Select General Education Teacher: Provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.

The Reading Coach evaluates school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum assessment and intervention approaches; assists in the design and implementation of progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring; and supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention plans.

The Counselor provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students, and links child-serving community agencies to the schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.

School Psychologist: Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation; and facilitates data-based decision making activities. Exceptional Student Education Teacher: Collaborates with general education teachers to integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction.

Speech Language Pathologist: Educates the team in the role language plays in curriculum, assessment, and instruction, as a basis for appropriate program design; assists in the selection of screening measures; and helps identify systemic patterns of student need with respect to language skills.

#### Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The Principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing RtI, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities. The Assistant Principal works with the Principal to accomplish the plans set forth above.

Select General Education Teacher: Provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.

The Reading Coach evaluates school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum assessment and intervention approaches; assists in the design and implementation of progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring; and supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention plans.

The Counselor provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students, and links child-serving community agencies to the schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.

School Psychologist: Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation; and facilitates data-based decision making activities. Exceptional Student Education Teacher: Collaborates with general education teachers to integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction.

Speech Language Pathologist: Educates the team in the role language plays in curriculum, assessment, and instruction, as a basis for appropriate program design; assists in the selection of screening measures; and helps identify systemic patterns of

student need with respect to language skills.	
Describe the plan to support MTSS.	
iteracy Leadership Team (LLT)	
School-Based Literacy Leadership Team	
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).	
The school-based Literacy Leadership Team consists of the Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, Librari Teacher and Classroom Teachers.	an, Resource
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).	
The Literacy Leadership Team meets monthly to look at strengths and weaknesses in reading and to develop a increase student participation in reading.	ictivities to
What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?	
The major initiative this year will be to ensure that all classrooms participate in STAR testing and Accelerated Re	eading.
*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition  Describe plans for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary schapplicable.  At Suwannee Primary School, all incoming kindergarten students are assessed prior to or upon entering kinderg to ascertain individual and group needs and to assist in instructional/intervention programs. All students are as area of letter knowledge, numbers to 10, counting objects, basic colors and shapes. Data is used to plan for ins FAIR, FLKRS and/or ThinkGate is completed. Kindergarten academic and behavioral instruction will include daily einstruction, modeling, guided practice, and independent practice.	garten in order ssessed in the struction until
Grades 6-12 Only	
Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.	
For schools with Grades 6-12, describe the plan to ensure that teaching reading strategies is the responsibility o	of every teacher.
High Schools Only	
Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1003.413(g)(j) F.S.	
How does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between relevance to their future?	ı subjects and
How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course sel	lections, so that

students course	e of study is personally	meaningrui?			
Postsecondar	y Transition				
Note: Required f	or High School - Sec. 1	008.37(4), F.S.			
Describe strateg Feedback Repor	, ,	ent readiness for the p	ublic postsecondary leve	el based on annual analysis	of the <u>High Schoo</u>

### PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

### Reading Goals

* When using percentages, include the number of students the percentage represents (e.g., 70% (35)).
Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need
of improvement for the following group:

Based on the analysis of of improvement for the fo		data, and refere	nce to "G	Guiding Questions", ident	ify and define areas in need
1a. FCAT2.0: Students sreading.	scoring at Achieven	nent Level 3 in			
Reading Goal #1a:					
2012 Current Level of P	Performance:	2	2013 Exp	pected Level of Perforn	nance:
	Problem-Solvir	ng Process to In	crease S	itudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person Position Respon for Monito	on Insible	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data Si	ubmitted		
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the formula. The Florida Alternate As Students scoring at Lev Reading Goal #1b:	ssessment:		nce to "G	Guiding Questions", ident	ify and define areas in need
2012 Current Level of P	Performance:	2	2013 Εχρ	pected Level of Perforn	nance:
	Problem-Solvir	ng Process to In	crease S	Student Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person Position Respons for Monito	on Insible	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data Si	ubmitted		
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the fo		data, and refere	nce to "G	Guiding Questions", ident	ify and define areas in need
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students Level 4 in reading.	scoring at or above	e Achievement			
Reading Goal #2a:					

		Proble	em-Solving Process	s to I	ncrease St	udent	Achievement			
Antio	cipated Barrier	Strategy		for		Dete	ess Used to rmine tiveness of egy	Evalı	uation Tool	
			No	Data (	Submitted					
Based	d on the analysis of s	student ach	nievement data, and	refer	ence to "Gu	uidina	Ouestions", identify	and d	efine areas in need	
of im	provement for the fol	llowing gro	up:	10101		aran ig				
	lorida Alternate As ents scoring at or a ng.			n						
Read	ing Goal #2b:									
2012	Current Level of P	erformand	ce:		2013 Exp	ected	Level of Performa	nce:		
		Disabile	on Calida Dunasa	- 4- 1			. A alaise sa ann ann a			
		Proble	em-Solving Process	5 10 1	ncrease st	uaeni	. Acnievement			
Antio	cipated Barrier	Strategy		for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of		Evalu	Evaluation Tool	
			No	Data S	Submitted					
	d on the analysis of sorovement for the following			refer	ence to "Gu	uiding	Questions", identify	and d	lefine areas in need	
gains	CAT 2.0: Percentag s in reading. ing Goal #3a:	ge of stude	ents making learnir	ng	1. 86% of students in Kindergarten and 1st grade will score proficient on the district's final Thinkgate reading assessment.  2. 86% of full-year only students in K-1 will achieve proficiency (green) on the Florida Assessment for Instruction					
					in Reading (FAIR).					
2012	Current Level of P	erformand	ce:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:					
Waitir	ng on data						t grade students wi ate assessment.	ll scor	e proficient on the	
		Proble	em-Solving Process	s to I	ncrease St	udent	Achievement			
	Anticipated Barr	ier	Strategy	1	son or Pos esponsible Monitorinç	for	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy		Evaluation Tool	
			nterrupted 90 minute ng block utilizing all							

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

	school staff	
	•Utilize para-pros to	
	work with small groups	1
	•Specific skills groups	
	based on Targeted	
	Diagnostic Inventory	1
	(TDI) from the FAIR test	1
	•Built in Spiral Review	1
	windows to re-teach	1
	content that students	
	are not mastering	
	•RtI data meetings with	
	Principal, AP, Reading	
	Coach monthly to assist	
	with students not making	
1	progress academically,	
	behaviorally	
	•Student Support Team	1
	(SST) meetings with	1
	Guidance Counselor,	
	Psychologist,	
	Administration, Reading	
	Coach and Parent (if	
	needed) to assist	
	teachers with students	
	struggling academically	
	and behaviorally	
	•Widening the Circle	1
	Teams to teach and give	
	additional support to	
	special education	
	Istudents	
		┙

Based on the analysis of s of improvement for the fol	tudent achievement data, lowing group:	and refere	ence to "Gu	uiding Questions", identify	and define areas in need
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving Pro	ocess to Li	ncrease St	udent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data S	Submitted		

erence to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need
Decrease the percentage of kindergarten students in lower quartile on the FAIR assessment by 10%. Decrease the percentage of 1st grade students in the lower quartile on the FAIR assessment by 10%.
2013 Expected Level of Performance:

On the Spring 2011 FAIR assessment, ...% of kindergarten students were in lower quartile and ..% of 1st grade students students will be in the lower quartile and ...% of 1st grade in lower quartile.

On the Spring 2012 Fair Assessment ...% of kindergarten students will be in the lower quartile.

Problem-	Solvina	Process	tο	Increase	Student	Achievement
FIODICITI-	Surving	F100033	ιO	THU Case	Student	Acinevenient

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	82% Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Lack of parent involvement Poor attendance	*Uninterrupted 90 minute reading block utilizing all school staff. *Para support to assist in small groups *Specific skills groups based on TDI from FAIR. *Monthly RtI data meetings with Principal, AP, Reading Coach. *Student Support Team (SST)meetings	Principal/AP/Academic Coach	School/District/State Assessments	FAIR/ThinkGate/ STAR

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

			Reading Goal	#					
5A. Ambitious Measurable Obschool will red by 50%.	jectives (AMO	s). In six year	5A :						<u>~</u>
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-20	)14	201	4-2015	2015-2016		2016-2017
		dent achieveme ving subgroup:	ent data, and	refere	ence to "Gi	uiding Ques	tions", identify a	and defin	ne areas in need
Hispanic, Asia	5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.								
Reading Goal	#5B:								
2012 Current	Level of Perf	formance:			2013 Exp	ected Leve	el of Performan	ce:	
		Problem-Sol	ving Process	s to I r	ncrease S <sup>.</sup>	tudent Ach	ievement		
Anticipated E	3arrier St	trategy		Perso Positi Respo for Monit	on onsible	Process L Determin Effective Strategy	е	Evaluati	ion Tool
			No	Data S	Submitted				

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.

2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solving	Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or ion onsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
		No Data	Submitted			
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the fo		ata, and refer	ence to "G	uiding Questions", identif	y and define areas in nee	
5D. Students with Disa satisfactory progress i	bilities (SWD) not mak	king				
Reading Goal #5D:						
2012 Current Level of F	Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solving	Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or ion onsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
		No Data	Submitted			
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the fo		ata, and refer	ence to "G	uiding Questions", identif	y and define areas in nee	
5E. Economically Disac satisfactory progress i		ot making				
Reading Goal #5E:						
2012 Current Level of F	Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perform	ance:	
	Problem-Solving	Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement		
		Perso		Process Used to		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for	tion onsible toring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

Reading Goal #5C:

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

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

### Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Prograr	m(s)/Material(s)		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Developme	ent		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Reading Goals

### Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.

CELLA Goal #1:

No Data Submitted  No Data Submitted  No Data Submitted  Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.  2. Students scoring proficient in reading.  CELLA Goal #2:  2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:  Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  Person or Position Responsible friedtly energy of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.  3. Students scoring proficient in writing.  CELLA Goal #3:  2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:  Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring  Person or Position Responsibl	2012 Current Percent	of Students Proficient in I	istening/speak	ing:	
Anticipated Barrier  Strategy  Responsible for Monitoring  No Data Submitted  Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.  2. Students scoring proficient in reading.  CELLA Goal #2:  Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  Person or Position Responsible for Strategy  No Data Submitted  Person or Position Responsible For Strategy  No Data Submitted  Person or Position Responsible For Strategy  No Data Submitted  Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.  3. Students scoring proficient in writing.  CELLA Goal #3:  Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  Problem-Solving Process Student Achievement					
Anticipated Barrier  Strategy  Responsible for Monitoring  No Data Submitted  No Data Submitted  No Data Submitted  Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.  2. Students scoring proficient in reading.  CELLA Goal #2:  Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  Person or Position Responsible frectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  No Data Submitted  Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.  3. Students scoring proficient in writing.  CELLA Goal #3:  2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:  Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Process Used to Determine Strategy  Person or Position Responsible For Forces Student Achievement  Process Used to Determine Strategy		Problem-Solving Proces	ss to Increase S	Student Achievement	
Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.  2. Students scoring proficient in reading.  CELLA Goal #2:  2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:  Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  Anticipated Barrier  Strategy  Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring  No Data Submitted  Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.  3. Students scoring proficient in writing.  CELLA Goal #3:  2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:  Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring  Process Used to Determine English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.  3. Students scoring proficient in writing:  Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  Anticipated Barrier  Strategy  Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Evaluation Total Control of Strategy  Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Evaluation Total Control of Strategy  Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Evaluation Total Control of Strategy	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for	Determine Effectiveness of	Evaluation Tool
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.  CELLA Goal #2:  2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:  Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring  No Data Submitted  Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.  3. Students scoring proficient in writing.  CELLA Goal #3:  2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:  Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring  Person or Position Responsible for Students Proficient in Writing:  Person or Position Responsible for Strategy  Person or Position Responsible for Strategy  Person or Position Responsible for Strategy  Evaluation Total Control of Strategy  Evaluat		No	'	'	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring  No Data Submitted  Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.  3. Students scoring proficient in writing.  CELLA Goal #3:  Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  Process Used to Determine Students.  Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Evaluation Tocks Strategy  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Students read in English	n at grade level text in a mai	nner similar to no	on-ELL students.	
Anticipated Barrier  Strategy  Responsible for Monitoring  No Data Submitted  Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.  3. Students scoring proficient in writing.  CELLA Goal #3:  2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:  Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Evaluation Total Control of Students Proficient in Writing:  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Evaluation Total Control of Strategy  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Evaluation Total Control of Strategy  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Evaluation Total Control of Strategy  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Evaluation Total Control of Strategy  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy		roficient in reading.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring No Data Submitted  No Data Submitted  Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.  3. Students scoring proficient in writing.  CELLA Goal #3:  2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:  Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  Prosition Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Evaluation Total Strategy  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Evaluation Total Strategy  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy		J			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring No Data Submitted  No Data Submitted  Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.  3. Students scoring proficient in writing.  CELLA Goal #3:  2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:  Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  Prosition Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Evaluation Total Strategy  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Evaluation Total Strategy  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy					
Anticipated Barrier  Strategy  Responsible for Monitoring  No Data Submitted  Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.  3. Students scoring proficient in writing.  CELLA Goal #3:  2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:  Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Evaluation Total Control of Students Proficient in Writing:  Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Evaluation Total Control of Strategy  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Evaluation Total Control of Strategy	2012 Current Percent	of Students Proficient in r	eading:		
Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.  3. Students scoring proficient in writing.  CELLA Goal #3:  2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:  Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  Anticipated Barrier  Strategy  Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Evaluation Too Strategy	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for	Determine Effectiveness of	Evaluation Tool
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.  CELLA Goal #3:  2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:  Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  Anticipated Barrier  Strategy  Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Evaluation Total		No	Data Submitted		
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.  CELLA Goal #3:  2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:  Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  Anticipated Barrier  Strategy  Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Evaluation Total	Students write in Englis	h at grade level in a manner	similar to non-E	LL students.	
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:  Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring  Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Evaluation Too					
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement  Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring  Person or Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy  Evaluation Too Strategy					
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy Evaluation Too	2012 Current Percent	of Students Proficient in v	vriting:		
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy Evaluation Too					
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Position Responsible for Monitoring Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy		Problem-Solving Proces	ss to Increase S	Student Achievement	
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for	Determine Effectiveness of	Evaluation Tool
No Data Shbuilted		No	Data Submitted	ı	1

### CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

### **Elementary School Mathematics Goals**

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Strategy Responsible Anticipated Barrier **Evaluation Tool** Effectiveness of for Strategy Monitoring No Data Submitted Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Responsible **Evaluation Tool** Anticipated Barrier Strategy Effectiveness of Strategy Monitoring No Data Submitted Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

Based on the analysis of soft improvement for the fol	student achievement data, and Ilowing group:	d refere	ence to "Gu	uiding Questions", identify	and define areas in need
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #2b:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Exp	ected Level of Performa	nce:
	Problem-Solving Proces	s to Ir	ncrease St	udent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	No Data Submitted				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:						
gain	CAT 2.0: Percentage of s in mathematics.  Dematics Goal #3a:	students making learnir	86% of students in Kindergarten and 1st grade will score proficient on the district's final Thinkgate math assessment.			
2012	Current Level of Perfor	2013 Expected	Level of Performance:			
waitii	ng on data		86% of students in Kindergarten and 1st grade will score proficient on the district's final Thinkgate math assessment.			
	F	Problem-Solving Process	s to I	ncrease Student	Achievement	
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		•Utilize focus maps and teach Next Generation SSS deeply •Implement new math series, Math Connects •Quarterly benchmark	Principal/AP/Academi Coach/MathCoach			

assessment windows to	
re-teach content that	
students are not	
mastering	
<ul> <li>Specific skills groups</li> </ul>	
based on initial	
Thinkgate Math	
Assessment	
•Impact Math for hands-	
on exploration and	
discovery	
•RtI data meetings	
monthly to discuss	
students not making	
progress	
•SST meetings monthly	
to assist teachers with	
students struggling	
academically and	
behaviorally	
•Widening the Circle	
Teams to teach and give	
additional support to	
special education	
students	

ta, and refere	ence to "Gi	uiding Questions", ident	ify and define areas in
s in			
	2013 Ехр	ected Level of Perforn	mance:
Process to I	ncrease S <sup>r</sup>	tudent Achievement	
Positi Respo	ion onsible	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data S	Submitted		
ta, and refere	ence to "G	uiding Questions", ident	ify and define areas in
t 25%			
t	Perso Posit Resp for Monit No Data S	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring No Data Submitted  a, and reference to "G	Position Responsible for Monitoring  No Data Submitted  A, and reference to "Guiding Questions", ident

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #4:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
Problem-Solving Process to	Increase Student Achievement				

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Responsible	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
No Data Submitted					

Based on Ambitious but A	Achievable Annual Measur	able Objectiv	es (AMOs	s), AMO-2, F	Reading and Ma	th Performance Target
5A. Ambitious but Achiev Measurable Objectives (A school will reduce their a by 50%.	able Annual MOs). In six year	ntary School	Mathemat	tics Goal #		<u></u>
Baseline data 2010-2011	12 2012-2013 20	)13-2014	2014	4-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the fo	student achievement data ollowing subgroup:	a, and refere	nce to "Gi	uiding Ques	tions", identify	and define areas in nee
5B. Student subgroups Hispanic, Asian, Americ satisfactory progress ii		ack,				
Mathematics Goal #5B:	:					
2012 Current Level of F	Performance:	2	2013 Exp	ected Leve	el of Performar	nce:
	Problem-Solving Pr	rocess to Inc	crease St	tudent Ach	lievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Persor Position Respor for Monito	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of		е	Evaluation Tool
		No Data Su	ubmitted			
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the fo	student achievement data bllowing subgroup:	a, and refere	nce to "Gi	uiding Ques	tions", identify	and define areas in nee
5C. English Language L satisfactory progress i	earners (ELL) not makii n mathematics.	ng				
Mathematics Goal #5C:	:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Exp	ected Leve	el of Performar	nce:

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data S	Submitted		
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the fo	student achievement data, allowing subgroup:	and refer	ence to "G	uiding Questions", identi	fy and define areas in need
5D. Students with Disal satisfactory progress i	oilities (SWD) not making n mathematics.				
Mathematics Goal #5D					
2012 Current Level of F	Performance:		2013 Exp	ected Level of Perform	nance:
	Problem-Solving Prod	cess to l	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data S	Submitted		
Based on the analysis of of improvement for the fo	student achievement data, abllowing subgroup:	and refer	ence to "G	uiding Questions", identi	fy and define areas in need
E. Economically Disadv satisfactory progress i	antaged students not mal	king			
Mathematics Goal E:					
2012 Current Level of F	Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving Prod	cess to L	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	for		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

No Data Submitted

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

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

### Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Progra	diri(s)/iviaterial(s)		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Developm	nent		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Mathematics Goals

## Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

When us	ing percenta	ges, include	the number	of students	s the percent	tage represents	s (e.g.,	70% (	35))	
---------	--------------	--------------	------------	-------------	---------------	-----------------	----------	-------	------	--

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:				
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:						
1b. Florida Alternate	Assessment:					
Students scoring at L	evels 4, 5, and 6 in scienc	ce.				
Science Goal #1b:						
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
	Problem-Solving Process	s to I	ncrease S	Student Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
	No	Data S	Submitted		_	

Based on the analysis areas in need of improv			d reference	e to "Guiding Questio	ns", identify and define
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.					
Science Goal #2a:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving	g Process to I	ncrease S	Student Achieveme	nt
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Res for	son or tion ponsible itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data	Submitted		

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment:

Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science.

Science Goal #2b:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posi Resp for	on or tion oonsible itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted					

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

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

### Science Budget:

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
	•		Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Developme	nt		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

### Writing Goals

Anticipated Barrier

Strategy

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

Based on the analysis of in need of improvement			eference to	o "Guiding Questions"	, identify and define areas
1a. FCAT 2.0: Student 3.0 and higher in writi	_	ement Level			
Writing Goal #1a:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Exp	pected Level of Perfo	ormance:
	Problem-Solving	Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievemen	t
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or tion oonsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
		No Data	Submitted		
Based on the analysis of in need of improvement			eference to	o "Guiding Questions"	, identify and define areas
1b. Florida Alternate A at 4 or higher in writin		nts scoring			
Writing Goal #1b:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	Problem-Solving	Process to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievemen	t

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

Person or

Responsible

Monitoring

No Data Submitted

Position

Process Used to

Effectiveness of Strategy **Evaluation Tool** 

Determine

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

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

### Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

### Attendance Goal(s)

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference of improvement:	to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need
1. Attendance	
Attendance Goal #1:	
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)

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

	Pro	blem-Solving Process t	o Increase Stude	nt Achievement	
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of parent interest/involvement in school.	Educate parents to the importance of school and understanding of compulsory attendance law.  Include parents in school activities, encourage attendance.  Follow the truancy flow chart with fidelity.  Parent conferences/attendance meetings with implementation of interventions.  Utilization of district truancy officer.  Implementation of the 30, 90 day attendance rule.	Principal, Ast. Principal. Guidance Counselor	Track attendance weekly.	Final school attendance rate, monthly attendance report of absences and tardies

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

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

### Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Progr	am(s)/Material(s)		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
		•	Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00

Professional Developmer	nt		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
	•		Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Attendance Goal(s)

## Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to fimprovement:	o "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need			
1. Suspension				
Suspension Goal #1:				
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In- School			
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School			
Problem-Solving Process to I	ncrease Student Achievement			
for	Drocass Head to			
No Data Submitted				

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
		N	lo Data Submitted	d		

#### Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

### Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:				
1. Parent Involvement				
Parent Involvement Goal #1:				
*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.				
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:			

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

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
		Ν	lo Data Submitted	d		

### Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. STEM					
STEM Goal #1:					
	Problem-Solvin	g Process to Incre	ease Student Ach	ievement	
Anticipated Barrier Strategy Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy					
No Data Submitted					

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
		Ŋ	No Data Submitted	d		

### STEM Budget:

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

### Additional Goal(s)

### K-1 Reading Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1. K-1 Reading Goal	70% of students in Grade K and 1st grade will score				
K-1 Reading Goal #1:	proficient in reading on the district assessment.				
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:				
Kindergarten 28% 1st grade 27%	Kindergarten 70% 1st grade 70%				

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of additional support for struggling students	*Uninterrupted 90 minute reading block utilizing all school staff *Utilize para-pros to work with small groups *Specific skills groups based on Targeted Diagnostic Inventory (TDI) from the FAIR test *Built in Spiral Review windows to re-teach content that students are not mastering *Rtl data meetings with Principal, AP, Reading Coach monthly to assist with students not making progress academically, behaviorally. *Student Support Team (SST) meetings with Guidance Counselor, Psychologist, Administration, Reading Coach and Parent (if needed) to assist teachers with students struggling academically and behaviorally. *Widening the Circle Teams to teach and give additional support to special education students *Individual Data chats with teachers to look at individual student data.		Monthly data meetings, Classroom Walk-through	District Assessment

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 Learning Communities	K/1	Common Core Teacher Leaders District Academic Coach Reading Coach	PLC	magtings monthly	Lesson Plans Classroom Walkthroughs	Administration
ii vs. iii Reading intervention training	K/1	Gwen Vann, Instructional Specialist	grade level	October 2012	Classroom Walkthroughs, Lesson Plans	Administration

### Budget:

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

End of K-1 Reading Goal(s)

### K-1 Reading Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
The number of Kindergarten and 1st grade students scoring below proficient in reading will be reduced by 10%.					
2013 Expected level:					

Kindergarten 73 students (18.5% of 390) 1st grade 21 students (6.1% of 352) Kindergarten 66 students 1st grade 19 students

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of support for struggling students	Uninterrupted 90 minute reading block utilizing all school staff     Utilize para-pros to work with small groups     Specific skills groups based on Targeted Diagnostic Inventory (TDI) from the FAIR test     Built in Spiral Review windows to re-teach content that students are not mastering     RtI data meetings with Principal, AP, Reading Coach monthly to assist with students not making progress academically, behaviorally     Student Support Team (SST) meetings with Guidance Counselor, Psychologist, Administration, Reading Coach and Parent (if needed) to assist teachers with students struggling academically and behaviorally     Widening the Circle Teams to teach and give additional support to special education students		Monthly data meetings, Classroom Walk- through, Skills groups	assessment data skills groups intervention plans

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

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

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

Budget:

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

End of K-1 Reading Goal(s)

### K-1 Math Goal Goal:

	ed on the analysis of stu- eed of improvement for t	ident achievement data, the following group:	and	reference to "Gui	aing Questions, identif	y and define areas	
1. K-1 Math Goal Goal			math on the dis	arten students will score	•		
K-1	Math Goal Goal #1:			on the district a	de students will score p ssessment.	roncient in math	
201	2 Current level:			2013 Expected	level:		
Kindergarten 32% 1st grade 11%				Kindergarten 80% 1st grade 78%			
	Pr	oblem-Solving Proces	s to I	ncrease Studen	t Achievement		
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Too	
1	Lack of additional support for struggling students	•60 minute math block •Utilize para-pros to work with small groups •RtI data meetings with Principal, AP, Reading Coach monthly to assist with students not making progress academically, behaviorally •Student Support Team (SST) meetings with Guidance Counselor, Psychologist, Administration, Academic Coach and Parent (if needed) to assist teachers with students struggling academically and	Coac	ipal/AP/Academic h/MathCoach	Monthly data meetings, Classroom Walk-through	ThinkGate Assessments	

behaviorally  •Widening the Circle Teams to teach and give additional support to special education	
students	

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

PD Content / and/or   Focus	PLĊ	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 Learning Communitie	es	K/1	CCSS Teacher Leaders  District Math Coach  Instructional Specialist	PLC	Early Release monthly meetings	Lesson Plans CWT	Administraiton
Accelerated Math Traini		1st	AM Teacher Leaders District Math Coach	grade level	September 2012, ongoing	AM reports	Administration
ThinkGate Assessmen Data Review	-	K/1st	District Math Coach	grade level	February 2013	Assessment data reports	Administration

### Budget:

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

End of K-1 Math Goal Goal(s)

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, in need of improvement for the following group:	and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas	
1. K-1 Math Goal Goal K-1 Math Goal Goal #1:	The number of Kindergarten and 1st grade students scoring below proficient in math will be reduced by 10%.	
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:	
Kindergarten 35 students (8.8% of 395) 1st grade 34 students (9.6% of 352)	Kindergarten 31 students 1st grade 31 students	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement		

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of additional support for struggling students	•60 minute math block •Utilize para-pros to work with small groups *Benchmark assessments each 9 weeks with built in Spiral Review windows to re-teach content that students are not mastering •Rtl data meetings with Principal, AP, Reading Coach monthly to assist with students not making progress academically, behaviorally •Student Support Team (SST) meetings with Guidance Counselor, Psychologist, Administration, Academic Coach and Parent (if needed) to assist teachers with students struggling academically •Widening the Circle Teams to teach and give additional support to special education students	Coach/MathCoach	Monthly data meetings, Classroom Walk-through	Benchmark Assessments ThinkGate Assessments

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
		ľ	No Data Submitted	d		

### Budget:

Evidence-based Progr	am(s)/Material(s)		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.0
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.0
Professional Developn	nent		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.0
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.0
			Grand Total: \$0.0

End of K-1 Math Goal Goal(s)

### FINAL BUDGET

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

### Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: † Yes † No

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

No Attachment

### School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
	\$0.00

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

The School Advisory Council will review student growth data and make decisions on an as needed basis throughout the school year.

### AYP DATA

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

### SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found No Data Found No Data Found