

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

School Name: LAWTON M. CHILES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Alachua

Principal: Judy Black

SAC Chair: Rochelle Warm

Superintendent: Dan Boyd

Date of School Board Approval: 10/2012

Last Modified on: 11/13/2012

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)
					Lawton Chiles Elementary 2011-2012 Grade A 3rd grade Math 64% students scored level 3 or higher Reading 63% students scored level 3 or higher 4th grade Math 74% students scored level 3 or higher Reading 75% students scored level 3 or higher 5th grade Math 61% students scored level 3 or higher Reading 70% students scored level 3 or higher 2010-2011 Grade B, Reading Mastery 89%, Math

Principal	Judy Black	BA- Elementary Florida International University Master of Science – Educational Leadership, Nova Southeastern University; Principal Certification- State of Florida	6	8	Mastery 88%, Science Mastery 74%, Writing Mastery 97%, AYP 90% Black did not make AYP in reading and math, Economically Disadvantaged did not make gains in reading and math. 2009-2010 Grade A, Reading Mastery 89%, Math Mastery 90%, Science mastery 68% Writing Master 88% AYP 100% 2008-09 Grade A, Reading Mastery 86%, Math mastery 85% Science mastery 61%, Writing mastery 96%. AYP: 97% Black did not make AYP in reading 2007-08 Grade B, Reading Mastery 84%, Math mastery 82%, Science mastery 66% , Writing mastery 96%. AYP 85% Black, FRPL, and SWD did not make AYP in reading and math. 2006-07 Grade A Reading mastery 90%, Math mastery 89%, Science mastery 69%, Writing mastery 96%. AYP 97% black did not make AYP in reading. Principal at Prairie View Academy 2005-06 Grade C Reading mastery 60%, Math mastery 47%, Writing mastery 87%. AYP 97% FRPL did not make gains in reading 2004-05 Grade D, Reading mastery 52%, Math mastery 42%, Writing mastery 83%, AYP 87% Black & FRPL did not make gains in math
-----------	------------	---	---	---	--

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

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)
No data submitted				

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	Regular meetings of new teachers with principal	Principal	May 2013	
2	Partner new teachers with veteran staff	CRT	May 2013	
3	Meet with Teams, including new teachers discuss RTI	Principal, CRT, FCIMS, Title I Teachers	May 2013	
4	Solicit site-based interns	Principal, teacher mentors	May 2013	
5				

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

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

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number 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
50	4.0%(2)	26.0%(13)	28.0%(14)	46.0%(23)	58.0%(29)	100.0%(50)	12.0%(6)	8.0%(4)	26.0%(13)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

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

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Amber Purser	Jolene Ross Aunna Kilgore	District works with all beginning teachers. They spend time in the classrooms and meeting with the teachers after school. They also hold meetings that include all beginning teachers throughout the District.	Observations & Meetings

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Services are provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through additional instructional in reading for grades K-5. FCIM Coordinator overseeing disaggregation and interpretation of school-wide, grade-level, and classroom data to determine strengths and weaknesses.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

District provides Chiles with technology, reading coach, engagement coach and math coach.

Title III

Title X- Homeless

District Homeless Coordinator provides resources (clothing, school supplies, social services referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Positive Behavior Support program implemented 2010-2011.

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

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.

Guidance Counselor, Principal, Assistant Principal, Curriculum Resource Teacher, Title I, FCIMS Facilitator, Teachers, ESE 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?

Meet weekly to discuss students, disaggregate and interpret data, provide support for high quality instruction/interventions matched to meet the student needs, monitor progress to make important educational decisions.

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?

At each grade level meeting, the team will look at students, their needs will be discussed, changes in curriculum and support staff provided.

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.

RtI data will be based on series of assessments identified at the district level and administered at the school. Items for the assessments are taken from the MacMillian Benchmark Assessments, the Big Idea math series, the district formative assessment program for math and science, and writing prompts developed for district use. FAIR assessments are also taken into consideration for reading results. Data at the beginning of the year will be captured and presented through the district's student information system. Toward the end of the year, the data presentation will be migrated into the district's Local Instructional Information System.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

District and school staff will work with the faculty to train for RtI. The FCIMS facilitator and guidance counselor have created a procedure for the staff to use in the RTI process.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Black, J., Principal, Booth, S., CRT, Mullinax, M., FCIMS Facilitator, Reszczenski, C., Media Specialist, Stobbie, K. Kdg. Team, Simonds, R., 1st Gr.Team, Leon, M., 2nd Gr.Team, Thompson, J., 3rd Gr.Team, Lapcevic, T. 4th Gr.Team, Blackwood, B. 5th Gr.Team

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

The Literacy Leadership Team meets every other month to discuss concerns brought to them by their teams. We address how reading is being taught, curriculum being used and changes that need to be implemented.

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

Providing literature books for our above level readers at each grade level. Providing students in above level groups with literature circles in grades kindergarten through three.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

Chiles kindergarten students begin school with a staggered start.

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the [High School Feedback Report](#)

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	Increase percentage of students performing at level 3 on FCAT 2.0 reading 2012-2013
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 3-5, 18% (60) of students scored a Level 3 on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	20% of students in grades 3-5 will score a Level 3 in reading on 2013 FCAT 2.0.

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	Providing additional tutoring time for lowest quartile in math and/or reading	Title I services will be provided in math and/or reading for grades 3, 4, & 5 students.	Title I teachers, Principal, CRT, FCIMS	Formative evaluations, Use of Go Math Program Materials & Assessment Unit Tests Reading	Ontrack Assessment 3x yearly, Big Idea Assessment, Go Math Program Assessment, Reading Tests
2	Attendance, tardies, early check out from school, class size requirements	Monitor attendance, tardies and early checkout	Principal, Assistant Principal, Data Base Manager	Attendance, tardy reports	Attendance, tardy reports
3	Students having difficulty with comprehension	Small groups within reading block, Title I tutoring outside of reading block for grades 1-2, Use of direct instruction reading and language programs to supplement the core reading program.	Principal Asst. Principal CRT FCIMS Title I Teachers Classroom Teachers	Review data (FAIR, FCAT, Benchmark tests, classroom observations)	FAIR District Benchmark Tests 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Scores Title I Assessments Classroom Progress Progress Monitoring

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	Increase percentage of students performing at level 4 and 5 on FCAT 2.0 reading 2012-2013
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
53% (172) of students in grades 3-5 scored at Levels 4 and 5 on 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading.	55% of students in grades 3-5 will score at Levels 4 and 5 on 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading.

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	Class size requirements	Students are grouped by ability for reading instruction	Principal, CRT, classroom teachers	Reading Assessments	FCAT Reading 2.0 2013
2	Because of class size requirements, we have had to heterogenously group students by number as opposed to instructional level. This practice has now limited the scope of the use of above level intructional practices.	Students will be grouped by instructional groups in reading enabling our most capable reading students to receive 90 minutes of reading instruction above grade level through the use of above leveling in the Core Reading program and through the use of literature. This Literature Level will incorporate the use of higher order thinking skills, and reading comprehension skills and strategies appropriate for above level readers.	Principal, Assistant Principal, CRT, FCIMS Facilitator, Classroom Teachers	FAIR PRS and FSP, FAIR Reading Comprehension scores, and District Reading Benchmark Test data will be used to monitor students' progress in using higher order thinking skills and comprehension skills and strategies.	2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading

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 reading. Reading Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	Increase percentage of students making learning gains on FCAT 2.0 reading 2012-2013
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71% of the students made learning gains on the 2011 FCAT in reading.	FCAT 2.0 Reading 2013, 75% of students in grades 3-5 will make Learning Gains in Reading.

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	Attendance	Teachers making contact with parents after 5 absences and referring names to assistant principal for follow up.	Principal, Teacher, Guidance Counselor	Review daily attendance reports	Attendance reports
2	Poor comprehension due to low background knowledge.	Follow the IFC and District Pacing guide and Reading Assessment schedule. Provide Title I tutoring to students in addition to their core reading program. Use of Smartboards to access sites to build background knowledge. Use of Literacy Workstations in Grades K-2.	Principal CRT FCIMS Title I Teachers Classroom Teachers	Review FAIR, District Benchmark Tests, 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Scores, Title I Assessments, Classroom Progress, Progress Monitoring	FAIR District Benchmark Tests 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Scores Title I Assessments Classroom Progress Progress Monitoring
3	Increase use of Kagan & CRISS Strategies	Train teachers on Kagan & CRISS strategies	Principal, CRT, FCIMS, Classroom teachers	Review FAIR, District Benchmark Tests, 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Scores, Title I Assessments, Classroom Progress, Progress Monitoring	Review FAIR, District Benchmark Tests, 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Scores, Title I Assessments, Classroom Progress, Progress Monitoring
4	Poor comprehension due to low background knowledge.	Follow the IFC and District Pacing guide and Reading Assessment schedule. Provide Title I tutoring to students in addition to their core reading program. Use of Smartboards to access sites to build background knowledge. Use of Literacy	Principal Asst. Principal CRT FCIMS Title I Teachers Classroom Teachers	Review FAIR, District Benchmark Tests, 2012 FCAT Reading Scores, Title I Assessments, Classroom Progress, Progress Monitoring	FAIR District Benchmark Tests 2012 FCAT Reading Scores Title I Assessments Classroom Progress Progress Monitoring

		Workstations in Grades K-2.			
5	Increase use of Kagan & CRISS Strategies	Train teachers on Kagan & CRISS strategies	Principal, CRT, FCIMS, Classroom teachers	Review FAIR, District Benchmark Tests, 2012 FCAT Reading Scores, Title I Assessments, Classroom Progress, Progress Monitoring	Review FAIR, District Benchmark Tests, 2012 FCAT Reading Scores, Title I Assessments, Classroom Progress, Progress Monitoring

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	Increase percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains on FCAT 2.0 reading 2012-2013
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
57%(26) of students in the Lowest 25% made gains in Reading on the 2012 FCAT 2.0	60% of students in the Lowest 25% will make learning gains in Reading on the 2013 FCAT 2.0

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	Attendance, early checkout & Tardies	Follow District and school policy for attendance.	Principal, Data Base Manager	Monitor tardies, early checkout and attendances	Attendance, tardy, early checkout reports
	Poor comprehension due to low background knowledge	Follow the IFC and District Pacing guide and Reading Assessment schedule. Provide Title I tutoring to	Principal CRT FCIMS Title I Teachers Classroom	Review FAIR, District Benchmark Tests, 2012 FCAT 2.0 Math & Reading Scores,	FAIR District Benchmark Tests 2013 FCAT 2.0 Math & Reading

2		students in addition to their core reading program. Use of Smartboards to access sites to build background knowledge. Use of Literacy Workstations in Grades K-2.	Teachers	Title I Assessments, Classroom Progress, Progress Monitoring	Scores Title I Assessments Classroom Progress Progress Monitoring
3	Attendance, early checkout & Tardies	Follow District and school policy for attendance.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Data Base Manager	Monitor tardies, early checkout and attendances	Attendance, tardy, early checkout reports
4	Poor comprehension due to low background knowledge	Follow the IFC and District Pacing guide and Reading Assessment schedule. Provide Title I tutoring to students in addition to their core reading program. Use of Smartboards to access sites to build background knowledge. Use of Literacy Workstations in Grades K-2	Principal Asst. Principal CRT FCIMS Title I Teachers Classroom Teachers	Review FAIR, District Benchmark Tests, 2012 FCAT Reading Scores, Title I Assessments, Classroom Progress, Progress Monitoring	FAIR District Benchmark Tests 2012 FCAT Reading Scores Title I Assessments Classroom Progress Progress Monitoring
5	Language Deficiency in students in grades K-2	Use Language for Learning and Title I tutoring for qualifying students in addition to core reading program. Use of Literacy Workstations in grades K-2	Title I teachers	Title I Assessments	FAIR & Title I Assessments
6	Lack of parental involvement and home support, ex. Homework not being completed	Parent involvement activities through Title I, frequent contact with parents	Principal Asst. Principal Title I Teachers	Monitor sign-in sheets, FAIR, Benchmark assessments, Title I tests, FCAT	Sign-in sheets, FAIR, Benchmark assessments, Title I tests, FCAT

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Reading Goal # Reduce achievement gap by 50%				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	78	82	84	85	87	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	Increase student achievement on FCAT 2.0 reading in each sub-group
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
5% (1) Asian students did not make satisfactory progress in Reading on 2012 FCAT 2.0 68% (65) Black students did not make satisfactory progress in Reading on 2012 FCAT 2.0 47% (8) Hispanic students did not make satisfactory progress in Reading on 2012 FCAT 2.0 6% (11) White students did not make satisfactory progress in Reading on 2012 FCAT 2.0	100% (1) Asian students will make satisfactory progress in Reading on 2013 FCAT 2.0 70% Black students will make satisfactory progress in Reading on 2013 FCAT 2.0 50% Hispanic students will make satisfactory progress in Reading on 2012 FCAT 2.0012. 97% White students will make satisfactory progress in reading on 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0

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	scheduling training	Increase use of Kagan & CRISS Strategies Train teachers on Kagan & CRISS strategies	Principal, CRT	Increase in student achievement	2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading and Math
2	Behavior	Form Social Groups to discuss ways to work and play together, Lunch with Assistant Principal	Principal, Assisstant Principal, Guidance Counselor	Behavioral Referrals	Behavioral Reports
3	Poor comprehension due to low background knowledge	Follow the IFC and District Pacing guide and Reading Assessment schedule. Provide Title I tutoring to students in addition to their core reading program. Use of Smartboards to access sites to build background knowledge. Use of Literacy Workstations in Grades K-2.	Principal Asst. Principal CRT FCIMS Title I Teachers Classroom Teachers	Review FAIR, District Benchmark Tests, 2012 FCAT Reading Scores, Title I Assessments, Classroom Progress, Progress Monitoring	FAIR District Benchmark Tests 2012 FCAT Reading Scores Title I Assessments Classroom Progress Progress Monitoring

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. Reading Goal #5C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	scheduling ESOL students with ESOL endorsed teachers	documentation of ESOL students with ESOL endorsed teachers Staffing each grade level with ESOL endorsed teachers	Principal	No teachers teaching out of field for ESOL students	

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	Increase percentage of student making satisfactory progress in reading on FCAT 2.0 2012-2013
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71% (29) students did not make satisfactory progress in	35% of students will make satisfactory progress in reading on

reading on FCAT			FCAT 2.0 2012-2013sat		
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	Scheduling	Schedule ESE teachers blocks of 90 minutes for reading and 60 minutes math	Principal	Correct minutes for FTE	

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	Increase the number of students on free/reduced lunch making progress on FCAT 2.0 reading by 10% (grades 3-5)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
61% (77) students on free/reduced lunch did not make satisfactory progress in reading on the FCAT 2.0 2012	Increase the number of students on free/reduced lunch making progress on FCAT 2.0 reading by 10%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Providing additional tutoring time for lowest quartile in math and/or reading	Title I services will be provided in math and/or reading for grades 3, 4, & 5 students.	Title I teachers, Principal, CRT, FCIMS	Formative evaluations, Use of Go Math Program Materials & Assessment Unit Tests Reading	Ontrack Assessment 3x yearly, Big Idea Assessment, Go Math Program Assessment, Reading Tests
2	Poor comprehension due to low background knowledge	Follow the IFC and District Pacing guide and Reading Assessment schedule. Provide Title I tutoring to students in addition to their core reading program. Use of Smartboards to access sites to build background knowledge. Use of Literacy Workstations in Grades K-2	Principal Asst. Principal CRT FCIMS Title I Teachers Classroom Teachers	Review FAIR, District Benchmark Tests, 2012 FCAT Reading Scores, Title I Assessments, Classroom Progress, Progress Monitoring	FAIR District Benchmark Tests 2012 FCAT Reading Scores Title I Assessments Classroom Progress Progress Monitoring
3	Lack of parental involvement and home support	Parent involvement activities through Title I, frequent contact with parents	Principal Asst. Principal Title I Teachers	Monitor sign-in sheets, FAIR, Benchmark assessments, Title I tests, FCAT	Sign-in sheets, FAIR, Benchmark assessments, Title I tests, FCAT

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
Treasures, Triumphs, EIR, Secret Stories, Reading Mastery, Language for Learning, Thinking Basics	K-5	FCIMS, CRT	school-wide	Early Release Dates	Monthly FCIMS/RTI Meetings	FCIMS Facilitator, Title I Lead Teacher, RTI Team
Earobics, Ticket To Read	K-5	FCIMS Facilitator	school-wide	Early Release Dates	FCIMS/RTI Meetings	FCIMS Facilitator, Title I Lead Teacher, RTI Team
Kagan Strategies Training CRISS Strategies Training	K-5	District Facilitator	school-wide	TBA	District Facilitator	Principal, District Facilitator

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Secret Stories	Secret Stories	School Funds	\$250.00
			Subtotal: \$250.00
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
Kagan Strategies Training CRISS Strategies Training		School Funds Title I Funding	\$2,000.00
			Subtotal: \$2,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$2,250.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.

CELLA Goal #1:

N/A

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:

N/A

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				

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	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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

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

CELLA Budget:

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

End of 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:	Increase percentage of students performing at level 3 on the FCAT 2.0 Math 2012-2013
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
18% (58) of students performed at level 3 on the FCAT 2.0 Math 2011-2012	20% of students will perform at level 3 on the FCAT 2.0 Math 2012-2013

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	Providing additional tutoring time for lowest quartile in math and/or reading	Title I services will be provided in math and/or reading for grades 3, 4, & 5 students.	Title I teachers, Principal, CRT, FCIMS	Formative evaluations, Use of Go Math Program Materials & Assessment Unit Tests Reading	Ontrack Assessment 3x yearly, Big Idea Assessment, Go Math Program Assessment, Reading Tests
2	scheduling tutoring	Monitor student progress using On-Track Assessments Students (grades 3-5) scoring 1 or 2 on Fcat and /or below 25% on On-Track in September will be provided additional tutoring	Principal, CRT, grade level teacher	Review On-Track, Unit Assessments, Mini-assessments, and remediation provided through "Go Math" will ensure monitoring of student progress toward mastery	On-Track assessment, "Go Math" assessments
3	attendance	Follow District and school policy for attendance	Principal, Assistant Principal, Data Base Manager	Monitor attendance	Attendance reports

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

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

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

No Data Submitted

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	Increase percentage of students in grades 3-5 scoring at Levels 4 or 5 in Math on 2013 FCAT 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
48% of students in grades 3, 4 and 5 scored at Levels 4 or 5 on the 2011 FCAT 2.0 in Math.	50% of students in grades 3-5 will score at Levels 4 or 5 in Math on 2013 FCAT 2.0.

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	Class size requirements	Instruction in Math/Science grades 4 & 5 is provided for high achieving students through the use of departmentalization in Mathematics. Students staffed in the Gifted program receive math/Science instruction in that setting with adjustments to the District pacing guides and the application of problem solving and higher order thinking strategies.	Principal, classroom teachers, Gifted teachers	District Mathematics Assessments.	FCAT Math 2.0 2013
2	Class size requirements.	Instruction in Math is provided for high achieving students through the use of departmentalization in Mathematics. Students staffed in the Gifted program receive math instruction in that setting with adjustments to the District pacing guides and the application of problem solving and higher order thinking strategies.	Principal, Assistant Principal, classroom teachers, Gifted teachers	District Mathematics Assessments.	FCAT Math 2012.

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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	Increase percentage of students making learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 in Math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
68% (132) of Lawton Chiles students made learning gains on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 in Math.	70% of students are expected to make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 in Math.

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	Pacing guide	Tutor students performing below grade level through Title I and FCAT afterschool tutoring	Principal, grade level teachers, FCIMS Facilitator	Adjusting pace of pacing guides for students requiring remediation and reteach	Big Idea Test and Go Math Program assessment
2	Attendance	Teachers making contact with parents after 5 absences and referring names to assistant principal for follow up.	Principal, Teacher, Guidance Counselor	Review daily attendance reports	Attendance reports

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	55% of Lawton Chiles students are expected to make learning gains on the 2011-2012 FCAT in Math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
60% of students in low 25 made learning gains in Math FCAT 2.0 2011-2012	62% of Lawton Chiles students are expected to make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 in Math.

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	Attendance, early checkout & Tardies	Follow District and school policy for attendance.	Principal, Data Base Manager	Monitor tardies, early checkout and attendances	Attendance, tardy, early checkout reports
2	Poor comprehension due to low background knowledge	Follow the IFC and District Pacing guide and Reading Assessment schedule. Provide Title I tutoring to students in addition to their core reading program. Use of Smartboards to access sites to build background knowledge. Use of Literacy Workstations in Grades K-2.	Principal CRT FCIMS Title I Teachers Classroom Teachers	Review FAIR, District Benchmark Tests, 2012 FCAT 2.0 Math & Reading Scores, Title I Assessments, Classroom Progress, Progress Monitoring	FAIR District Benchmark Tests 2013 FCAT 2.0 Math & Reading Scores Title I Assessments Classroom Progress Progress Monitoring
3	High mobility of students	Monitor progress of incoming students on district math pacing guide	Principal, grade level teachers, FCIMS Facilitator	Review Ontrack Assesments, Big Idea Tests, Go Math Chapter Tests	Ontrack Assesments, Big Idea Tests, Go Math Chapter Testsnit Tests

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Elementary School Mathematics Goal # Reduce achievement gap by 50%					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	71	76	78	81	83	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	Decrease the number of students in subgroups not making satisfactory progress in Math on FCAT 2012-2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

71% (67) Black students did not make satisfactory progress in Mat on 2012 FCAT 2.0 59% (10) Hispanic students did not make satisfactory progress in Math on 2012 FCAT 2.0 13% (22) White students did not make satisfactory progress in Math on 2012 FCAT 2.0	36% Black students will make satisfactory progress in Math on 2013 FCAT 2.0 43% Hispanic students will make satisfactory progress in Math on 2012 FCAT 2.0012. 99% White students will make satisfactory progress in Math on 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0
---	---

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	scheduling training	Increase use of Kagan & CRISS Strategies Train teachers on Kagan & CRISS strategies	Principal, CRT	Increase in student achievement	2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading and Math
2	Scheduling	FCAT afterschool, Title I, additional tutoring during teacher led PE.	Classroom teachers, Title I teachers	Reviewing deficit areas on assessments and planning instruction to address deficits	Ontrack Assessment, Big Idea Assessment, and Go Math Program Assessments

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	scheduling ESOL students with ESOL endorsed teachers	documentation of ESOL students with ESOL endorsed teachers Staffing each grade level with ESOL endorsed teachers	Principal	No teachers teaching out of field for ESOL students	

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	Increase percentage of students with disabilities making satisfactory progress in Math on FCAT 2.0 2012-2013
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71%(29) students with disabilities did not make satisfactory progress in Math on FCAT 2.0 2012-2013	31% of students with disabilities will make satisfactory progress in Math on FCAT 2.0 2012-2013

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	Scheduling	Schedule ESE teachers blocks of 90 minutes for reading and 60 minutes math	Principal	Correct minutes for FTE	
2					

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

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:	Increase percentage of students on free/reduced lunch making satisfactory progress in Math on FCAT 2.0 2012-2013
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67% (85) students on free/reduced lunch did not make satisfactory progress in Math on FCAT 2.0 2011-2012	18% students on free/reduced lunch will make satisfactory progress in Math on FCAT 2.0 2012-2013

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	Providing additional tutoring time for lowest quartile in math and/or reading	Title I services will be provided in math and/or reading for grades 3, 4, & 5 students.	Title I teachers, Principal, CRT, FCIMS	Formative evaluations, Use of Go Math Program Materials & Assessment Unit Tests Reading	Ontrack Assessment 3x yearly, Big Idea Assessment, Go Math Program Assessment, Reading Tests
2	Scheduling	FCAT afterschool, Title I, additional tutoring during teacher led PE.	Classroom teachers, Title I teachers	Reviewing deficit areas on assessments and planning instruction to address deficits	Ontrack Assessment, Big Idea Assessment, and Go Math Program Assessments

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

PD Content /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
Implement Go Math Series District Math	K-5	District Math Supervisor, CRT	K-5 Instructional Staff	Early Release Wednesdays as scheduled	Implementation of Go Math series and all components	Principal,
Kagan Strategies Training CRISS Strategies Training	K-5	District Facilitator	K-5 instructional Staff	TBA	District Facilitator	Principal, District Facilitator

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Kagan Strategies Training CRISS Strategies Training		School Funds Title I Funds	\$1,000.00
			Subtotal: \$1,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$1,000.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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.		Increase percentage of students scoring level 3 in Science on FCAT 2.0 2012-2013			
Science Goal #1a:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
30% (33) of students scored level 3 in Science on FCAT 2.0 2012-2013		36% of students will score level 3 in Science on FCAT 2.0 2012-2013			
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 background knowledge	Implement new science curriculum	Classroom teachers	Monitoring student progress on district On Track assessments and Science Benchmark Tests	On Track assessments, National Geographic Benchmark Tests
2	Class size requirements	Provide differentiated science instruction for enrichment	Principal, Assistant Principal, classroom teachers	District On Track Science Test results and Science Benchmark Tests	2012 FCAT Science

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	Increase percentage of students scoring level 4 or 5 in Science on FCAT 2.0 2012-2013
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
30% (33)of students scored level 4 or 5 in Science on FCAT 2.0 2012-2013	33% of students will score a Levels 4 or 5 in Science on FCAT 2.0 2012-2013.

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	Class size requirements	Instruction in Science is provided for high achieving students through the use of departmentalization in Science. Students staffed in the Gifted program receive science instruction in that setting with adjustments to the District pacing guides and the application of problem solving and scientific thinking strategies.	Principal, CRT, classroom teachers	District OnTrack Science Test results	FCAT 2.0 Science 2012-2013

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

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

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

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

Science Budget:

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

Writing Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	Increase percentage of students scoring level 3 or higher on Florida Writes 2013
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
94% (92) of students scored 3 or higher on the Florida Writes 2012	96% of students will score 3 or higher on the Florida Writes 2013

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	Increased rigor and expectations in scoring rubric for 2012 FCAT Writing	Revision of school-wide Writing Handbook and scoring rubric reflecting new standards and increased expectations in scoring rubric to be developed by staff.	Writing Handbook Revision Committee, CRT	Completion and implementation of revised Writing Handbook.	Revised Writing Handbook
2	Dissemination of revised Lawton Chiles Writing Handbook to new to Chiles students entering after 1st grading period.	Copies of revised handbook will be included in registration materials for students enrolling after 1st 9 weeks of school.	CRT, Database Manager	Question on Parent Survey regarding receipt of writing handbook.	Parent Survey
3	Communication of new writing standards to all parents.	Distribute revised Lawton Chiles Writing Handbooks to each household with the first report card and a meeting with 4th grade parents in October 2011.	4th grade Language Arts teachers, CRT	Documentation of those parents in attendance at FCAT Writing 2012 Parent Workshop and question on Parent Survey regarding receipt of writing handbook.	Parent Survey and Sign in Sheet

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Writing Inservice	K-5	S. Surrency, D. Cooper	School-wide language arts teachers	Upon completion of revisions LC Writing Handbook	Writing prompts scored reflecting new scoring expectations and monitored school-wide 3 times per year	Principal, CRT
LC Writing Handbook Revision Committee	K-5	CRT	Grade Level representative on Handbook Revision Committee and all Language Arts teachers	October 2012	Writing Prompts scored reflecting new scoring expectations and monitored school-wide 3 times per year.	Principal, CRT

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Produce & Copy Writing Handbook		School Funds	\$350.00
			Subtotal: \$350.00
			Grand Total: \$350.00

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:

1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	Improve the daily attendance rate by reducing the number of excessive absences (more than 10 days) 2012- 13.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
83% (560) Students with < 10 days absent 2011-12	85% (524) students with <10 days absent
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
113 students with 10 or more absences in 2011-2012	15% (92) students with > 10 days absences
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
25% (154) students with ten or more tardies	20% (123) students with ten or more tardies

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	Communicating effectively with parents the importance of students attending school every day and arriving to school on time.	Call parents on the student's third unexcused absence or tardy.	Assistant Principal	Weekly monitoring of attendance and tardy reports.	Number of students absent and tardy this school year compared with previous school years.
2	Unpredictable parental support in ensuring that students attend school daily and on time.	Weekly review of students who are absent or tardy on a regular basis.	Assistant Principal, Data base clerk, Truancy Officer.	Monitor school attendance and tardy data IC reports weekly	Progress monitoring of attendance and tardy reports utilizing data comparison of last year data with this year.
3	Parent unaware of number of absences and our goal to have 100% in attendance daily	School-wide attendance banner hung in front of school building. Positive attendance awards every 9 weeks.	AssisantPrincipal	Monitor attendance reports	Number of students absent and tardy this school year compared with previous school years.

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						

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	Decrease the number of students suspended by 1% (7 students) for the 2011-2012 school year.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
0	0
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
0	0
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions

63	57				
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School				
33	26				
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	Fidelity of program implementation of Postive Behavior Support Program	Active involvement with identified group based upon IC report of top 10% of referrals.	Principal, Behavior Resource Teacher	Weekly review of discipline referral data	Reductions of number of suspensions
2	Limited parental support for students with high level of suspensions.	Character Building School-wide Implementation program. Monthly social skill streaming with small groups. STARS program for Individual students that have repeated behavioral referrals.	Faculty, Principal	Monthly PBS meeting with PBS and discipline committee members. Students showing evidence of utilizing positive decision making and coping techniques.	Students exhibiting positive traits on school campus Reduction in suspensions verified for high incident targeted groups Positive impact on attendance evident by using RTI data

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						

Suspension Budget:

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

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

End of 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:		Bullying is a concern of many parents.			
<i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>					
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:		2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:			
59% of the parents at Chiles do not believe bullying is a concern, but 23% don't know and 15% disagree and 3% strongly disagree.		Increase the number of parents who do not see bullying as a concern at Chiles, while decreasing the parents who do not know.			
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	Misinformation, not understanding what bullying is, teasing	Meet with students, as well as parents, to discuss what bullying is and how it is dealt with at Chiles. Publicize bullying data in our Communicator	Behavior Resource Teacher	Increase parents' knowledge of bullying at Chiles	Parent Survey

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						

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:				
1. STEM				
STEM Goal #1:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
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 STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Secret Stories	Secret Stories	School Funds	\$250.00
				Subtotal: \$250.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Kagan Strategies Training CRISS Strategies Training		School Funds Title I Funding	\$2,000.00
Mathematics	Kagan Strategies Training CRISS Strategies Training		School Funds Title I Funds	\$1,000.00
				Subtotal: \$3,000.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Writing	Produce & Copy Writing Handbook		School Funds	\$350.00
				Subtotal: \$350.00
				Grand Total: \$3,600.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prevent	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

Meet regularly throughout the school year, usually every month. Meetings are advertised in the school newsletter to parents, the Communicator, as well as on our school marquee.

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

Alachua School District LAWTON M. CHILES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	89%	88%	97%	74%	348	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	74%	64%			138	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	60% (YES)	47% (NO)			107	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					593	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Alachua School District LAWTON M. CHILES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	89%	90%	88%	68%	335	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	70%	64%			134	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	52% (YES)	60% (YES)			112	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					581	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested