Florida Department of Education



June 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised April 29, 2011

School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: Pasco Elementary	District Name: Pasco
Principal: Katie Lail	Superintendent: Mrs. Heather Fiorentino
SAC Chair: Angela Bennett	Date of School Board Approval:

Student Achievement Data and Reference Materials:

The following links will open in a separate browser window.

School Grades Trend Data (Use this data to complete Sections 1-4 of the reading and mathematics goals and Sections 1 and 2 of the writing and science goals.) Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data (Use this data to inform the problem-solving process when writing goals.) High School Feedback Report K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

Administrators

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ statewide assessment Achievement Levels, learning gains, lowest 25%), and AMO progress, along with the associated school year)
Principal	Katie Lail	BA- Elementary Ed., MA-Education Leadership, MA- Guidance and Counseling, SLD K- 12, Math 6-8, ESOL Certification	1	8	 11-12: School Grade C, High Standards in Reading 44%, Math 44%, Writing 79%, and Science 30%, Learning Gains in Reading 58% and Math 69%, Lowest 25% making Learning Gains in Reading 64% and Math 65% 10-11: School Grade B, AYP: No, High Standards in Reading 72%, Math 65%, Writing 81%, and Science 56%, Learning Gains in Reading 65% and Math 61%, and Lowest 25% making Learning Gains in Reading 45% and Math 60% 09-10: School Grade B, AYP: No, High Standards in Reading 73%, Math 70%, Writing 83%, and Science 51%, Learning Gains in Reading 60% and Math 73%, and Lowest 25% making Learning Gains in Reading 42% and Math 74% 08-09: School Grade A, AYP: Yes, High Standards in Reading 75% and Math 66%, and Lowest 25% making Learning Gains in Reading 75% and Math 66%, and Lowest 25% making Learning Gains in Reading 66% and Math 63% 07-08: School Grade B, AYP: No, High Standards in Reading 74%, Math 67%, Writing 68%, and Science 44%, Learning Gains in Reading 66% and Math 70%, and Lowest 25% making Learning Gains in Reading 66% and Math 68%
Assistant Principal	Nena Green	BA-Elementary and Middle Ed., MA – School Administration	0		N/A

Instructional Coaches

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	Number of Years at Current School	Number of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/ Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Math	Lindsay Campbell	BA-Elementary Ed.	11	5	 11-12: School Grade C, High Standards in Reading 44%, Math 44%, Writing 79%, and Science 30%, Learning Gains in Reading 58% and Math 69%, Lowest 25% making Learning Gains in Reading 64% and Math 65% 10-11: School Grade C, AYP: No, High Standards in Reading 65%, Math 61%, Writing 89%, and Science 34%, Learning Gains in Reading 57% and Math 62%, and Lowest 25% making Learning Gains in Reading 57% and Math 58% 09-10: School Grade C, AYP: No, High Standards in Reading 70%, Math 64%, Writing 77%, and Science 33%, Learning Gains in Reading 57% and Math 54%, and Lowest 25% making Learning Gains in Reading 48% and Math 74% 08-09: School Grade A, AYP: Yes, High Standards in Reading 74%, Math 71%, Writing 86%, and Science 30%, Learning Gains in Reading 68% and Math 64%, and Lowest 25% making Learning Gains in Reading 69% and Math 72% 07-08: School Grade C, AYP: No, High Standards in Reading 69%, Math 63%, Writing 70%, and Science 25%, Learning Gains in Reading 65% and Math 64%, and Lowest 25% making Learning Gains in Reading 69% and Math 72%

Reading	Elizabeth Mitchell	MA-Reading, BA- Elementary Ed., ESOL certification	1	5	 11-12: School Grade C, High Standards in Reading 44%, Math 44%, Writing 79%, and Science 30%, Learning Gains in Reading 58% and Math 69%, Lowest 25% making Learning Gains in Reading 64% and Math 65% 10-11: School Grade A, AYP: No, High Standards in Reading 77%, Math 70%, Writing 81%, and Science 63%, Learning Gains in Reading 67% and Math 65%, and Lowest 25% making Learning Gains in Reading 53% and Math 68% 09-10: School Grade A, AYP: No, High Standards in Reading 77%, Math 69%, Writing 84%, and Science 52%, Learning Gains in Reading 61% and Math 66%, and Lowest 25% making Learning Gains in Reading 55% and Math 73% 08-09: School Grade A, AYP: Yes, High Standards in Reading 83%, Math 74%, Writing 84%, and Science 62%, Learning Gains in Reading 71% and Math 68%, and Lowest 25% making Learning Gains in Reading 65% and Math 70% 07-08: School Grade B, AYP: No, High Standards in Reading 74%, Math 67%, Writing 68%, and Science 44%, Learning Gains in Reading 66% and Math 70%, and Lowest 25% making Learning Gains in Reading 66% and Math 70%, and Lowest 25% making Learning Gains in Reading 66% and Math 70%, and Lowest 25% making Learning Gains in Reading 66% and Math 70%, and Lowest 25% making

<u>Highly Effective Teachers</u>

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
1. Recruit: The district advertises and recruits regionally and nationally when necessary. HR Department carefully screens all applicants. Title 1 Principals were trained in the Haberman Assessment to ensure quality teachers are hired in high poverty schools.	Human Resources	On-going

2.	Retain: Beginning teachers are assigned to highly qualified teachers, who are trained as a mentors to provide support, resources and advice throughout the first year. In addition, all teachers are provided staff development and coaching opportunities to meet their individual professional needs.	District Office, School-based administrators, mentors and coaches	Monthly meetings and as needed throughout the year
3.			
4.			

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who are NOT highly effective. *When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
0% (0)	N/A

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First- Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
52	0	27% (14)	33% (18)	38% (20)	25% (13)	Data not available until 10/2012	20% (10)	2%(1)	84% (43)

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.

June 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised April 29, 2011

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Liz Mitchell	Instructional staff based upon data	Assistance w/implementation of 90 min. reading block w/fidelity	Coaching, Modeling
Lindsay Campbell	Instructional staff based upon data	Providing assistance with implementation of core math instruction using best practices.	Coaching, Modeling

Additional Requirements

Coordination and Integration-Title I Schools Only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I funding will be used to provide professional development opportunities to teachers and administrators to address the specific academic achievement needs of the school. Title III funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to support after-school tutoring.

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

Title I funds will be used to expand the summer school program to Level 2 students.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Migrant funding will be used to provide Instructional Assistants to service migrant and/or homeless students.

Migrant funding will be used to provide academic support and social services to students on the Priority for Services list.

Title I, Part D

Title II

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

Title III

Title III funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide extra support to English Language Learners (ELLs) by offering after school tutoring in academic language acquisition, to assist ELLs meet the academic content and English proficiency standards. Title III funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to support after-school tutoring.

Title X- Homeless

District homeless social worker provides resources (clothing, school supplies, social services, referrals) for students identified as homeless to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

The guidance department provides developmentally appropriate lessons to students in K-5 in violence prevention. The Sheriff Department provides an "Officer Friendly" to present Gang Resistance programs to students throughout the year.

Nutrition Programs
Student Nutrition Services provides free breakfast to all students. Students are provided fruits and vegetables for a healthy snack. Lunch is free to eligible students.
Housing Programs
Head Start
Pre-K provides assessment and preparation for Kindergarten.
Adult Education
Career and Technical Education
Job Training
Other

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

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team. Members of the MTSS leadership team are: Administration, Literacy Coach, Math Resource Teacher, ESE Teacher, School Psychologist, Guidance Counselor, Behavior Specialist, K-5 General Education Teachers, Speech Language Pathologist, Technology Specialist and RtI Coach. Describe how the school-based MTSS leadership team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts? The RtI Leadership team meets monthly to review universal screening data and progress monitoring data as well as plan for interventions. The leadership team will complete an assessment of the RtI implementation progress as well as the staff's practices and skill development to determine the level of technical assistance and professional development assistance needed to support the school-wide implementation of RtI. Members of the Lead Literacy Team, Team Facilitators, and PBS leadership team serve on the RtI Leadership to ensure RtI efforts are coordinated throughout the school. Describe the role of the school-based MTSS leadership team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan (SIP). Describe how the RtI problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP? The RtI Leadership team will analyze current data including relevant demographic and school profile information, school-wide and grade level achievement data, progress monitoring data, student, staff and parent surveys as well as disaggregated data to make recommendations for school improvement. They also plan for interventions, gather resources for support, follow up on individual student progress and identify professional development needs in order for RtI interventions to be successful. 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. Student data is housed with-in Pasco Star, PMRN, Core K-12 and Terms. Data may be accessed through these systems for problem-solving with whole school, grade, class and individual students. In addition, formative classroom data is collected for each academic area throughout the year. The leadership team presents this data graphically in grade level meetings to facilitate curriculum and instructional decisions to meet students' academic and behavioral needs. Formative and summative data are analyzed to address Tier 2 and Tier 3 concerns for groups and individual students. Grade level teams, with the support of the RtI Leadership Team, use the data to problem-solve Tier 2 and Tier 3 academic needs and develop behavior intervention plans. Reading - MMH Weekly and Unit Assessments, FAIR, Quick Phonics Screener, Running Record Math – Pre/Post unit test, CORE K-12 Science - Chapter Post Test, CORE K-12 Writing - School-wide writing prompts, MMH Unit assessments Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS. The School-Based RtI Leadership Team will receive tiered coaching support from the district PS/RtI coach. A primary focus of this coaching will be building capacity for all School-Based RtI Leadership Team members to serve as facilitators in the problem solving process with a gradual release of responsibility to the grade level facilitators. Describe the plan to support MTSS. The SBLT will meet monthly as a PLC to problem-solve the continued school-wide support of MTSS. Team facilitators will provide imbedded PD to team members on MTSS during collaborative planning meetings.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team
Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).
• Administration
• Literacy Coach
• ESE Teacher
School Psychologist
• School Social Worker
• K-5 Basic Education Teachers
• Speech Language Pathologist
• Media/Technology Specialist
Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).
The Lead Literacy Team meets monthly to review data from a variety of sources to determine the level of technical assistance and professional development assistance needed to
support the literacy goals and objectives connected to ELA-CCSS. The lead literacy team is charged with prioritizing and developing start development needs, developing and university of the school's literacy missive connected to ELA-CCSS.
monitoring the SIP's interacy goals, analyzing data and communicating the school's interacy priorities connected to ELA-CCSS
What will be the major initiatives of the LL1 this year?
Ine LLT team will analyze reading data, provide input into the School Improvement Plan, and monitor the progress of literacy goals and objectives throughout the year. They include:
 ELA-CCSS Descered and Inquiry projects (core MMH reading strategy)
 Writing components within the MMH reading series
 Enhancement and differentiation of Literacy Stations
 Independent reading time with teacher conferencing
 Data analysis for effective problem solving within Tier 1 and Tier 2

Public School Choice

• Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification

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

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

At Pasco Elementary School, all Kindergarten students are assessed upon entering Kindergarten in order to determine individual and group needs to assist in the development of effective, rigorous instruction, and intervention programs. All students are assessed within the areas of Basic Skills/School Readiness, Oral Language/Syntax, Print/Letter Knowledge and Phonological Awareness/Processing. Screening data will be collected and aggregated by mid September, 2012. Data will be used to plan daily academic and social/emotional instruction for all students and for groups or individual students who may need intervention beyond core instruction. Core Kindergarten academic and behavior instruction will include daily explicit instruction, modeling, guided practice, and independent practice of all academic and /or social emotional skills identified by screening data. Specific screening tools our school will use include: FLKRS, FAIR, and ECHOS.

*Grades 6-12 Only Sec. 1003.413 (2)(b) F.S

For schools with grades 6-12, how does the school ensure that every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student?

*High Schools Only

Note: Required for High School-Sec. 1003.413(2)(g), (2)(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 <u>High School Feedback Report</u>.

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1A. FCAT 2.0:	1A.1. Lack of	1A.1.	1A.1. Administration, literacy	1A.1. Reading PD notes,	1A.1. Weekly and unit		
Students scoring at	collaborative	Teachers	coach, classroom teachers	grade level PLC notes,	assessments, student	1	
Achievement Level 3	planning	will		walk-throughs, observations	performance tied to	1	
in reading.	that focuses	participate		and student data discussed	rubrics, FAIR and teacher	1	
U U	on what	in reading		during PLCs and data shares	developed questions	1	
	students	P.D., which		-		1	
	need to	will focus				1	
	Know,	on planning				1	
	Understand	using NG-				1	
	and Do	SSS and				1	
	based upon	ELA-CCSS				1	
	NG-SSS and	with an				1	
	ELA-CCSS	emphasis on				1	
		developing				1	
		purposeful				1	
		text-				1	
		dependent				1	
		questions.				1	
						1	
		Grade level				1	
		teams will				1	
		be provided				1	
		planning				1	
		time to				1	
		develop				1	
		rubrics, and				1	
		purposeful				1	
		questions				1	
		based upon				1	
		a common				1	
		understand				1	
		of what					
		students					
		need to					
		Know,					
		Understand				1	
		and Do.				1	

Reading Goal #1A: The percentage of students achieving Level 3 on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 19% to 35%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	19% (62)	35% (114)					
		1A.2. Lack of student engagement and practice in compre hending multi-step questions to deepen understandin g of text	 1A.2. Teachers will model meta-cognition strategies throughout the day and follow-up with student practice during small group guided instruction and student conferencing time using gradual release of responsibility strategies. Students will engage in Think, Write, Share journaling. 	1A.2. Administration, literacy coach, classroom teachers	1A.2. Walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	1A.2. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes	

	1	1	1	1	İ.	Í	
		1A.3. Lack	1A.3. Time will be scheduled	1A.3. Administration,	1A.3. Reading PD	1A.3. Weekly and unit	
		of stamina	daily for students to read	literacy coach, classroom	notes, grade level PLC	assessments, journals,	
		and ability to	independently.	teachers	notes, walk-throughs,	student conferencing	
		independe	Training will be provided to		observations and student	notes	
		ntly apply	teachers to facilitate routines		data discussed during		
		reading	and structures necessary for		PLCs and data shares		
		comprehensi	independent reading and				
		on strategies	conferencing.				
		when					
		reading	Teachers will participate in				
		complex text	PD to develop a common				
			understanding of ELA-				
			CCSS as it relates to text				
			complexity.				
			Students will engage				
			in Think, Write, Share				
			journaling.				
1B. Florida	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Alternate							
Assessment:							
Students scoring at							
Levels 4, 5, and 6 in							
reading.							
Reading Goal #1B:	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
	Level of Performance:*	Level of Performance:*					
Enter narrative for the	r enormance.	renormance.					
goui in inis box.							
	Enter numerical data for	Enter numerical data for					
	current level of	expected level of					
	performance in this box	performance in this box					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		10.2	10.2	10.2	10.2	10.2	
		^{1B.3.}	18.3.	18.3.	IB.3.	IB.3.	

June 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised April 29, 2011

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
2A. FCAT 2.0:	2A.1. Lack of	2A.1.	2A.1. Grade level teams will	2A.1. Reading PD notes.	2A.1. Weekly and unit	
Students scoring	collaborative	Teachers	be provided planning time	grade level PLC notes.	assessments, student	
at or above	planning	will	to develop rubrics and	walk-throughs observations	performance tied to	
Achievement Levels	that focuses	participate	purposeful questions based	and student data discussed	rubrics FAIR and teacher	
4 in reading.	on what	in reading	upon a common understand	during PLCs and data shares	developed questions	
· ··· · ······························	students	P.D., which	of what students need to			
	need to	will focus	Know Understand and Do			
	Know	on planning				
	Understand	using NG-				
	and Do	SSS and				
	based upon	ELA-CCSS				
	NG-SSS and	with an				
	ELA-CCSS	emphasis on				
		developing				
		purposeful				
		text-				
		dependent				
		questions.				
Reading Goal #2A:	<u>2012 Current</u>	2013 Expected				
The generations of	Performance:*	Performance:*				
The percentage of						
students achieving						
Level 4 and 5 on the						
2015 FCAT Reading						
will increase from						
2170 10 5570.						
	21% (69)	35% (113)				

	2A.2. Lack of student engagement and practice in compre hending multi-step questions to deepen understandin g of text	2A.2. Teachers will model meta-cognition strategies throughout the day and follow-up with student practice during small group guided instruction and student conferencing time using gradual release of responsibility strategies. Students will engage in Think, Write, Share journaling.	2A.2. Administration, literacy coach, classroom teachers	2A.2. Walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	2A.2. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes	
	2A.3. Lack of stamina and ability to independe ntly apply reading comprehensi on strategies when reading complex text.	 2A.3. Time will be scheduled daily for students to read independently. Training will be provided to teachers to facilitate routines and structures necessary for independent reading and conferencing. Teachers will participate in PD to develop a common understanding of ELA-CCSS as it relates to text complexity. Students will engage in Think, Write, Share journaling. 	2A.3. Administration, literacy coach, classroom teachers	2A.3. Reading PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	2A.3. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes	

Alternate		
Assessment:		
Students scoring at		
or above Level 7 in		
reading.		
Reading Goal #2B: 2012 Current 2013 Expected		
Level of Level of Performance:*		
Enter narrative for the reformance. reformance.		
gou in mis oo.		
Enter numerical Enter numerical data for data for		
current level of expected level of		
performance in performance in this box.		
2B.2. 2B.2. 2B.2. 2B.2.	2B.2.	
2B.3. 2B.3. 2B.3. 2B.3.	2B.3.	

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

3A. FCAT 2.0:	3A.1. Lack of	A.1.	3A.1. Administration, literacy	3A.1. Reading PD notes,	3A.1. Weekly and unit	
Percentage of	collaborative	Teachers	coach, classroom teachers	grade level PLC notes,	assessments, student	
students making	planning	will		walk-throughs, observations	performance tied to	
learning gains in	that focuses	participate		and student data discussed	rubrics, FAIR and teacher	
reading.	on what	in reading		during PLCs and data shares	developed questions	
-	students	P.D., which		-		
	need to	will focus				
	Know,	on planning				
	Understand	using NG-				
	and Do	SSS and				
	based upon	ELA-CCSS				
	NG-SSS and	with an				
	ELA-CCSS	emphasis on				
		developing				
		purposeful				
		text-				
		dependent				
		questions.				
		Grade level				
		teams will				
		be provided				
		planning				
		time to				
		develop				
		rubrics, and				
		purposeful				
		questions				
		based upon				
		a common				
		of what				
		students				
		need to				
		Know				
		Linderstand				
		and Do				

Reading Goal #3A: The percentage of students making learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading will increase from 58% to 75%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	58% (188)	75% (243) 3A.2. Lack of student engagement and practice in compre hending multi-step questions to deepen understandin g of text	3A.2. Teachers will model meta-cognition strategies throughout the day and follow-up with student practice during small group guided instruction and student conferencing time using gradual release of responsibility strategies. Students will engage in Think, Write, Share journaling.	3A.2. Administration, literacy coach, classroom teachers	3A.2. Walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	3A.2. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes	

			i	1			î.
		3A.3. Lack	3A.3. Time will be scheduled	3A.3. Administration, literacy	3A.3. Reading PD	3A.3. Weekly and unit	
		of stamina	daily for students to read	coach, classroom teachers	notes, grade level PLC	assessments, journals,	
		and ability to	independently.		notes, walk-throughs,	student conferencing	
		independe			observations and student	notes	
		ntly apply	Training will be provided to		data discussed during		
		reading	teachers to facilitate routines	3	PLCs and data shares		
		comprehensi	and structures necessary for				
		on strategies	independent reading and				
		when	conferencing.				
		reading	C C				
		complex text	Teachers will participate in				
		1	PD to develop a common				
			understanding of ELA-				
			CCSS as it relates to text				
			complexity.				
			1 5				
			Students will engage				
			in Think, Write, Share				
			journaling.				
			,				
3B. Florida	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
Alternate							
Assessment:							
Percentage of							
students making							
learning gains in							
reading.							
Reading Goal #3B:	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
	Level of Performance:*	Level of Performance:*					
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	<u>r errormance.</u>	<u>r errormance.</u>					
50 <i>m</i> m mis 00 <i>m</i>							
	Enton numarical	Entay numarical					
	Enter numerical data for	Enter numerical data for					
	Enter numerical data for current level of	Enter numerical data for expected level of					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					

	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

June 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised April 29, 2011

Deced on the smallerin	A seti simata J	Cture to any	Daman an Daaitian	Drawers Used to Determine	E-releastion Tool	
based on the analysis	Dorrior	Sualegy	Person of Position	Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation 1001	
data and reference to	Daniel		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy		
"Guiding Questions"						
identify and define areas						
in need of improvement						
for the following group:						
4A. FCAT 2.0:	4A.1. Lack of	4A.1. Tier II	4A.1. Administration, literacy	4A.1. Walk-throughs,	4A.1. Weekly and unit	
Percentage of	collaborative	and Tier III	coach, classroom teachers	observations and student	assessments, journals,	
students in lowest	planning	instruction		data discussed during PLCs	student conferencing	
25% making	that focuses	will be		and data shares	notes	
learning gains in	on what	coordinated				
reading.	students	and aligned				
-	need to	with grade				
	Know,	level core				
	Understand	instruction				
	and Do	and				
	during Core	instructional				
	Instruction	routines				
	connected	during				
	with Tier 2	common				
	and Tier 3	planning				
	Interventions	time.				
		Classroom				
	1	teacher and				
	1	intervention				
	1	staff will use				
	1	common and				
	1	consistent				
		language.				

Reading Goal #4A: The percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading on the 2013 FCAT will increase from 64% to 75%	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	64% (51)	75% (61)					
		4A.2. Lack of student engagement and practice in compre hending multi-step questions to deepen understandin g of text	4A.2. Teachers will model meta-cognition strategies throughout the day and follow-up with student practice during small group guided instruction and student conferencing time using gradual release of responsibility strategies. Students will engage in Think, Write, Share journaling.	4A.2. Administration, literacy coach, classroom teachers	4A.2. Walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	4A.2. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes	

ſ			4A.3. Lack	4A.3. Time will be scheduled	4A.3. Administration, literacy	4A.3. Reading PD	4A.3. Weekly and unit	
I			of stamina	daily for students to read	coach, classroom teachers	notes, grade level PLC	assessments, journals,	
I			and ability to	independently.		notes, walk-throughs,	student conferencing	
I			independe			observations and student	notes	
I			ntly apply	Training will be provided to		data discussed during		
I			reading	teachers to facilitate routines	5	PLCs and data shares		
I			comprehensi	and structures necessary for				
I			on strategies	independent reading and				
I			when	conferencing.				
I			reading					
I			complex text	Teachers will participate in				
I				PD to develop a common				
I				understanding of ELA-				
I				CCSS as it relates to text				
I				complexity.				
I								
I				Students will engage				
I				in Think, Write, Share				
I				journaling.				
l				, C				
ŀ	4B. Florida	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.		
	Alternate							
4	Assessment:							
1	Percentage of							
ſ	students in lowest							
ſ	25% making							
ľ	learning gains in							
Į	reading.							
ŀ	Reading Goal #4B:	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
I		Level of Performance:*	Level of Performance:*					
ľ	Enter narrative for the	renormance.	r errormanee.					
240	goui in inis box.							
I								
I								
ļ		_						
		Enter numerical data for	Enter numerical data for					
		current level of	expected level of					
		performance in	performance in					
1					-			-

	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	
	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. In six years	Baseline data						
school will reduce	2010-2011	39%	45%	50%	56%	62%	67%
their achievement gap by 50%.	34%						
Reading Goal #5A:							
The reading							
achievement gap will							
be reduced by 50% by							
2016-2017.							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
for the following subgroups:							

5B. Student	5B.1.	5B.1. Teachers will	5B.1. Administration, literacy	5B.1. Reading PD	5B.1. Weekly and unit	
subgroups by	White: Lack of	participate in reading	coach, classroom teachers	notes, grade level PLC	assessments, student	
ethnicity (White,	collaborative planning	P.D., which will focus on		notes, walk-throughs,	performance tied to	
Black, Hispanic,	that focuses on what	planning using NG-SSS		observations and student	rubrics, FAIR and teacher	
Asian, American	students need to Know,	and ELA-CCSS with an		data discussed during	developed questions	
Indian) not making	Understand and Do based	emphasis on developing		PLCs and data shares		
satisfactory progress	upon NG-SSS and ELA-	purposeful text-dependent				
in reading.	CCSS	questions.				
	Black: Lack of collaborative planning that focuses on what students need to Know, Understand and Do based upon NG-SSS and ELA- CCSS Hispanic: Lack of collaborative planning that focuses on what students need to Know, Understand and Do based upon NG-SSS and ELA- CCSS	Grade level teams will be provided planning time to develop rubrics, and purposeful questions based upon a common understand of what students need to Know, Understand and Do.				

Reading Goal #5B:	2012 Current Level of	2013 Expected Level of					
Based upon the 2013	Performance:*	Performance:*					
FCAT							
10/11.							
The percentage of							
The percentage of							
students in the white							
subgroup scoring a							
level 3 or higher will							
increase from 55% to							
70%.							
The percentage of							
students in the black							
subgroup gooring o							
subgroup scoring a							
level 3 or nigher will							
increase from 21% to							
40%.							
The percentage							
of student in the							
Hispanic subgroup							
scoring a level 3 or							
higher will increase							
from 280/ to 600/							
110111 3876 10 0076.							
	White:	White:					
	55% (60)	70% (76)					
	D_{12}^{12}	D_{10}^{10}					
	Black:	Black:					
	21% (11)	40% (21)					
	Hispanic:	Hispanic: 60% (91)					
	38% (58)	Asian:					
	Asian:	American Indian:					
	American Indian:						
		 ^{5B.2.} White: Lack of student engagement and practice in comprehending multi- step questions to deepen understanding of text Black: Lack of student engagement and practice in comprehending multi- step questions to deepen understanding of text Hispanic: Lack of student engagement and practice in comprehending multi- step questions to deepen understanding of text 	5B.2. Teachers will model meta-cognition strategies throughout the day and follow-up with student practice during small group guided instruction and student conferencing time using gradual release of responsibility strategies. Students will engage in Think, Write, Share journaling.	5B.2. Administration, literacy coach, classroom teachers	5B.2. Walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	5B.2. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes	
--	--	--	---	--	---	---	--
--	--	--	---	--	---	---	--

White: Lack of stamina and ability to independently apply reading comprehension strategies when reading complex text Black: Lack of stamina and ability to independently apply reading comprehension strategies when reading complex text Hispanic: Lack of stamina and ability to independently apply reading comprehension strategies when reading complex text	 b.3. Time will be scheduled daily for students to read independently. Training will be provided to teachers to facilitate routines and structures necessary for independent reading and conferencing. Teachers will participate in PD to develop a common understanding of ELA-CCSS as it relates to text complexity. Students will engage in Think, Write, Share journaling. 	literacy coach, classroom teachers	sB.3. Reading PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	sB.3. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes	
---	--	---------------------------------------	--	---	--

June 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised April 29, 2011

Based on the analysis	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool	
of student achievement	Barrier	0.5	Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy		
data and reference to						
"Guiding Questions,"						
identify and define areas						
in need of improvement						
for the following						
subgroup:						
5C. English	5C.1. Lack of	5C.1. ELL	5C.1. Administration, literacy	5C.1. Reading PD notes,	5C.1. Weekly and unit	
Language Learners	collaborative	Resource	coach, classroom teachers	grade level PLC notes,	assessments, student	
(ELL) not making	planning	Teacher and		walk-throughs, observations	performance tied to	
satisfactory progress	that focuses	IA's will		and student data discussed	rubrics, FAIR and teacher	
in reading.	on what	participate		during PLCs and data shares	developed questions	
	students	in reading				
	need to	P.D., which				
	Know	will focus				
	Understand	on planning				
	and Do	to connect				
	and Do	Come				
	during Core	Core				
	Instruction	instruction				
	connected	with ELL				
	with ELL	interventions				
	support.					
		The				
		classroom				
		tooobor ord				
		ELL support				
		staff will use				
		common and				
		consistent				
		language				
		and				
		strategies				

Reading Goal #5C: The percentage of ELL students scoring a 3 or higher will increase from 9% to 40%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	9% (3)	40% (13)					
		5C.2. Lack of student engagement and practice in compre hending vocabulary and multi- step questions to deepen understand ing of text using ELL specific resources	5C.2. PD will be provided to build f teachers' capacity and knowledge of effective ELL strategies within the CORE and during interventions The classroom teacher and ELL support staff will use common and consistent language and strategies.	5C.2. Administration, literacy coach, classroom teachers	5C.2. Walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	5C.2. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	

Based on the analysis	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool	
of student achievement	Barrier		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy		
data and reference to						
"Guiding Questions,"						
identify and define areas						
in need of improvement						
for the following						
5D Students	5D 1 Lack of	5D 1 Tier II	5D 1 Administration literacy	5D 1 Walk-throughs	5D 1 Weekly and unit	
with Disabilition	collaborative	and Tier III	south classroom teachers	observations and student	assessments journals	
(SWD) wat maling				data diagram d during DI Ca	assessments, journais,	
(SWD) not making	planning	instruction		data discussed during PLCs	student conferencing	
satisfactory progress	that focuses	will be		and data shares	notes	
in reading.	on what	coordinated				
	students	and aligned				
	need to	with grade				
	Know,	level core				
	Understand	instruction				
	and Do	and				
	during Core	instructional				
	Instruction	routines				
	connected	during				
	with Tior 2	aammon				
	with Tiel 2 1 Tien 2					
	and Tier 3	planning				
	Interventions	time.				
		C1				
		Classroom				
		teacher and				
		intervention				
		staff will use				
		common and				
		consistent				
		language				
	Instruction connected with Tier 2 and Tier 3 Interventions	routines during common planning time. Classroom teacher and intervention staff will use common and consistent language.				

Reading Goal #5D: The percentage of SWD students scoring a 3 or higher will increase from 15% to 40%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	15% (11)	40% (29)					
		5D.2. Lack of student engagement and practice in compre hending multi-step questions to deepen understandin g of text	5D.2. Teachers will model meta-cognition strategies throughout the day and follow-up with student practice during small group guided instruction and student conferencing time using gradual release of responsibility strategies. Students will engage in Think, Write, Share journaling.	5D.2. Administration, literacy coach, classroom teachers	5D.2. Walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	5D.2. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes	

5D.3. Lack	5D.3. Time will be scheduled	5D.3. Administration, literacy	5D.3. Reading PD	5D.3. Weekly and unit	
of stamina	daily for students to read	coach, classroom teachers	notes, grade level PLC	assessments, journals,	
and ability to	independently.		notes, walk-throughs,	student conferencing	
independe	1 2		observations and student	notes	
ntly apply	Training will be provided to		data discussed during		
reading	teachers to facilitate routines		PLCs and data shares		
comprehensi	and structures necessary for				
on strategies	independent reading and				
when	conferencing.				
reading					
complex text	Teachers will participate in				
	PD to develop a common				
	understanding of ELA-				
	CCSS as it relates to text				
	complexity.				
	C/ 1 / 11				
	Students will engage				
	in Think, write, Share				
	journanng.				

June 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised April 29, 2011

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

5E. Economically	5E.1. Lack of	5E.1.	5E.1. Administration, literacy	5E.1. Reading PD notes,	5E.1. Weekly and unit		
Disadvantaged	collaborative	Teachers	coach, classroom teachers	grade level PLC notes,	assessments, student	1	
students not making	planning	will		walk-throughs, observations	performance tied to	1	
satisfactory progress	that focuses	participate		and student data discussed	rubrics, FAIR and teacher	1	
in reading.	on what	in reading		during PLCs and data shares	developed questions	1	
	students	P.D., which		-		1	
	need to	will focus				1	
	Know,	on planning				1	
	Understand	using NG-				1	
	and Do	SSS and				1	
	based upon	ELA-CCSS				1	
	NG-SSS and	with an				1	
	ELA-CCSS	emphasis on				1	
		developing				1	
		purposeful				1	
		text-				1	
		dependent				1	
		questions.				1	
						1	
		Grade level				1	
		teams will				1	
		be provided				1	
		planning				1	
		time to				1	
		develop				1	
		rubrics, and				1	
		purposeful				1	
		questions				1	
		based upon				1	
		a common				1	
		understand				1	
		of what				1	
		students					1
		need to					
		Know,				1	
		Understand					
		and Do.					
						1	1

Reading Goal #5E: The percentage of economically disadvantaged students scoring level 3 or higher will increase from 36% to 60%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	36% (102)	60% (170)					
		5E.2. Lack of student engagement and practice in compre hending multi-step questions to deepen understandin g of text	SE.2. Teachers will model meta-cognition strategies throughout the day and follow-up with student practice during small group guided instruction and student conferencing time using gradual release of responsibility strategies. Students will engage in Think, Write, Share journaling.	5E.2. Administration, literacy coach, classroom teachers	5E.2. Walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	5E.2. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes	

	5E.3. Lack	5E.3 Time will be scheduled	5E.3. Administration, literacy	5E.3. Reading PD	5E.3. Weekly and unit	
	of stamina	daily for students to read	coach classroom teachers	notes grade level PLC	assessments journals	
	and ability to	independently		notes walk-throughs	student conferencing	
	independe	independencij.		observations and student	notes	
	ntly apply	Training will be provided to		data discussed during	notes	
	reading	teachers to facilitate routines		PI Cs and data shares		
	comprehensi	and structures necessary for		I Les and data shares		
	on strategies	independent reading and				
	when	conferencing				
	reading	conferencing.				
	oomnlov tovt	Tagahara will participate in				
	complex lext	DD to doubler a common				
		PD to develop a common				
		understanding of ELA-				
		CCSS as it relates to text				
		complexity.				
		Students will engage				
		in Think, Write, Share				
		journaling.				

Reading Professional Development

Professional						
Development						
(PD) aligned with						
Strategies through						
Professional						
Learning						
Community (PLC)						
or PD Activities						
Please note that each						
strategy does not require a						
professional development or						
The activity.		PD Facilitator	PD Participants	Target Dates (e.g., early release)		
PD Content/Topic	Grade Level/	and/or	(e.g., PLC, subject, grade level,	and Schedules (e.g., frequency of	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible
and/or PLC Focus	Subject	PLC Leader	or school-wide)	meetings)		for Monitoring

ELA-CCSS Framework	K-5	Literacy Coach	School-Wide	August 8-9, 2012 Guided question discussions during weekly grade level PLCs.		Literacy Coach and Administration
ELA-CCSS Text Complexity and Text Dependent Questions	K-5	Literacy Coach	School-wide	August, 2012-May, 2013	School-based facilitator, PLC discussions, and model classrooms, Coaching and lesson plan support with the Literacy Coach	Literacy Coach and Administration
Lesson Planning for CCSS	K-5	PLC Leaders	K-5 grade level	August, 2012-May, 2013	School-based facilitator, PLC discussions, and model classrooms, Coaching and lesson plan support with the Literacy Coach	
Meta-Cognition and Gradual Release of Responsibility	K-5	Literacy Coach and PLC Leaders	K-5 grade level	August, 2012-May, 2013	School-based facilitator, PLC discussions, and model classrooms, Coaching and lesson plan support with the Literacy Coach	Literacy Coach and Administration
Independent Reading and Conferencing	eading ing K-5 Literacy Coach and PLC K-5 grade level August, 2012-May, 2013		School-based facilitator, PLC discussions, and model classrooms, Coaching and lesson plan support with the Literacy Coach	Literacy Coach and Administration		
Comprehension and vocab. strategies for ELL learners	K-5	Literacy Coach and ELL Resource Teacher	K-5 grade level	August, 2012-May, 2013	School-based facilitator, PLC discussions, and model classrooms, Coaching and lesson plan support with the Literacy Coach and ELL Resource teacher	Literacy Coach and Administration

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school funded activities/			
activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Classroom Libraries connected with CCSS	Literature and Non-Fiction books	Title 1	\$10,000.00
Increase stamina and engagement in reading complex text	Journals, classroom books	Title 1	\$7,000.00
Subtotal:\$17,000.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

June 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised April 29, 2011

Increase stamina and engagement in	Computer-based programs	Title 1	\$10,000.00
reading complex text			
Subtotal:\$10,000.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Collaborative Planning	Stipends, Substitutes	Title 1	\$7,000.00
Subtotal:\$7,000.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Tier 2 and Tier 3 Intervention	Reading Intervention Teacher (2)	Title 1	\$90,000.00
Subtotal:\$90,000.00			
Total:124,000.00			

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

CELLA Goals	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Language Acquisition					
Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.	1.1. Lack of opportunity to engage verbally in collaborative sharing of thoughts and ideas	 1.1. Students will engage in Think, Write, Share journaling. The classroom teacher and ELL support staff will use common and consistent language and strategies. 	1.1. Administration, Coaches, ELL Resource Teacher	1.1. Walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	1.1. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes	
CELLA Goal #1: The percent of students who speak and understand English at the proficient level will increase from 44% to 60% based upon the 2013 CELLA.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking 44% (60)					
	00)					

		1.2. Lack of opportunity to practice speaking and responding to oral information in English	 1.2. Students will engage in Think, Write, Share journaling. The classroom teacher and ELL support staff will use common and consistent language and strategies. 	1.2. Administration, Coaches, ELL Resource Teacher	1.2. Walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	1.2. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes.
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.
Students read grade- level text in English in a manner similar to non- ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading	2.1. Lack of collaborative planning that focuses on what students need to Know, Understand and Do during Core Instruction connected with ELL support.	 2.1. ELL Resource Teacher and IA's will participate in reading P.D., which will focus on planning to connect Core instruction with ELL interventions. The classroom teacher and ELL support staff will use common and consistent language and strategies 	2.1. Administration, literacy coach, classroom teachers	2.1. Walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	2.1. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes	
CELLA Goal #2: The percent of students who score proficient in reading will increase from 23% to 35% based upon the 2013 CELLA.	2012 Current Percent of Student: Proficient in Reading:	S				

2	23% (32)					
		2.2. Lack of student engagement and practice in comprehending vocabulary and multi-step questions to deepen understanding of text using ELL specific resources	2.2. Teachers will model meta-cognition strategies throughout the day and follow-up with student practice during small group guided instruction and student conferencing time. Students will engage in Think, Write, Share journaling.	2.2. Administration, literacy coach, classroom teachers	2.2. Walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	2.2. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non- ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.	2.1. Lack of instruction in grammar, spelling and conventions utilizing ELL specific resources.	2.1. Additional time will be scheduled to ensure implementation of the language arts component using MMH treasures	2.1. Administration, Coaches, ELL Resource Teacher	2.1. Walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	2.1. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes, demand writing	

CELLA Goal #3: The percent of students scoring proficient in writing will increase from 17% to 30% based upon the 2013 CELLA.	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing :					
	17% (23)	2.2. Scoring and feedback on student writing is not consistent across vertical and horizontal teams.	2.2. Professional development, coaching and mentoring will be offered in student conferencing, scoring and writing rubrics. Develop common writing rubrics that clearly outline student expectations in the writing process, grammar, conventions, & spelling	2.2. Administration, Coaches, ELL Resource Teacher	2.2. Walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	2.2. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes, demand writing
		2.3.Lack of opportunities for students to write across the curriculum in response to reading.	2.3. Students will use a writing log throughout all content areas to respond to learning and reading	2.3. Administration, Coaches, ELL Resource Teacher	2.3. Walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	2.3. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Include only school-based funded		
activities/materials and exclude district		
funded activities/materials.		

Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)				
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount	
Subtotal:				
Technology				
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount	
Subtotal:				
Professional Development				
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount	
Collaborative Planning	Stipends, Substitutes	Title 1	\$500.0	
Visualizing and Verbalizing	Stipends, Substitutes	Title 1	\$500.00	
Subtotal:\$1,000.00				
Other				
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount	
Subtotal:				
Total:\$1,000.00				

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Elementary Mathematics Goals	Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achievem ent					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.	1A.1. Lack of math content knowledge to effectively plan, instruct and assess for analytical learning and understandin g.	1A.1. Teachers will participate in scheduled math PLCs designed to deepen their math content knowledge using resources from Think Central and District/ School math resource teachers	1A.1. Administration, math resource teacher, classroom teachers	1A.1. Math PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk- throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	1A.1. Unit assessments, math journals, student work samples, Core K-12	

Mathematics Goal #1A: The percentage of students scoring a level 3 on the 2013 FCAT will increase	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
from 24% to 45%.							
	24% (78)	45% (146)					
		1A.2. Students don't understand and how to apply thinking strategies (metacogni tive) when solving complex, multi- step word problems.	s1A.2. Grade level teams will be provided time to plan and develop purposeful questions based on pre-test- data that support higher- order thinking strategies. Students will use Visualizing and Verbalizing strategies, writing, drawing and manipulatives during math instruction	1A.2. Administration, math resource teacher, classroom teachers	IA.2. Math PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk- throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	1A.2. Unit assessments, math journals, student work samples, Core K-12	

		1A.3. The	1A.3. Training and coaching	1A.3. Administration, math	1A.3. Math PD notes, grade	1A.3. Unit assessments,	
		instructional	will be provided to ensure	resource teacher, classroom	level PLC notes, walk-	math journals, student	
		delivery	the instructional delivery	teachers	throughs, observations	work samples, Core K-12	
		model does	model includes centers,		and student data discussed	-	
		not include	inquiry-based activities,		during PLCs and data		
		inquiry-	journal writing and		shares, lesson plans		
		based	collaborative structures.				
		routines					
		that provide	Teachers will implement				
		ample	a routine that includes				
		opportunities	opportunities for students				
		for students	to practice, preview and				
		to practice.	review based on assessment				
		preview and	data				
		review based					
		on pre-test					
		data					
1B. Florida	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Alternate							
Assessment.							
Students scoring at							
Levels 4 5 and 6 in							
mathematics							
Mathematics Goal	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
	Level of	Level of					
#1D.	Performance:*	Performance:*					
Enter narrative for the							
goal in this box.							
	Enter numerical	Enter numerical					
	data for	data for					
	current level of performance in	expected level of performance in					
	this box.	this box.					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	
			12.0.		12.0.		

June 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised April 29, 2011

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
2A. FCAT 2.0:	2A.1. Lack of	2A.1.	2A.1. Administration, math	2A.1. Math PD notes, grade	2A.1. Unit assessments,	
Students scoring	math content	Teachers	resource teacher, classroom	level PLC notes, walk-	math journals, student	
at or above	knowledge	will	teachers	throughs, observations	work samples, Core K-12	
Achievement	to effectively	participate		and student data discussed	1 ,	
Levels 4 and 5 in	plan, instruct	in scheduled		during PLCs and data		
mathematics.	and assess	math PLCs		shares, lesson plans		
	for analytical	designed to				
	learning and	deepen their				
	understandin	math content				
	g.	knowledge				
		using				
		fesources				
		Central and				
		District/				
		School math				
		resource				
		teachers				
Mathematics Goal	2012 Current	2013 Expected				
<u>#2A:</u>	Level of Performance:*	Level of Performance:*				
	r errormance.	<u>r errormance.</u>				
i ne percentage of						
above levels 1 and 5						
on the $2013 \text{ FC} \text{AT}$						
will increase from						
17% to 35%						

17% (54)	35% (113)					
	2A.2. Students don't understand and how to apply thinking strategies (metacogni tive) when solving complex, multi- step word problems.	2A.2. Grade level teams will be provided time to plan and develop purposeful questions based on pre-test- data that support higher- order thinking strategies. Students will use Visualizing and Verbalizing strategies, writing, drawing and manipulatives during math instruction	2A.2. Administration, math resource teacher, classroom teachers	2A.2. Math PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk- throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	2A.2. Unit assessments, math journals, student work samples, Core K-12	
	2A.3. The instructional delivery model does not include inquiry- based routines that provide ample opportunitie for students to practice, preview and review based on pre-test data.	2A.3. Training and coaching will be provided to ensure the instructional delivery model includes centers, inquiry-based activities, journal writing and collaborative structures Teachers will implement a routine that includes sopportunities for students to practice, preview and review based on assessment data.	2A.3. Administration, math resource teacher, classroom teachers	2A.3. Math PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk- throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	2A.3. Unit assessments, math journals, student work samples, Core K-12	

2B. Florida	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Alternate							
Assessment:							
Students scoring at							
or above Level 7 in							
mathematics.							
Mathematics Goal	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
<u>#2B:</u>	Level of Derformence:*	Level of Porformance:*					
	renomance.	<u>renomance.</u>					
Enter narrative for the							
goui in inis vox.							
	Enter numerical data for	Enter numerical data for					
	current level of	expected level of					
	performance in this box	performance in this box					
	11113 0024	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

June 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised April 29, 2011

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3A. FCAT 2.0:	3A.1. Lack of	3A.1.	3A.1. Administration, math	3A.1. Math PD notes, grade	3A.1. Unit assessments,	
Percentage of	math content	Teachers	resource teacher, classroom	level PLC notes, walk-	math journals, student	
students making	knowledge	will	teachers	throughs, observations	work samples, Core K-12	
learning gains in	to effectively	participate		and student data discussed	1	
mathematics.	plan, instruct	in scheduled		during PLCs and data		
	and assess	math PLCs		shares, lesson plans		
	for analytical	designed to				
	learning and	deepen their				
	understandin	math content				
	g.	knowledge				
		using				
		resources				
		from Think				
		Central and				
		District/				
		School math				
		resource				
		teachers				
Mathematics Coal	2012 Current	2013 Expected				
$\#_2 \Lambda$	Level of	Level of				
# <u>5A.</u>	Performance:*	Performance:*				
Based upon the 2013						
FCAT, the percentage						
of students making						
learning gains will						
increase from 69% to						
80%.						

· · · · ·				1	i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	i .	
69%	% (224)	80% (260)					
		3A.2. Students don't understand and how to apply thinking strategies (metacogni tive) when solving complex, multi- step word problems.	3A.2. Grade level teams will be provided time to plan and develop purposeful questions based on pre-test- data that support higher- order thinking strategies. Students will use Visualizing and Verbalizing strategies, writing, drawing and manipulatives during math instruction	3A.2. Administration, math resource teacher, classroom teachers	3A.2. Math PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	3A.2. Unit assessments, math journals, student work samples, Core K-12	
		3A.3. The instructional delivery model does not include inquiry- based routines that provide ample opportunities for students to practice, preview and review based on pre-test data.	3A.3. Training and coaching will be provided to ensure the instructional delivery model includes centers, inquiry-based activities, journal writing and collaborative structures Teachers will implement a routine that includes opportunities for students to practice, preview and review based on assessment data.	3A.3. Administration, math resource teacher, classroom teachers	3A.3. Math PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk- throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	3A.3. Unit assessments, math journals, student work samples, Core K-12	

3B. Florida	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
Alternate							
Assessment:							
Percentage of							
students making							
learning gains in							
mathematics.							
Mathematics Goal	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
<u>#3B:</u>	Level of Performance [*]	Level of Performance.*					
Enter requesting for the	r errormanee.						
enter narrative for the goal in this box.							
S · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·							
	Enter numerical	Enter numerical					
	data for	data for					
	current level of performance in	expected level of					
	this box.	this box.					
		3B 2	3B 2	3B 2	3P 2	3B 2	
		50.2.	55.2.	50.2.	50.2.	50.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

June 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised April 29, 2011

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

Percentage of students in how pollaborative [Teachers students in what and students in what students in what and the focuses participate is undents resource teacher, classroom in scheduled level PLC notes, walk- morupho, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans math plantal, students in work samples, Core K-12 is undents math PLCs is signed to contexted math plantal, students math plantal, shares, lesson plans math plantal, shares, lesson plans in druing Cre in struction with Tre 2 is struction with Tre 2 is struction in druing PLCs resources is sing is struction with Tre 2 is struction in druing PLCs resources is sing is struction with Tre 2 is struction with tre 3 is struction and is struction with tre 4 is struc	4A. FCAT 2.0:	4A.1. Lack of	4A.1.	4A.1. Administration, math	4A.1. Math PD notes, grade	4A.1. Unit assessments,	
Students in lowest 25% making earning gains in mathematics. blanning hat focuses and point designed to designed to designe	Percentage of	collaborative	Teachers	resource teacher, classroom	level PLC notes, walk-	math journals, student	
25% making that focuses participate and student data discussed tearning gains ow with in scheduled during PLCs and data nadtematics. students math PLCs shares, lesson plans need to designed to designed to with TCs using transpace during PLCs and data and Duderstand math content shares, lesson plans during PLCs and Ticr 3 positric/ resources sources sources connected from Think resources sources sources conlaborat collaborat inderventions sources sources collaborat ively plan iof Tre 2 and Ticr 3 and Ticr 3 interventions Tier II and interventions interventions Tier II and instruction with grade level core instruction resource confinated and aligned with grade level core instructional instructional indiring common common source instructional	students in lowest	planning	will	teachers	throughs, observations	work samples, Core K-12	
learning gains in on what in scheduled during PLCs and data mathematics. shares is an aff PLCs need to designed to Know, deepen their Understand math content hard Do during Core using Instruction resources Connected from Think with Tier 2 Central and and Tier 3 District' Interventions School math interventions Fooliaborat resources teachers to collaborat interventions Tier II and Tier II instruction with gade level core instructional routines during Core teachers II collaborat interventions Tier II and Tier II and Tier II instruction and aligned with grade level core instructional routines during Core commented teachers II collaborat interventions Tier II and Tier II instruction and aligned with grade level core instructional routines during Core commented teachers II teachers II t	25% making	that focuses	participate		and student data discussed		
mathematics. students math PLCs of designed to head of the students of the student of the stud	learning gains in	on what	in scheduled		during PLCs and data		
need to designed to Know, deepen their Understand math content and Do knowledge during Core using Instruction resources connected from Think with Tier 2 Central and and Tier 3 District' instructions resource teachers to collaborat collaborat ively plan for Tier 2 and Tier 3 and Tier 3 interventions resource conductions elaborat ively plan for Tier 2 and Tier 3 and Tier 3 interventions Tier II and Tier III instruction with grade evel core instruction with grade evel core instructional and and aigned with grade evel core instructional and instructional routines during	mathematics.	students	math PLCs		shares, lesson plans		
Know, deepen their Understand math content and Do during Core using Instruction resources connected from Think with Tir2 Cerntal and and Tier 3 District/ Interventions School math resource teachers to collaborat wiely plan for Tir2 and Tier 3 interventions Tier II and Tier II and Tier II and Tier II and Tier II and tinstruction will bb coordinated and aligned with grade level core instructional rotines during for math teachers to collaborat will bb coordinated and aligned with grade level core instructional rotines during common		need to	designed to				
Understand math content and Do knowledge during Core using Instruction resources connected from Think with Tier 2 Central and and Tier 3 District/ InterventionsSchool math resource collaborat collaborat ively plan for Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions for Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions interventions for Tier 1 and Tier 3 interventions interventions for Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions interventions for Tier 1 and instruction and instruction and instruction and instructional and instruction<		Know,	deepen their				
and Do knowledge during Core using Instruction resources connected from Think with Tire 2 Central and and Tier 3 District/ InterventionsSchool math . resource teachers to collaborat ively plan for Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions Tier II and Tier III instruction will be coordinated and aligned with grade level core instruction and instructional routines during common		Understand	math content				
during Core using Instruction resources connected from Think with Tier 2 Central and and Tier 3 District/ InterventionsSchool math - resource collaborat vely plan for Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions Tier II and Tier III instruction will be coordinated and aligned with grade level core instruction and mistructional routines during common		and Do	knowledge				
Instruction resources from Think with Tier 2 Central and and Tier 3 District' Interventions Forbool math resource teachers to collaborat ively plan for Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions Tier II and Tier III instruction will be coordinated and aligned with grade level core instruction and		during Core	using				
connected from Think with Tier 2 Central and and Tier 3 District/ InterventionsSchool math resource teachers to collaborat ively plan for Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions Tier II and Tier III instruction will be coordinated and aligned with grade level core instructional routines during common		Instruction	resources				
with Tier 2 Central and and Tier 3 Disticit/ Interventions School math resource teachers to collaborat ively plan for Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions Tier II and Tier II and Tier III instruction will be coordinated and aligned with grade level core instruction and not mistruction with grade level core instruction and instruction with grade level core instruction and instruction with grade level core instruction and instruction and instruction and instruction and instruction and instruction instruction and instruction instruction and instruction		connected	from Think				
and Tier 3 District/ InterventionsSchool math resource teachers to collaborat ively plan for Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions Tier II and Tier III instruction will be coordinated and aligned with grade level core instructional routines during common		with Tier 2	Central and				
InterventionsSchool math . resource . resource . collaborat ively plan for Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions Tier II and Tier III instruction will be coordinated and aligned with grade level core instruction and instructiona routines during common		and Tier 3	District/				
resource teachers to collaborat ively plan for Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions Tier II and Tier III instruction will be coordinated and aligned with grade level core instructional routines during common		Interventions	School math				
teachers to collaborat ively plan for Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions Tier II and Tier III instruction will be coordinated and aligned with grade level core instructional routines during common			resource				
collaborat ively plan for Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions Tier II and Tier III instruction will be coordinated and aligned with grade level core instructional routines during common			teachers to				
Tier II and Tier III instruction will be coordinated and aligned with grade level core instructional routines during common			collaborat				
tor Trer 2 and Tier 3 interventions Tier II and Tier III instruction will be coordinated and aligned with grade level core instruction and instruction instruction and instruction and instruction and instruction instructin instruction instruction instruction instruction inst			ively plan				
Tier II and Tier III instruction will be coordinated and aligned with grade level core instruction and instructional routines during common			for Tier 2				
Tier II and Tier III instruction will be coordinated and aligned with grade level core instruction and and instructional routines during common			and Tier 3				
Tier II and Tier III instruction will be coordinated and aligned with grade level core instruction and instructional routines during common			interventions				
If if if and Tier III instruction will be coordinated and aligned with grade level core instruction and instruction and instruction dinstructional routines during common			Tion II and				
instruction will be coordinated and aligned with grade level core instruction and instructional routines during common			Tier II and				
will be coordinated and aligned with grade level core instruction and instructional routines during common			instruction				
coordinated and aligned with grade level core instruction and instructional routines during common			urill bo				
and aligned with grade level core instruction and instructional routines during common			coordinated				
with grade level core instruction and instructional routines during common			and aligned				
level core instruction and instructional routines during common			with grade				
instruction and instructional routines during common			level core				
and instructional routines during common			instruction				
instructional routines during common			and				
routines during common			instructional				
during common			routines				
common			during				
			common				
planning			planning				
time.			time.				

June 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811

Revised April 29, 2011

Mathematics Goal #4A: Based on the 2013 FCAT, the percentage of students in the lowest quartile making learning gains will increase from 65% to 75%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	65% (52)	75% (60)					
		4A.2. Students do not comprehend complex, multi-step text to accurately solve math word problems	4A.2. Students will use Visualizing and Verbalizing strategies, writing, drawing and manipulatives during math instruction	4A.2. Administration, math resource teacher, classroom teachers	4A.2. Math PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk- throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	4A.2. Unit assessments, math journals, student work samples, Core K-12	

		4A3 The	4A 3 Training and coaching	14.3 Administration math	4A 3 Math PD notes grade	44.3 Unit assessments	
		instructional	will be provided to ensure	resource teacher classroom	level PLC notes walk-	math journals student	
		delivery	the instructional delivery	teachers	throughs observations	work samples Core K-12	
		model does	model includes centers	teachers	and student data discussed	work samples, core it 12	
		not include	inquiry-based activities		during PLCs and data		
		inquiry_	iournal writing and		shares lesson plans		
		hased	collaborative structures		shares, lesson plans		
		routines	conaborative structures				
		that provide	Tagahara will implement				
		ample	a routine that includes				
		ample	a routille that includes				
		for students	to practice, provide and				
		to prostion	to practice, preview and				
		nraviaw and	dete				
		raviou becad	uaia.				
		on pro tost	1				
		doto					
		uata.					
4B. Florida	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.		
Alternate							
Assessment:							
Percentage of							
students in lowest							
25% making							
learning gains in							
mathematics.							
Mathematics Goal	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
#4B:	Level of	Level of	-				
	Performance:*	Performance:*	-				
Enter narrative for the			-				
goal in this box.			-				
			-				
			-				
	Enter numerical	Enter numerical					
	current level of	expected level of					
	performance in	performance in					
	unis dox.	4B 2	4B 2	4B 2	4B 2	4B 2	
		1.2.2.					

June 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811 Revised April 29, 2011
	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. In six years	Baseline data 2010-2011						
school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	33%	39%	45%	50%	56%	62%	67%
Mathematics Goal #5A: The percent of students scoring a level 1 or level 2 (67%) will decrease by 50% by 2016- 2017.							
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

	CD 1	T 1 11	1 A 1 1 1 A 1		.	
5B. Student		5B.1. Teachers will	5B.1. Administration, math	5B.1. Math PD notes, grade	5B.1. Unit assessments,	
subgroups by	White: Lack of math	participate in scheduled	resource teacher, classroom	level PLC notes, walk-	math journals, student	
ethnicity (White,	content knowledge	math PLCs designed to	teachers	throughs, observations	work samples, Core K-12	
Black, Hispanic,	to effectively plan,	deepen their math content		and student data discussed	_	
Asian, American	instruct and assess for	knowledge using resources		during PLCs and data		
Indian) not making	analytical learning and	from Think Central and		shares, lesson plans		
satisfactory progress	understanding.	District/School math		F		
in mathematics.		resource teachers				
in mathematics.	Black: Lack of math					
	content knowledge					
	to effectively plan					
	instruct and assess for					
	analytical learning and					
	understanding					
	understanding.					
	Limenia, Leel, of moth					
	Hispanic: Lack of math					
	content knowledge					
	to effectively plan,					
	instruct and assess for					
	analytical learning and					
	understanding.					

Mathematics Goal	2012 Current Level of	2013 Expected Level of			
#5B:	Performance:*	Performance:*			
<u>#3D.</u>					
D					
Based upon the 2013					
FCAT:					
The percentage of					
students in the white					
subgroup gooring o					
subgroup scoring a					
level 3 or higher will					
increase from 49% to					
65%.					
The percentage of					
students in the black					
students in the black					
subgroup scoring a					
level 3 or higher will					
increase from 35% to					
50%.					
The percentage					
of student in the					
Hispanic subgroup					
scoring a level 3 or					
higher will increase					
from 38% to 55%.					
	White [.]	White [.]			
	49% (54)	65% (72)			
	$D_{100}(34)$	Dials:			
		DIACK.			
	35% (18)	50% (26)			
	Hispanic:	Hispanic:			
	38% (58)	55% (84)			
	Asian:	Asian:			
	American Indian:	American Indian:			

5B.2. White: Stu understand and apply thinking (metacognitive solving comple word problems Black: Student understand and apply thinking (metacognitive solving comple word problems Hispanic: Stud understand and apply thinking (metacognitive solving comple word problems	adents don't5B.2. Grade level teams willI how tobe provided time to planand develop purposefuland develop purposefulaud develop purposefulquestions based on pre-testb) whenquestions based on pre-testcx, multi-stepdata that support higher-cs.Students will usevisualizing and Verbalizingstrategiesb) whenex, multi-stepcs.ents don'tI how tostrategiesb) whenex, multi-stepcs.ents don'tI how tostrategieschow to <td< th=""><th>5B.2. Administration, math resource teacher, classroom teachers</th><th>5B.2. Math PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk- throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans</th><th>5B.2. Unit assessments, math journals, student work samples, Core K-12</th><th></th></td<>	5B.2. Administration, math resource teacher, classroom teachers	5B.2. Math PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk- throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	5B.2. Unit assessments, math journals, student work samples, Core K-12	
---	--	---	--	--	--

i			Í.	i	ii
	5B.3. White: The	5B.3. Training and coaching	5B.3. Administration,	5B.3. Math PD notes,	5B.3. Unit
	instructional delivery model	will be provided to ensure	math resource teacher,	grade level PLC	assessments,
	does not include inquiry-	the instructional delivery	classroom teachers	notes, walk-throughs,	math
	based routines that provide	model includes centers,		observations and student	journals,
	ample opportunities for	inquiry-based activities,		data discussed during	student work
	students to practice, preview	journal writing and		PLCs and data shares,	samples,
	and review based on pre-test	collaborative structures		lesson plans	Core K-12
	data.			_	
		Teachers will implement			
	Black: The instructional	a routine that includes			
	delivery model does not	opportunities for students to			
	include inquiry-based	practice, preview and review	7		
	routines that provide ample	based on assessment data.			
	opportunities for students				
	to practice, preview and				
	review based on pre-test				
	data.				
	Hispanic: The instructional				
	delivery model does not				
	include inquiry based				
	routines that provide ample				
	opportunities for students				
	to practice, preview and				
	review based on pre-test				
	data				
	uaia.				

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

5C. English	5C.1. Lack of	5C.1.	5C.1. Administration, math	5C.1. Math PD notes, grade	5C.1. Unit assessments,	
Language Learners	collaborative	Teachers	resource teacher, classroom	level PLC notes, walk-	math journals, student	
(ELL) not making	planning	will	teachers, ELL Resource	throughs, observations	work samples, Core K-12	
satisfactory progress	that focuses	participate	teacher	and student data discussed	_	
in mathematics.	on what	in scheduled		during PLCs and data		
	students	math PLCs		shares, lesson plans		
	need to	designed to				
	Know,	deepen their				
	Understand	math content				
	and Do	knowledge				
	during Core	using				
	Instruction	resources				
	connected	from Think				
	with ELL	Central and				
	Interventions	District/				
		School math				
		resource				
		teachers to				
		collaborat				
		ively plan				
		for Tier 2				
		and Tier 3				
		interventions				
		Tier II and				
		Tier III				
		instruction				
		will be				
		coordinated				
		and aligned				
		with grade				
		level core				
		instruction				
		and				
		instructional				
		routines				
		during				
		common				
		planning				
		time				

Mathematics Goal #5C: Based on the 2013 FCAT, the percentage of ELL students scoring a 3 or higher will increase from 6% to 40%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	6% (2)	40% (13)					
		5C.2. Students do not comprehend complex, multi-step text to accurately solve math word problems	5C.2. Students will use Visualizing and Verbalizing strategies, writing, drawing and manipulatives during math instruction	5C.2. Administration, math resource teacher, classroom teachers, ELL Resource teacher	5C.2. Math PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk- throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	5C.2. Unit assessments, math journals, student work samples, Core K-12	

							î.
		5C.3. The	5C.3. Training and coaching	5C.3. Administration, math	5C.3. Math PD notes, grade	5C.3. Unit assessments,	
		instructional	will be provided to ensure	resource teacher, classroom	level PLC notes, walk-	math journals, student	
		delivery	the instructional delivery	teachers, ELL Resource	throughs, observations	work samples, Core K-12	
		model does	model includes centers,	teacher	and student data discussed		
		not include	inquiry-based activities,		during PLCs and data		
		inquiry-	journal writing and		shares, lesson plans		
		based	collaborative structures		_		
		routines					
		that provide	Teachers will implement				
		ample	a routine that includes				
		opportunities	opportunities for students				
		for students	to practice, preview and				
		to practice,	review based on assessment				
		preview and	data.				
		review based					
		on pre-test					
		data.					
Based on the analysis	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
of student achievement	Barrier		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
"Guiding Questions"							
identify and define areas							
in need of improvement							
for the following							
subgroup:							

5D. Students	5D.1. Lack of	5D.1.	5D.1. Administration, math	5D.1. Math PD notes, grade	5D.1. Unit assessments,	
with Disabilities	collaborative	Teachers	resource teacher, classroom	level PLC notes, walk-	math journals, student	
(SWD) not making	planning	will	teachers, Intervention/ESE	throughs, observations	work samples, Core K-12	
satisfactory progress	that focuses	participate	teacher	and student data discussed	-	
in mathematics.	on what	in scheduled		during PLCs and data		
	students	math PLCs		shares, lesson plans		
	need to	designed to		_		
	Know,	deepen their				
	Understand	math content				
	and Do	knowledge				
	during Core	using				
	Instruction	resources				
	connected	from Think				
	with Tier 2	Central and				
	and Tier 3	District/				
	Interventions	School math				
		resource				
		teachers to				
		collaborat				
		ively plan				
		for Tier 2				
		and Tier 3				
		interventions				
		T. II 1				
		Tier II and				
		l ier III				
		instruction				
		will be				
		coordinated				
		and aligned				
		instruction				
		and				
		instructional				
		routines				
		during				
		common				
		nlanning				
		time				
		ume				

Mathematics Goal #5D: The percentage of SWD scoring a 3 or higher will increase from 24% to 40%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	24% (17)	40% (28)					
		5D.2. Students do not comprehend complex, multi-step text to accurately solve math word problems	5D.2. Students will use Visualizing and Verbalizing strategies, writing, drawing and manipulatives during math instruction	5D.2. Administration, math resource teacher, classroom teachers, Intervention/ESE teacher	5D.2. Math PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk- throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	5D.2. Unit assessments, math journals, student work samples, Core K-12	

5D.3. The	5D.3. Training and coaching	5D.3. Administration, math	5D.3. Math PD notes. grade	5D.3. Unit assessments.	
instructional	will be provided to ensure	resource teacher. classroom	level PLC notes, walk-	math journals, student	
delivery	the instructional delivery	teachers Intervention/ESE	throughs observations	work samples Core K-12	
model does	model includes centers	teacher	and student data discussed		
not include	inquiry-based activities		during PLCs and data		
inquiry_	iournal writing and		shares lesson plans		
hased	collaborative structures		shares, lesson plans		
routines	condonative structures				
that provide	Taachars will implement				
unat provide	a routing that includes				
ampie	a foutille that includes				
opportunities	opportunities for students				
for students	to practice, preview and				
to practice,	review based on assessment				
preview and	data.				
review based					
on pre-test					
data.					

Based on the analysis of student achievement	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
data and reference to			1 0				
"Guiding Questions,"							
identify and define areas							
in need of improvement							
subgroup.							
5E. Economically	5E.1. Lack of	5E.1.	5E.1. Administration, math	5E.1. Math PD notes, grade	5E.1. Unit assessments,		
Disadvantaged	math content	Teachers will	resource teacher, classroom	level PLC notes, walk-	math journals, student		
students not making	knowledge	participate	teachers	throughs, observations	work samples, Core K-12		
satisfactory progress	to	in scheduled		and student data discussed	1 /		
in mathematics.	effectively	math PLCs		during PLCs and data			
	plan.	designed to		shares, lesson plans			
	instruct and	deepen their		F			
	assess for	math content					
	analytical	knowledge					
	learning and	using					
	understandin	resources					
	anaerstanan	from Think					
	5.	Central and					
		District/					
		School math					
		resource					
		teachers					
		louonois					
Mathematics Goal	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
<u>#5E:</u>	Level of Performance:*	Level of Performance:*					
	r erformatice.	r criofinance.					
Based on the 2013							
FCAT, the percentage							
of Economically							
Disadvantaged							
Students scoring a 3							
or higher will increase							
from 37% to 50%.							
1			1			1	1

37% (105)	50% (141)					
	5E.2. Students don't understand and how to apply thinking strategies (metacogni tive) when solving complex, multi- step word problems.	5E.2. Grade level teams will be provided time to plan and develop purposeful questions based on pre-test- data that support higher- order thinking strategies. Students will use Visualizing and Verbalizing strategies, writing, drawing and manipulatives during math instruction	5E.2. Administration, math resource teacher, classroom teachers	5E.2. Math PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk- throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	5E.2. Unit assessments, math journals, student work samples, Core K-12	
	SE.3. The instructional delivery model does not include inquiry- based routines that provide ample opportunities for students to practice, preview and review based on pre-test data.	5E.3. Training and coaching will be provided to ensure the instructional delivery model includes centers, inquiry-based activities, journal writing and collaborative structures Teachers will implement a routine that includes opportunities for students to practice, preview and review based on assessment data.	5E.3. Administration, math resource teacher, classroom teachers	5E.3. Math PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk- throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	5E.3. Unit assessments, math journals, student work samples, Core K-12	

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

School Mathema	Problem-						
	Solving						
	Process to						
	Increase						
	Student						
	Achievem						
	ent						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT 2.0:	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.		
Students scoring at							
Achievement Level 3							
in mathematics.	2012 0	2012 5 4 1					
Mathematics Goal	Level of	Level of					
#1 <u>A.</u>	Performance:*	Performance:*					
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.							
	Enter numerical	Enter numerical					
	data for current level of performance in this box.	data for expected level of performance in this box.					
		1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	

1B. Florida	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Alternate							
Assessment:							
Students scoring at							
Levels 4, 5, and 6 in							
mathematics.							
Mathematics Goal	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
<u>#1B:</u>	Level of Performance:*	Level of Performance:*					
	renormance.	r errormance.					
Enter narrative for the							
goui in inis 001.							
	T						
	Enter numerical data for	Enter numerical data for					
	current level of	expected level of					
	performance in this box	performance in this box					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Ouestions"	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:							
2A. FCAT 2.0:	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.		
Students scoring							
at or above							
Achievement							
Levels 4 and 5 in							
mathematics.							
Mathematics Goal_ #2A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.							
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
		2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		

Mathematics Goal_ #2B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.							
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions,"	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:							
3A. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.		
Mathematics Goal #3A: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
		3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	
		3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	
3B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		

Mathematics Goal_ #3B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.							
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

Based on the analysis	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
of student achievement	Barrier		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
data and reference to							
Guiding Questions,							
in need of improvement							
for the following group:							
4A FCAT 2 0.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.		
Percentage of							
students in lowest							
25% making							
2.5 70 making							
learning gains in							
mathematics.							
Mathematics Goal	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
<u>#4A:</u>	Level of Parformanaa:*	Level of Parformance:*					
	renormance.	renomance.					
Enter narrative for the							
goal in this box.							
	Enter numerical	Enter numerical					
	data for	data for					
	current level of	expected level of					
	this box.	this box.					
		4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	
		4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	
AD Elorido	4B 1	4B 1	4B 1	4B 1	4B 1	<u> </u>	
4D. FIOTIUA	TD.1.		п <u>р.</u> 1.				
Alternate							
Assessment:							
Percentage of							
students in lowest							
25% making							
learning gains in							
mathematics							

Mathematics Goal_ #4B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.							
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
		4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	
		4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	

Based on ambitious	2011 2012	2012 2013	2013 2014	2014 2015	2015 2016	2016 2017	
based on anothous	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2013-2010	2010-2017	
but achievable Annual							
Measurable Objectives							
(AMOs), identify							
reading and mathematics							
performance target for							
the following years							
5A. In six years,	Baseline data 2010-2011						
school will reduce							
their achievement							
gan hy 50%							
gap by 5070.							
Mathematics Goal							
wathematics Obar							
<u>#5A:</u>							
Enter narrative for the							
goal in this box.							
-							
Based on the analysis	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
of student achievement	i interpatea Barrier	Sumegy	Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
data and reference to			Responsible for Wontering	Effectiveness of Strategy			
"Cuiding Questions"							
identify and define areas							
identify and define areas							
in need of improvement							
for the following							
subgroups:							
5B. Student	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.		
subgrouns by	White:						
subgioups by	Black:						
etnnicity (white,	Hispanic:						
Black, Hispanic,	Asian:						
Asian, American	American Indian:						
Indian) not making							
satisfactory progress							
in mathematics							
min mathematics.		1	1	1	1	1	

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

Based on the analysis	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
of student achievement	Barrier		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
data and reference to							
"Guiding Questions,"							
identify and define areas							
in need of improvement							
for the following							
subgroup:							
5C. English	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.		
Language Learners							
(FII) not molying							
(ELL) not making							
satisfactory progress							
in mathematics.							
Mathematics Goal	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
#5C:	Level of	Level of					
	Performance:*	Performance:*					
Enter narrative for the							
goal in this box.							
-							
	E						
	Enter numerical	Enter numerical					
	autu jor current level of	expected level of					
	performance in	performance in					
	this box.	this box.					
		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
Based on the analysis	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
of student achievement	Barrier		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
data and reference to							
"Guiding Questions,"							
identify and define areas							
in need of improvement							
for the following							
subgroup:							

5D. Students	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.		
with Disabilities							
(SWD) not making							
satisfactory progress							
in mathematics.							
Mathematics Goal	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
<u>#5D:</u>	Level of Performance:*	Level of Performance:*					
Enter narrative for the							
goal in this box.							
	Enter numerical	Enter numerical					
	aata jor current level of	aata jor expected level of					
	performance in	performance in					
	inis oox.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
		50.1		(D.)	(D. 2	(D. 2	
		эD. <u>3</u> .	р . .з.	DD.3.	טעט.3.	SD.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
subgroup:							
5E. Economically	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.		
Disadvantaged							
students not making							
satisfactory progress							
in mathematics.							
Mathematics Goal #5E: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
		5E. <mark>2</mark> .	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	
		5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals
Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

_								
Sch	ool Mathemat	Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achievem ent						
	Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
	1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
] 	Mathematics Goal #1: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
ľ			1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in mathematics.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Mathematics Goal #2: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

Based on the analysis	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
of student achievement	Barrier		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
data and reference to							
"Guiding Questions"							
identify and define areas							
in need of improvement							
for the following group:							
for the following group.	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1		
3. Florida Alternate	5.1.	5.1.	5.1.	5.1.	5.1.		
Assessment:							
Percentage of							
students making							
learning gains in							
mathematics.							
Mathematics Goal #3:	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
	Level of	Level of					
Enter narrative for the	Performance:*	Performance:*					
goal in this hor							
50							
	Enter numerical	Enter numerical					
	data for	data for					
	current level of	expected level of					
	performance in	performance in					
	this box.	this box.					
		2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.2	
		5.2.	5.2.	5.2.	5.2.	5.2.	
		3 3	3 3	3.3	3 3	3 3	
		5.5.	5.5.	5.5.	5.5.	5.5.	
Based on the analysis	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool	1	
of student achievement	Barrier	Sumogy	Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
data and reference to	Darrier		Responsible for wontoring	Effectiveness of Sualegy			
Guiding Questions,"							
identify and define areas							
in need of improvement							
for the following group:							

4. Florida Alternate 4.1.	4	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.		
Assessment:							
Percentage of							
students in lowest							
25% making							
learning gains in							
mathematics.							
Mathematics Goal #4: 2012	<u>2 Current</u>	2013 Expected					
Ender a second a Perfe	ormance *	Level of Performance [*]					
Enter narrative for the		errormance.					
Som in mis bow							
Enton	w numerical 1	Enter numerical					
data f	for a	lata for					
curre	ent level of	expected level of					
perfor this b	box. t	this box.					
	4	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	
	/	1.2	4.2	4.3	1 2	1 2	
	ľ	+.3.	4 .3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
for the following group:							
2. Students scoring	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
at or above							
Achievement Levels							
4 and 5 in Algebra 1.							
Algebra Goal #2: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for					
	current level of performance in this box.	expected level of performance in this box.					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

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

Algebra 1 Goal #3B: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

Based on the analysis	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
of student achievement	Barrier		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
data and reference to							
"Guiding Questions,"							
identify and define areas							
for the following							
subgroup.							
3C English	3C 1	3C 1	3C 1	3C 1	3C 1		
I anguaga I aarnars	50	50.11					
(FII) not making							
(EEE) not making							
satisfactory progress							
in Algebra I.							
<u>Algebra 1 Goal #3C:</u>	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
	Level <u>01</u> Performance:*	Level of Performance:*					
Enter narrative for the	r chormanee.	r crionnance.					
goai in this box.							
	Tradam and a start	Frates and a l					
	Lnter numericat data for	data for					
	current level of	expected level of					
	performance in	performance in					
	this box.	this box.	20.2	20.2	202	20.2	
		3C.2.	30.2.	30.2.	30.2.	30.2.	
		3C 3	3C 3	3C 3	3C 3	3C 3	
		50.5.			0.0.0		
Based on the analysis	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
of student achievement	Barrier		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
data and reference to							
"Guiding Questions,"							
identify and define areas							
for the following							
subgroup.							
3D Students	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.		
with Disabilities							
(SWD) not moking							
(SWD) not making							
satisfactory progress							
in Algebra 1.							

Algebra 1 Goal #3D: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
		3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	
		3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	

Based on the analysis	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
of student achievement	Barrier		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
data and reference to							
"Guiding Questions,"							
identify and define areas							
in need of improvement							
subgroup:							
	3E 1	3E 1	3F 1	3F 1	2E 1		
SE. Economically	50.1.	50.1.	51.1.	51.1.	5E.1.		
Disadvantaged							
students not making							
satisfactory progress							
in Algebra 1.							
Algebra 1 Goal #3E:	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
	Level of	Level of					
Enter narrative for the	Performance:*	Performance:*					
goal in this box.							
	Enter numerical	Enter numerical					
	aata jor currant laval of	aata jor avpactad laval of					
	performance in	performance in					
	this box.	this box.					
		3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	
		3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
for the following group:	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1	2.1		
2. Students scoring	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
at or above							
Achievement Levels							
4 and 5 in Geometry.							
Geometry Goal #2: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for					
	current level of performance in this box.	expected level of performance in this box.					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
the following years	D 11					
3A. In six years,	Baseline					
school will reduce	data 2011-					
gap by 50%.	2012					
Geometry Goal #3A:						
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroups:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.	3B.1. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	

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

Based on the analysis	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
of student achievement	Barrier		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
data and reference to							
"Guiding Questions,"							
identify and define areas							
in need of improvement							
for the following							
subgroup:	201	201	201	201	201		
3C. English	3C.1.	3C.1.	30.1.	30.1.	30.1.		
Language Learners							
(ELL) not making							
satisfactory progress							
in Geometry.							
Geometry Goal #3C:	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
Sconledy Gour #30.	Level of	Level of					
Enter narrative for the	Performance:*	Performance:*					
goal in this box.							
0							
	Enter numerical	Enter numerical					
	data for	data for					
	current level of	expected level of					
	performance in	performance in					
	this box.	this box.	202	202			
		3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	
		2C 2	20.2	2C 2	20.3	2C 3	
		50.5.	50.5.	50.5.	50.5.	50.5.	
Based on the analysis	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
of student achievement	Barrier		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
data and reference to			, i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i				
"Guiding Questions,"							
identify and define areas							
in need of improvement							
for the following							
subgroup:							
3D. Students	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.		
with Disabilities							
(SWD) not making							
satisfactory progress							
in Coomotry							
in Geometry.							

Geometry Goal #3D: Enter narrative for the	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
goal in this box.							
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
		3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	
		3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
subgroup:							
3E. Economically	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.		
Disadvantaged							
students not making							
satisfactory progress							
in Geometry.							
Geometry Goal #3E: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* Enter numerical data for					
	current level of performance in this box.	expected level of performance in this box.					
		3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	3E.2.	
		3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	3E.3.	

End of Geometry EOC Goals

Mathematics Professional Development

Professional			
Development			
(PD) aligned with			
Strategies through			
Professional			
Learning			

Community (PLC) or PD Activities Please note that each strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Math Content Knowledge	K-5	District Trainer, Math Resource Teacher, Administration	PLC	August, 2012-May, 2013	School-based facilitator, PLC discussions, and model classrooms Coaching and lesson plan support with the Math Resource Teacher	Math Resource Teacher, Administration
Standards of Professional Practices	K-5	District Trainer, Math Resource Teacher, Administration	School-Wide	August 8-9, 2012	School-based facilitator, PLC discussions, and model classrooms Coaching and lesson plan support with the Math Resource Teacher	Math Resource Teacher, Administration
Math-CCSS	K-5	District Trainer, Math Resource Teacher, Administration	PLC	August, 2012-May, 2013	School-based facilitator, PLC discussions, and model classrooms Coaching and lesson plan support with the Math Resource Teacher	Math Resource Teacher, Administration

Mathematics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

Motivate and Engage students in math problem solving	Computer based programs	Title 1	\$5000.00
Subtotal:\$5,000.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Standards of Mathematical Practices	Stipends	Title 1	7,000.00
Math-CCSS	Stipends, Substitutes	Title 1	\$4,000.00
Subtotal:\$11,000.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Modeling, Coaching and Training	Math Resource Teacher	Title 1	\$30.000.00
Subtotal:\$30,000.00			
Total:\$46,000.00			

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]).

Elementary and Middle Science Goals	Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achievem ent					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.	1A.1. Limited knowledge in analyzing science assessment data to plan for inquiry based lessons that connect with Science NG- SSS.	1A.1. Grade level teams will plan inquiry- based lessons connected with labs, which are connected to Science NG-SSS and based upon Core K-12 science data.	1A.1. Administration, classroom teachers	1A.1. Science PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	1A.1. Unit assessments, science journals, student work samples, Core K-12	

Science Goal #1A: The percent of students scoring a level 3 will increase from 24% to 50% based on the 2013 FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	24% (21)	50% (43) 1A.2. Extending and refining learning strategies are not consistently implemented in core science instruction	1A.2. Classroom teachers will utilize Moodle, learning logs, inquiry-based labs and technology as instructional tools to extend learning in science.	1A.2. Administration, classroom teachers	1A.2. Science PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	1A.2. Unit assessments, science journals, student work samples, Core K-12	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		

Science Goal #1B: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2A. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.	2A.1. Limited knowledge in analyzing science assessment data to plan for inquiry based lessons that connect with Science NG- SSS.	2A.1. Grade level teams will plan inquiry- based lessons connected with labs, which are connected to Science NG-SSS and based upon Core K-12 science data.	2A.1. Administration, math resource teacher, classroom teachers	2A.1. Science PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	2A.1. Unit assessments, science journals, student work samples, Core K-12		

Science Goal #2A: The percent of students scoring a level 4 and 5 will increase from 8% to 20% based on the 2013 FCAT.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	8% (7)	20% (17) 2A.2. Extending and refining learning strategies are not consistently implemented in core science instruction.	2A.2. Classroom teachers will utilize Moodle, learning logs, inquiry-based labs and technology as instructional tools to extend learning in science.	2A.2. Administration, math resource teacher, classroom teachers	2A.2. Science PD notes, grade level PLC notes, walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares, lesson plans	2A.2. Unit assessments, science journals, student work samples, Core K-12	
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	
2B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in science.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		

	Science Goal #2B: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
		Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
ĺ			2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	

End of Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

High School Science Goals	Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achievem ent						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Science Goal #1: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Danad an the amplantia	Auticiantal	Cturnt a mar	Damaan an Daaitian	Des sons Used to Determine	E l ti Tl		
Based on the analysis	Anticipated	Strategy	Person of Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation 1001		
of student achievement	Barrier		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
data, and reference to							
"Guiding Questions",							
identify and define areas							
in need of improvement							
for the following group:							
2. Florida Alternate	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Assessment:							
Students scoring at							
or above Level 7 in							
science.							
Science Goal #2.	2012 Current	2013Expected					
<u>Bereinee Gour #2.</u>	Level of	Level of					
Enter narrative for the	Performance:*	Performance:*					
coal in this hoy							
goui in inis box.							
	Enter numerical	Enter numerical					
	data for	data for					
	current level of	expected level of					
	performance in	performance in					
	this dox.	this box.				2.2	
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
						1	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

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

	ent						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Students scoring	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
at Achievement							
Level 3 in Biology 1.							
Biology 1 Goal #1: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Biology 1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		

Biology 1 Goal #2: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

End of Biology 1 EOC Goals

Science Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Inquiry based Science Lessons	K-5	District Trainer	Grade-level PLC	3x year – substitutes and stipends	Lesson Plans, walkthroughs, Core K-12	Administration

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Science collaborative planning	Stipends	Title 1	\$2,000.00
Subtotal:\$2,000.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Inquiry-based learning	Science lab materials	Title 1	\$5,000.00
Subtotal:\$5,000.00			
Total:\$7,0000.00			

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Writing Goals	Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achievem ent						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1A. FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.	1A.1. Lack of instruction in grammar, spelling and conventions utilizing MMH resources.	1A.1. Additional time will be scheduled to ensure implement ation of the language arts component using MMH treasures	1A.1. Administration, literacy coach, classroom teachers	1A.1. Walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	1A.1. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes, demand writing		
Writing Goal #1A: The percentage of 4 th grade students achieving Level 3.0 in FCAT Writes will increase from 79% to 90%.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
--	---	---	---	---	---	--	--
	79% (71)	90% (82)					
		IA.2. Scoring and feedback on student writing is not consistent across vertical and horizontal teams.	1A.2. Professional development, coaching and mentoring will be offered in student conferencing, scoring and writing rubrics. Develop common writing rubrics that clearly outline student expectations in the writing process, grammar, conventions, & spelling	1A.2. Administration, literacy coach, classroom teachers	IA.2. Walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	1A.2. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes, demand writing	
		1A.3. Lack of opportunities for students to write across the curriculum in response to reading.	1A.3. Students will use a writing log throughout all content areas to respond to learning and reading	1A.3. Administration, literacy coach, classroom teachers	1A.3. Walk-throughs, observations and student data discussed during PLCs and data shares	1A.3. Weekly and unit assessments, journals, student conferencing notes	

1B. Florida	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Alternate							
Assessment:							
Students scoring at 4							
or higher in writing.							
Writing Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of						
Enter narrative for the	Performance:*	2013 Expected					
goal in this box.		Level of					
		Performance:*					
	Enter numerical	Enter numerical					
	aata jor current level of	aata for expected level of					
	performance in	performance in					
	this dox.	1B 2	1B 2	1B 2	1B 2	1B 2	
		10.2.	12.2.	10.2.	10.2.	10.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

Writing Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or						
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
Student conferencing, rubric and scoring	K-5	Literacy Coach	Grade level PLC	August, 2012-May, 2013	Lesson plans, PLC meeting notes, Walkthroughs, Writing	Administration, literacy coach

Writing Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Student conferencing, rubric development and scoring	Stipends, substitutes	Title 1	\$4000.00
Subtotal:\$4000.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:\$4,000.00			

End of Writing Goals

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
Civics Goal #2: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

Civics Professional Development

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

Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

Civics Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

Subtotal:		
Total:		

End of Civics Goals

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

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

		i i					
U.S. History	Problem-						
EOC Goals	Solving						
	Process to						
	Increase						
	Student						
	Achievem						
	ont						
	ent						
Based on the analysis	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
of student achievement	Barrier		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
data and reference to							
identify and define areas							
in need of improvement							
for the following group:							
1. Students scoring	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
at Achievement							
Level 3 in U.S.							
History.							
U.S. History Goal #1:	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
	Level of	Level of					
Enter narrative for the	Performance:*	Performance:*					
goal in this box.							
	Enter numerical	Enter numerical					
	data for	data for					
	performance in	expected level of performance in					
	this box.	this box.					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		13	1 3	1 3	1 3	1 3	
		1.3.	1.5.	1.5.	1.5.	1.5.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in U.S. History.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
U.S. History Goal #2: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	

U.S. History Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

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

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

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

End of U.S. History Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Attendance Goal(s)	Problem- solving Process to Increase Attendan ce					
Based on the analysis of attendance data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1. Attendance	1.1. There are not enough powerful incentives for attending school or consequ ences for excessively missing school.	1.1. An incentive plan will be developed for students who have met their attendance goal. Students who have excessive absences and tardies will be assigned a mentor and parents will be contacted on a consistent basis.	1.1. Guidance counselor, social worker, PBS team, CSC Counselors	1.1. The PBS team will analyze attendance data on a quarterly basis.	1.1. School-wide and Individual student attendance rates.	

Attendance Goal #1:	2012 Current Attendance	2013 Expected Attendance					
The percent of	Rate:*	Rate:*					
students with							
excessive absences							
and tardies will							
decrease by at least							
20%							
2070.							
	94%.	96%					
	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
	Number of	Number of					
	Students with	Students with					
	Excessive	Excessive					
	Absences (10 or more)	Absences (10 or more)					
	<u>(10 01 more)</u>	<u>(10 01 more)</u>					
	35% (231)	15% (99)					
	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
	Number of	Number of Students with					
	Excessive	Excessive					
	Tardies (10 or	Tardies (10 or					
	more)	more)					
	22% (142)	10% (66)					
	· · · ·	× ,					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
1							

Attendance Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity						
Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

Attendance Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Attendance awards	Trophies and Certificates	Title 1	\$500.00
Subtotal:\$500.00			
Total:\$500.00			

End of Attendance Goals

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Suspension Goal(s) Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Problem- solving Process to Decrease Suspension Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1. Suspension	1.1. Replacement behaviors are not taught, modeled and practiced throughout the day.	1.1. The guidance counselor and behavior specialist will conduct intervention groups to practice replacement behaviors for aggression	1.1. Administration	1.1. Quarterly discipline reports will be analyzed	1.1. Discipline Reports	
Suspension Goal #1: The total number suspensions and students suspended (In-school and Out- of-School) will decrease by 25%.	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					
6	4					
2012 Total Number of Out-of- School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
28	21					
2012 Total Number of Students. Suspended Out- of- School	2013 Expected Number of Students. Suspended Out- of-School					
6	4					
	1.2. Discipline issues are not being reported or recorded accurately to facilitate problem-solving	1.2. Clearly communicate procedures and referral flowchart with staff.	1.2. Administration	1.2. Quarterly discipline reports will be analyzed	1.2. Discipline Reports and discipline tracker	
	1.3. Suspensions have little effect on changing students behavior	1.3. Implement a mentorship program for students who have ingoing discipline issues.	1.3. Administration	1.3. Quarterly discipline reports will be analyzed	1.3. Discipline Reports	

Suspension Professional Development

Professional			
Development			
(PD) aligned with			
Strategies through			
Professional			
Learning			

Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Tier II and Tier III Problem-solving	K-5	PBT Facilitator	PBT team and grade level PLC	Monthly – August, 2012- May, 2013	Discipline referral data and Discipline Tracker	Administration, Behavior Specialist

Suspension Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

Behavior Incentives	Guest speakers, Bounce House, Tangibles	Title 1	\$2000.00
Subtotal:\$2000.00			
Total:\$2000.00			

End of Suspension Goals

Dropout Prevention Goal(s) Note: Required for High School- F.S., Sec. 1003.53

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

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)	Problem- solving Process to Dropout Prevention					
Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1. Dropout Prevention	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	
Dropout Prevention Goal #1: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. *Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2011-2012 school year.	2012 Current Dropout Rate:*	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*				
	Enter numerical data for dropout rate in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected dropout rate in this box.				

2012 Current Graduation Rate:*	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*					
Enter numerical data for graduation rate in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected graduation rate in this box.					
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Dropout Prevention Professional Development

Professional						
Development						
(PD) aligned with						
Strategies through						
Professional						
Learning						
Community (PLC)						
or PD Activity						
Please note that each						
Strategy does not require a						
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

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)	Problem- solving Process to Parent Involveme nt	Stratagy	Derson or Decition	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Barrier	Strategy	Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation 1001		
1. Parent Involvement	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Parent Involvement Goal #1: Enter narrative for the goal in this box. *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:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of parent involvement in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of parent involvement in this box.					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Parent Involvement Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through						
Professional						
Learning						
Community (PLC)						
or PD Activity						
Please note that each						
professional development or						
PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

Parent Involvement Budget

Include only school-based funded			
activities/materials and exclude district			
funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Parent Resource Area	Books, Literature, games, curriculum practice	Title 1	\$5000.00
Subtotal:\$5000.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Parent Activities and student celebrations	Food and incentives	Title 1	\$2500.00
Provide monthly activities to involve	.5 Parent Involvement assistant	Title 1	\$8,000.00
parents in student learning			
Subtotal:\$10,500.00			
Total:\$15,500.00			

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

STEM Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
STEM Goal #1: Increase staff awareness of STEM during the 2012-13 school year.	1.1. Staff has limited knowledge of STEM.	1.1. SBLT will provide information and activities to staff members on a monthly basis.	1.1. SBLT,Tech Specialist,AdministrationMath ResourceTeacher	 1.1. Review of lesson plans for information and STEM activities Annual monitoring of guest speakers and training calendars that focused on STEM areas. 	1.1.LessonPlans, science lab calendar, training calendar
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

Professional			
Development			
(PD) aligned with			
Strategies through			
Professional			
Learning			
Community (PLC)			
or PD Activity			
Please note that each			
Strategy does not require a			
professional development or			

PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Integration od STEM	K-5	Admin., Math resource, tech specialist	School-wide	Monthly	Lesson plan, science lab calendars, training schedule	Administration

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) Goal(s)

CTE Goal(s)	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
CTE Goal #1: Increase students' awareness of career and technical opportunities.	1.1.Students have limited knowledge of career and technical opportunities.	1.1. Increase the number of guest speakers with a CTE focus.	1.1. Administration	1.1. Annual monitoring of guest speakers	1.1. Annual Activity and GATI calendar of guest speakers
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

Professional			
Development			
(PD) aligned with			
Strategies through			
Professional			
Learning			
Community (PLC)			
or PD Activity			
Please note that each			
June 2012			

Rule 6A-1.099811

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

CTE Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

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

Additional Goal(s)	Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achieveme nt						
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1. Additional Goal	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
Additional Goal #1: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	2012 Current Level :*	2013 Expected Level :*					
	Enter numerical data for current goal in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected goal in this box.					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

Additional Goals Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please not ethat 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

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

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

End of Additional Goal(s)

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)	
Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget	
	Total:\$124,000.00
CELLA Budget	
	Total:\$1,000.00
Mathematics Budget	
	Total:\$46,000.00
Science Budget	
	Total:\$7,000.00
Writing Budget	
	Total:\$4,000.00
Civics Budget	
	Total:
U.S. History Budget	
	Total:
Attendance Budget	
	Total:\$500.00
Suspension Budget	
	Tatal:\$2.000.00
Dropout Prevention Budget	10(41.02,000.00
	Totalı
Depend Invelvement Dudget	10(a).
Farent involvement budget	T.4.1.015 500.00
	10ta1:515,500.00
STEM Budget	
	Total:
CTE Budget	
	Total:
Additional Goals	
	Total:
	Grand Total:\$200,000.00
June 2012 Rule 6A-1.099811	
2012-2013 School Improvement Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
□Priority	□Focus	□Prevent

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

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

 \Box Yes \Box No

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

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

The School Advisory Council plays a vital role in the development and implementation of the School Improvement Plan. During the monthly meetings, SAC members will analyze teacher, student and parent survey data, formative and summative assessment data, attendance data, discipline data and the achievement of objectives from the 2012-13 SIP to make informed decisions regarding the development of the 2013-14 SIP. The School Advisory Council will also discuss the Title I funded programs and make decisions related to Title 1 funds to support the instructional needs of the school.

			-
Describe the projected use of SAC funds.		Amount	
Student Planners			600.00
June 2012			
Rule 6A-1.099811			
Revised April 29, 2011	181		

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