Florida Department of Education



DRAFT School Improvement Plan (SIP) Form SIP-1

Proposed for 2012-2013

2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

School Information

School Name: George Washington Carver Elementary #158	District Name: Duval County
Principal: Timothy T. Warren	Superintendent: Ed Pratt-Dannals
SAC Chair: Frankie Parsons	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)
----------	------	--------------------------------	--	---	---

		Bachelor of Science	5	10	
		in Music Education, Master of Science in Educational Leadership			Principal: George Washington Carver Elementary 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Grade: B Reading proficiency was 33%, math proficiency 56%, writing proficiency 80%, and Science proficiency 12%. Reading gains were 68%, math gains were 91%, reading low 25% was 82%, and math low 25% was 95%. There are less than ten students in the White, Hispanic, ELL, and Indian. Blacks, SWD, and Economically Disadvantage students did not make AYP in reading, while SWDs did not AYP in math. All other applicable NCLB subgroups made AYP.
					Principal: George Washington Carver Elementary 2010-2011 FCAT 2.0 Grade: D Reading proficiency was 42%, math proficiency 58%, writing proficiency 82%, and Science proficiency 9%. Reading gains were 54%, math gains were 66%, reading low 25% was 47%, and math low 25% was 70%. There are less than ten students in the White, Hispanic, ELL, and Indian. Blacks, SWD, and Economically Disadvantage students did not make AYP in reading, while SWDs did not AYP in math. All other applicable NCLB subgroups made AYP.
Principal	Timothy T. Warren				Principal: George Washington Carver Elementary 2009-2010 FCAT 2.0 Grade: C Reading proficiency was 43%, math proficiency 55%, writing proficiency 96%, and Science proficiency 35%. There are less than ten students in the White, Hispanic, ELL, and Indian. Blacks, SWD, and Economically Disadvantage students did not make AYP in reading, while SWDs did not AYP in math. All other applicable NCLB subgroups made AYP. Principal: Arlington Elementary Principal: George Washington Carver Elementary 2008-2009 FCAT 2.0 Grade: B Reading proficiency was 44%, math proficiency 55%, writing

Assistant		proficiency 88%, and Science proficiency 32%. There are less than ten students in the White, Hispanic, ELL, and Indian. Blacks, SWD, and Economically Disadvantage students did not make AYP in reading, while SWDs did not AYP in math. All other applicable NCLB subgroups made AYP. Principal: Arlington Elementary 2007-2008 FCAT 2.0 Grade: A Reading proficiency was 73%, math proficiency was 76%, writing proficiency was 73%, and science was 44%. 100% of the criteria were met by all applicable NCLB subgroups. Principal: Arlington Elementary 2006-2007 FCAT 2.0 Grade: B Reading proficiency was 66%, math proficiency was 65%, writing proficiency was 75%, and science was 41%. Economically Disadvantaged and SWDs did not make AYP in reading, while SWDs did not make AYP in math. All other NCLB subgroups made AYP. Principal: Arlington Elementary 2005-2006 FCAT 2.0 Grade: A Reading proficiency was 63%. Blacks, SWDs, and Economically Disadvantaged students did not make AYP in math. All other Reading proficiency
Principal		

Instructional Coaches

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of School Grades, FCAT/statewide assessment performance (percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and 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)
-----------------	------	--------------------------------	---	---	---

Reading	Annett Tobler	K-6 Elementary Ed	5	5	
			Ü		Reading Coach: George Washington Carver Elementary 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Grade: B Reading proficiency was 33%, math proficiency 56%, writing proficiency 80%, and Science proficiency 12%. There are less than ten students in the White, Hispanic, ELL, and Indian. Blacks, SWD, and Economically Disadvantage students did not make AYP in reading, while SWDs did not AYP in math. All other applicable NCLB subgroups made AYP
					Reading Coach: George Washington Carver Elementary 2010-2011 FCAT 2.0 Grade: D Reading proficiency was 42%, math proficiency 58%, writing proficiency 82%, and Science proficiency 9%. There are less than ten students in the White, Hispanic, ELL, and Indian. Blacks, SWD, and Economically Disadvantage students did not make AYP in reading, while SWDs did not AYP in math. All other applicable NCLB subgroups made AYP.
					Reading Coach: George Washington Carver Elementary 2009-2010 FCAT 2.0 Grade: C Reading proficiency was 43%, math proficiency 55%, writing proficiency 96%, and Science proficiency 35%. There are less than ten students in the White, Hispanic, ELL, and Indian. Blacks, SWD, and Economically Disadvantage students did not make AYP in reading, while SWDs did not AYP in math. All other applicable NCLB subgroups made AYP
					Reading Coach: George Washington Carver Elementary 2008-2009 FCAT 2.0 Grade: B Reading proficiency was 44%, math proficiency 55%, writing proficiency 88%, and Science proficiency 32%.

	There are less than ten students in the White, Hispanic, ELL, and Indian. Blacks, SWD, and Economically Disadvantage students did not make AYP in reading, while SWDs did not AYP in math. All other applicable NCLB subgroups made AYP Reading Coach: Long Branch Elementary 2007-2008 FCAT 2.0 Grade: D Reading proficiency was 44%, math proficiency 43%, writing proficiency 61%, and Science proficiency 19%. There are less than ten students in the White, Hispanic, ELL, and Indian. Blacks and Economically Disadvantage students did not make AYP in reading or math. Reading Coach: Long Branch Elementary 2006-2007 FCAT 2.0 Grade: D Reading proficiency was 36%, math proficiency 39%, writing proficiency 78%, and Science proficiency 6%. There are less than ten students in the White, Hispanic, ELL, and Indian. Blacks, SWD, and Economically Disadvantage students did not make AYP in reading or
	math.

Math	Tyra Forcine-Mobley	K-6 Elementary Ed	5	5	Math Coach: George Washington Carver Elementary 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Grade: B Reading proficiency was 33%, math proficiency 56%, writing proficiency 80%, and Science proficiency 12%. There are less than ten students in the White, Hispanic, ELL, and Indian. Blacks, SWD, and Economically Disadvantage students did not make AYP in reading, while SWDs did not AYP in math. All other applicable NCLB subgroups made AYP Math Coach 2010-2011 FCAT 2.0 Grade: D Reading proficiency was 42%, math proficiency 58%, writing proficiency 82%, and Science proficiency 9%. There are less than ten students in the White, Hispanic, ELL, and Indian. Blacks, SWD, and Economically Disadvantage students did not make AYP in reading, while SWDs did not AYP in math. All other applicable NCLB subgroups made AYP Math Coach: George Washington Carver Elementary 2008-2009 FCAT 2.0 Grade: B Math proficiency 55%, reading proficiency was 44%, writing proficiency 88%, and Science proficiency 32%. There are less than ten students in the White, Hispanic, ELL, and Indian. Blacks, SWD, and Economically Disadvantage students did not make AYP in reading, while SWDs did not AYP in math. All other applicable NCLB subgroups made AYP Math Coach: Norwood Elementary 2007-2008 FCAT 2.0 Grade: B No data available-school closed

Highly Effective Teachers

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

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date
Weekly teacher meetings with Academic Coaches	Tara Jackson, Instructional Coach, Annett Tobler, Reading Coach Tyra Mobley, Math Coach	5/13
2. Mentoring and Induction of Novice Teachers (MINT)	Annett Tobler, Professional Development Facilitator (PDF)	5/13
3. Initial Screening Observation meetings	Timothy T. Warren, Principal	11/12
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	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to
out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	support the staff in becoming highly effective

2 teachers or 7%	Alternative Certification/Teacher Induction Program/Must pass the FTCE

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
27	22% (6)	22% (6)	25% (7)	29% (8)	40% (11)	93% (25)	7% (2)	0% (0)	25% (7)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

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

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
-------------	-----------------	-----------------------	------------------------------

Nailah Abdul-Rahman	Tomia Hodge	Experienced highly qualified teacher with extensive Guided Reading training	Lesson planning OnCourse Grade Portal Classroom Observations Analyzing F.A.I.R and DRA Data
Joseph Brown	Renee Williams	Experienced highly qualified teacher with extensive success teaching in the FCAT grades	Lesson planning OnCourse Grade Portal Classroom Observations Analyzing FCAT and District Benchmark Data
Caitlin Hinrichs	Winifred Sherill	Experienced highly qualified teacher with extensive Guided Reading training	Lesson planning OnCourse Grade Portal Classroom Observations Analyzing F.A.I.R and DRA Data
Brittney Holmes	Tyra Forcine-Mobley	Experienced highly qualified teacher with extensive success teaching in the all grades	Lesson planning OnCourse Grade Portal Classroom Observations Analyzing F.A.I.R and DRA Data
Khanya Johnson	Carol Smith	Experienced highly qualified teacher with extensive success teaching in the FCAT grades to students considered "at risk"	Lesson planning OnCourse Grade Portal Classroom Observations Analyzing FCAT and District Benchmark Data
Erica Krause	Tara Jackson	Experienced highly qualified teacher with extensive Guided Reading training	Lesson planning OnCourse Grade Portal Classroom Observations Analyzing F.A.I.R and DRA Data
Holtie Murphy	Tara Jackson	Experienced highly qualified teacher with extensive Guided Reading training	Lesson planning OnCourse Grade Portal Classroom Observations Analyzing F.A.I.R and DRA Data
Tracy Nwokoh	Frankie Parsons	Experienced teacher proficient in teaching ELA	Lesson planning OnCourse Grade Portal Classroom Observations Analyzing F.A.I.R and DRA Data

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, Part C- Migrant

Title I. Part D

District provides Drop-out prevention programs to meet the various educational student needs, increase the promotion rate, and decrease the drop-out rate of all students, but especially black males.

Title II

The district provides additional funding for educational services, materials, and supplies for educational software, hardware and additional technology supplies

Title III

Support services and supplemental resources are provided through the district to improve the learning of ELLs.

Title X- Homeless

The district has social workers and counselors that work with parents/guardians of homeless children to ensure that students have acceptable housing, clothing, food, school supplies, and medical services

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI funds are used specifically to provide FCAT 2.0 Level 1 and 2 in reading and math with additional support through Saturday School, before/after school tutoring, in-school tutoring, as well as pertinent materials and curriculum.

Violence Prevention Programs

The district provides funding for various research-based programs (CHAMPS and Foundations) that reduce violence, and that improves school culture

Nutrition Programs

At the beginning of each school day, students are offered the opportunity to eat breakfast in the classroom (BIC). The benefit of Breakfast in the Classroom is students are more attentive and ready to learn from the nutritious breakfast they are receiving, as well as to encourage and provide students with the consumption of healthy foods.

Housing Programs

NA

Head Start

The district uses the VPK and Title I Pre-K program to make certain all students receive an adequate educational foundation to ensure success in school

Adult Education

NA

Career and Technical Education	
NA .	
Tob Training NA	
NA .	
Other	

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

School-Based MTSS/MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

- Timothy T. Warren, Principal
- Sariah Deligar-Howard, Guidance Counselor
- Tyra Mobley, Math/Science Coach
- Annett Tobler, Reading Coach
- Donnell Sampson, ESE Site Coach
- Robert Poole, School Psychologist
- Shivonne Troy, Behavioral Interventionist

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?

- MTSS/RTI Leadership Team meets bi-weekly in conjunction with the assessment schedule established at the school to facilitate a cohesive and comprehensive battery of district assessments.
- Meetings begin with analysis of reading and math classroom profiles that indicate the number of students scoring 80% and above on each assessment, the skill/concept being evaluated, and the percentage of students mastering each skill/concepts.
- Students not demonstrating mastery or are 25% below classroom averages are identified and progress monitored bi-weekly (Kindergarten monthly) using a variety of assessments, including assessments from the district's Learning Village/River Deep website, along with assessments created from the Florida Achieves website
- MTSS/RTI Leadership Team collects progress monitoring data on students that do not show mastery or lack significant growth (less than 30% growth) between assessments
- Guidance Counselor/MTSS/RTI Site Coach uses an excel spreadsheet to manage all MTSS/RTI progress monitoring information
- MTSS/RTI Leadership Team analyzes student performance, teacher instruction, curriculum, and environmental factors in the classroom to determine causation and to provide an effective intervention
- Provides a common vision for the use of data-based analysis and instruction
- Ensures the school-based MTSS/RtI Team is implementing and monitoring MTSS/RtI
- Develops assessments and provides documentation which ensures implementation of intervention support
- Collaborates in the design and delivery of professional development
- Communicates with parents and the community regarding school-based MTSS/RtI plans and activities
- Collaborates with colleagues to constantly evaluate and review students' performances
- Recommends instructional strategies to teachers that include reflective practices, analyzing student data, and differentiating instruction
- Implement intense interventions for Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 students
- Serves as Site Coach between teachers, students, and parents
- Models teaching and reflective practices and interventions for all school-based educators
- Encourages students to take an active role in their learning

Identifies and monitors student progress using data to make decisions about interventions and strategies regarding the effectiveness of MTSS/RtI.

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

The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team analyzes FCAT 2.0 reading, writing, math, and science data to determine areas of growth and deficiency. Recommendations based on the analysis of FCAT 2.0 data are utilized to create a comprehensive plan that will meet students instructional needs, improve teacher pedagogy, determine the most effective curriculum, and that will identify environmental factors that result in improved student achievement. The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team members assist with monitoring the implementation of the School Improvement Plan through formal/informal observation, review of lesson plans for differentiated instruction, and by analyzing student/classroom performance data to determine acceptable growth between pre-test and post-test.

MTSS Implementation

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

The school uses data from FCAT 2.0, FAIR, district benchmark assessments, PMAs, DRA, and curriculum based assessments as sources for student academic performance data. Academic data for reading, math, science, and writing are managed in the district's management system called Limelight. Data regarding absenteeism, referrals, and suspensions are managed from the district Student Information Management System (SIMS)/Genesis. The MTSS/RtI data management system consist of an excel spreadsheet which includes the following information: teacher name, student name, assessment scores (pre/post), causation factors (teacher, students, curriculum, environment), interventions (re-teach class, guided group, SES, before school/lunch/after school tutoring, Team-Up, administrative/coach support), progress monitoring (score, exit, tier, and TARGET).Color-coded cells are used to identify acceptable and insufficient growth. Net changes in each student's score will be calculated and charted for reporting. The school-based data management system also manages K-5th reading, math, writing, science performances. Additional data are collected and monitored using Houghton Mifflin Theme Tests, Selection Tests, and Benchmark Tests; Soar to Success; SRA; Open Court; and DRAs

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team utilizes training materials provided by the District MTSS/RtI Team to train teachers. A specific plan for delivering this training, including dates, trainers, topics, and materials are indicated on the school Professional Development Plan, which indicates the training on Early Release Days. During weekly morning teacher meetings, teachers will also discuss the MTSS/RtI process as a means of differentiating instruction and providing rigorous instruction.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The MTSS/RtI will receive support for additional professional development and instructional materials deemed necessary to adequately address student deficiencies.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

- Timothy T. Warren, Principal
- Annett Tobler, Reading Coach
- Tara Jackson, Reading Interventionist
- Tomia Hodge, 5th Grade Reading Teacher
- Frankie Parsons, 4th Grade Reading teacher
- Gerald Veasey, 3rd Grade Reading Teacher
- Lynn Dewolf, 2nd Grade Teacher
- Inger Pride, 1st Grade Teacher
- Holtie Murphy, Kindergarten Teacher

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

- Literacy Leadership Team meets bi-weekly in conjunction with the assessment schedule established at the school
- Meetings begin with analysis of reading classroom profiles that indicate the number of students scoring 80% and above on each FCIM mini assessment, the skill/concept being evaluated, and the percentage of students mastering each skill/concepts.
- Students not demonstrating mastery or are 25% below classroom averages are identified and progress monitored bi-weekly using a variety of assessments, including assessments from the district's Learning Village/River Deep website, along with assessments created from the Florida Achieves website, SuccessMaker, and Destination Success
- The Literacy Leadership Team reviews progress monitoring data on students that do not show mastery or lack significant growth (less than 30% growth) between reading assessments
- The Literacy Leadership Team analyzes student performance, teacher instruction, curriculum, and environmental factors in the classroom to determine causation and to provide an effective intervention
- Utilizes triangulated data from F.A.I.R, DRAs, theme tests, and curriculum-based benchmark to determine
- Recommend professional development
- Collaborates with colleagues to constantly evaluate and review students' performances
- Recommends instructional strategies to teachers that include reflective practices, analyzing student data, and differentiating instruction Models teaching and reflective practices and interventions for all school-based educators

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

- Establish a culture of collaboration within the faculty through Professional Learning Communities (faculty meeting breakout, teacher meetings am/pm, grade level planning, early release days, and data digs)
- Identify, develop and support teacher leaders
- Continue DRA and FAIR miscue and comprehension analyses
- Develop deeper understanding of Guided Reading
- Develop deeper understanding of Explicit Instruction
- Develop deeper understanding of teaching by Benchmark
- Building contextual vocabulary (reading, math, science)
- Building teacher knowledge to use authentic text to teach State Benchmarks
- Identify, review, and integrate Common Core Standards in daily lessons and FCIM calendar

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.

George Washington Carver Elementary Offers four Title 1 Pre-K programs, which includes a blended Pre-K (inclusion). The Pre-Kindergarten Criterion Referenced Test is administrated to all preschoolers as an initial diagnostic, a middle of the year update and a final assessment tool as they prepare to transition to kindergarten. Low-performing students are targeted early. Once identified, certified teachers and assistants work with low-performing students to build these basic skills. Funding to support academic materials and field trips is provided through the Title I office. Staff provides parents with packets of kindergarten activities, registration materials and workshops to train parents to assist their children at home. George Washington Carver Elementary provides all students with a packet of materials to use throughout the school year to assist students with making a smooth transition to kindergarten.

*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 personal meaningful?
Postsecondary Transition
Note: Required for High School- Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.
Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report.

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	
Students scoring at	Number of	Use Guided		Review of board	DRAs	
Students scoring at	students	Reading to		configuration		
Achievement Level 3	reading 1 or		Leadership Team		District Benchmark	
in reading.	more years	reading		Review of lesson plans	Assessment	
	below grade	level	RtI Team	L		
	level			Teacher observation	FCIM mini	
	T 1	Teach by			Assessments (weekly, monthly,	
	Teachers not teaching by	benchmark that will be covered		Review the percentage of students scoring on grade	and bi-monthly)	
	benchmark.	on the FCAT		level with their DRA (3 rd : 30)		
	ochciinark.	2.0		level with their DRA (5 *. 50)		
	Teachers not	1.0		Review the percentage of		
	providing	Provide		students scoring 80% and		
	explicit	school-based		above on FCIM reading mini		
	instruction	and district		assessments		
		level explicit				
		instruction		Review the number of		
		training		students scoring 80% and		
		D .1 1 1		above on their District		
		Provide school- based and		Benchmark		
		district level				
		teaching by				
		benchmark				
		training				
Reading Goal #1A:	2012 Current	2013 Expected				
	Level of	Level of				
The number of 3 rd -5 th	Performance:*	Performance:*				
grade students with a level						
3 reading proficiency will						
increase 3% from 33% to						
36%.						
	21/172 students o	r54/151students of	,			
	33% proficient	36%				

1		1A.2.		1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	
		Teachers not		All K-5th grade teachers	Review of board	DRAs	
		instructing at	calendars to identify		configuration		
		the	Sunshine State Standards	Leadership Team		District Benchmark	
		highest levels of	most likely to be assessed		Review of lesson plans	Assessment	
				RtI Team	1		
		of			Teacher observation	FCIM mini	
		Knowledge	Use FCIM reading focus			Assessments (weekly, monthly,	
		(cognitive	calendars to focus on the		Review the percentage of	and bi-monthly)	
		complexity)	lowest FCAT 2.0 reporting		students scoring on grade		
		l'empression)	categories:		level with their DRA (3 rd : 30)		
		Teachers not	Reading Application , Literary				
		familiar	Analysis, and Vocabulary)		Review the percentage of		
		with Webb's	i marysis, and vocasulary)		students scoring 80% and		
		Depth of	Provide explicit benchmark-focused		above on FCIM reading mini		
		Knowledge	instruction during reading	1	assessments		
		(cognitive	mini lessons		ussessineits		
		complexity)	111111 1030113		Review the number of		
		complexity)	Provide safety nets (before/after		students scoring 70% and		
1		Students not	school/ lunch tutoring/ SAI tutors/		above on their District		
		Students not					
		exposed to	and Team-Up) for		Benchmark		
		tasks at the	students scoring below				
		highest	FCAT 2.0 level 3				
		levels of	L				
		Webb's Depth	Differentiate instruction				
		of Knowledge					
		(cognitive					
		complexity)					
		School Wide					
		monitoring was					
		monitored by					
		reading theme					
		test instead of					
		by benchmark					
		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							
reading.							
i cading.							

R			2013 Expected Level of					
Λ	ĪA	Performance:*	Performance:*					
-								
-								
Γ		NA	NA					
Γ			1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
-								
Γ			1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

2A. FCAT 2.0:	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	
	Teachers not	Provide	Principal	Review of board	Classroom visitation log	
Students scoring	instructing at	teachers with	[configuration	Causicom visianion log	
at or above	the	Webh's Denth	Reading Coach		CAST	
Achievement Levels	highest levels of	fof		Review of lesson plans		
4 in reading.	Webb's Depth	Knowledge	Reading Interventionist		DRAs	
	of	training		Teacher observation		
	Knowledge		Grade level		District Benchmark	
	(cognitive	Require	chairperson	Review the percentage of	Assessment	
	complexity)	teachers to		students scoring on grade		
	L .	include the level	l		FCIM mini	
	Teachers not	of			Assessments (weekly, monthly,	
	familiar	complexity			and bi-monthly)	
	with Webb's	either within		students scoring 85% and	T II 1 CEC	
	Depth of Knowledge	their focus/ essential			Team-Up and SES tutoring mini	
	(cognitive	question or in			assessments	
	complexity)	their lesson		and or-monumy)	45505511101115	
	complexity)	plan (board		Review the number of		
	Students not	configuration)		students scoring 75% and		
	exposed to	configuration)		above on their District		
	tasks at the			Benchmark		
	highest	Use FCIM				
	levels of	reading focus				
	Webb's Depth					
	of Knowledge					
	(cognitive	Sunshine State				
	complexity)	Standards				
		most likely to				
		be assessed				
		on the FCAT 2.0				
		2.0				
		Use FCIM				
		reading focus				
		calendars to				
		focus on the				
		lowest FCAT				
		2.0 reporting				
		categories:				
		(Reading				
		Application,				
		Literary				
		Analysis, and				
		Vocabulary)				
		Provide explicit				
		benchmark-				
		Concinnark	l .	l	l	

Reading Goal #2A:		focused instruction during reading mini lessons Provide safety nets for students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 3 Differentiate instruction 2013 Expected					
iteauing Goai #2A.	Level of	Level of					
The number of 3 rd -5 th	Performance:*	Performance:*					
grade students with a level							
3 reading proficiency will							
increase 3% from 9% to 12%.							
1 4 70.							
	15/172 students or	18/151 students or					
	9%	12%					
		2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	2A.2.	
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	<u> </u>
2B. Florida	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Alternate		1					
Assessment:	1	1					
Students scoring at	1	1					
or above Level 7 in							
reading.		1					
-	Į		!	ļ			

Rea		2013 Expected Level of					
NA	Performance:*	Performance:*					
	NA	NA					
		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:						

24 EGAE 2	D 4 1	h . 1	b 4 1	b 4 1	b 4 1	
3A. FCAT 2.0:	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	
Percentage of	Teachers not	Provide	Principal Principal	Review of board	Classroom visitation	
students making		teachers with	Frincipai	configuration	log	
learning gains in	the		Reading Coach	Configuration	log	
	highest levels of	flof	Reading Coach	Review of lesson plans	Teacher Assessment	
reading.	Webb's Depth	Knowledge	Reading Interventionist	leteview of lesson plans	Instrument	
	of	training	iceding interventionist	Teacher observation	mstrument	
	Knowledge	truming.	Grade level	Teacher observation	DRAs	
	(cognitive	Require	chairperson	Review the percentage of	Did is	
		teachers to		students scoring 80% and	District Benchmark	
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	include the leve	1	above on theme tests	Assessment	
	Teachers not	of				
	familiar	complexity		Review the percentage of	FCIM mini	
		either within		students scoring on grade	Assessments (weekly, monthly,	
		their focus/		level with their DRA (3 rd : 30)	and bi-monthly)	
	Knowledge	essential				
	(cognitive	question or in		Review the percentage of	Team-Up and SES	
	complexity)	their lesson		students scoring 80% and	tutoring mini	
		plan		above on FCIM reading mini	assessments	
	Students not			assessments (weekly, monthly, and		
	exposed to	L		bi-monthly)		
	tasks at the	Use FCIM		L		
	highest	reading focus		Review the number of		
	levels of	calendars to		students scoring 70% and		
	Webb's Depth			above on their District		
	of Knowledge			Benchmark		
	(cognitive complexity)	Standards most likely to				
	complexity)	be assessed				
		on the FCAT				
		2.0				
		2.0				
		Use FCIM				
		reading focus				
		calendars to				
		focus on the				
		lowest FCAT				
		2.0 reporting				
		categories:				
		(Reading				
		Application,				
		Literary				
		Analysis, and				
		Vocabulary)				
		Provide explicit				
		benchmark-				

		focused instruction during reading mini lessons					
		Provide safety nets for students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 3					
		Differentiate instruction					
		Enroll FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s in Team Up and/or SES tutoring (F/R lunch)					
		Provide in- school push-in tutoring for FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s					
Reading Goal #3A: The number of 3 rd -5 th grade students making learning gains will increase 3% from 68% to 71%.	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	or 68%	107/151students or 71%					
		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 reading.			3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	NA	NA .					
		3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
		3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

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

4A. FCAT 2.0:	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	
	171.1.	171.11			17.11	
Percentage of	Teachers not	Provide			Classroom visitation	
students in lowest	instructing at	teachers with	Principal	Review of board	log	
25% making	the	Webb's Depth		configuration		
learning gains in	highest levels of	fof	Reading Coach		Teacher Assessment	
reading.	Webb's Depth	Knowledge	L	Review of lesson plans	Instrument	
g.	of	training	Reading Interventionist	L		
	Knowledge	n ·		Teacher observation	DRAs	
	(cognitive complexity)	Require teachers to	Grade level chairperson	Review the percentage of	District Benchmark	
	complexity)	include the leve		students scoring 80% and	Assessment	
	Teachers not	of	1	above on theme tests	Assessment	
	familiar	complexity			FCIM mini	
	with Webb's	either within			Assessments (weekly, monthly,	
	Depth of	their focus/		students scoring on grade	and bi-monthly)	
	Knowledge	essential		level with their DRA (3 rd : 30)		
	(cognitive	question or in			Team-Up and SES	
	complexity)	their lesson			tutoring mini	
	g. 1	plan		students scoring 80% and	assessment	
	Students not			above on FCIM reading mini		
	exposed to tasks at the	Use FCIM		assessments (weekly, monthly, and bi-monthly)		
	highest	reading focus		or-monuny)		
	levels of	calendars to		Review the number of		
	Webb's Depth			students scoring 70% and		
	of Knowledge			above on their District		
	(cognitive	Standards		Benchmark		
	complexity)	most likely to				
		be assessed				
		on the FCAT				
		2.0				
		Use FCIM				
		reading focus				
		calendars to				
		focus on the				
		lowest FCAT				
		2.0 reporting				
		categories:				
		Reading				
		Application,				
		Literary				
		Analysis, and				
		Vocabulary)				
		Provide explicit				
		benchmark-				

		focused instruction during reading mini lessons Provide safety nets for students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 3 Differentiate instruction Enroll FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s in Team Up and/or SES					
		tutoring (F/R lunch) Provide in-					
		school push-in tutoring for FCAT 2.0 level 1s and 2s					
Reading Goal #4A: The number of 3 rd -5 th grade students in the lowest 25% will increase 3% from 82%% to 85%.	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	141/172 students or 82%	128/151 students or 85%					
		4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	

		4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	
4B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.			4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.		
Reading Goal #4B:	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	NA	NA					
		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 their achievement	2010-2011	<mark>29%</mark>	35%	<mark>42%</mark>	<mark>48%</mark>	<mark>55%</mark>	<mark>61%</mark>
gap by 50%.							
Reading Goal #5A: The number of 3 rd -5 th grade students reading proficiently will increase 6-7% each year from 33% to 61% by 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		

5B. Student	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	
subgroups by		L	L			
ethnicity (White,	White: None enrolled 3 rd -5 th	Provide teachers with Webb's Depth of	Principal	Review of board	Classroom visitation	
l *.` ′	Black: Teachers not	Knowledge training	Reading Coach	configuration	log	
	instructing at the	Triowiedge training	reading coden	Review of lesson plans	Teacher Assessment	
Indian) not making	highest levels of	Require teachers to	Reading Interventionist	l	Instrument	
1. 6. 4	Webb's Depth of	include the level of		Teacher observation		
	Knowledge (cognitive	complexity either within	Grade level		DRAs	
in reading.	complexity)	their focus/essential		Review the percentage of	D: D	
	Teachers not familiar	question or in their lesson plan		students scoring 80% and above on theme tests	District Benchmark Assessment	
	with Webb's Depth of	pian		above on theme tests	Assessment	
	Knowledge (cognitive			Review the percentage of	FCIM mini	
	complexity)	Use FCIM reading focus		students scoring on grade	Assessments (weekly, monthly,	
		calendars to identify		level with their DRA (3 rd : 30)	bi-monthly)	
	Students not exposed to	Sunshine State Standards			T 11 1 2 2 2	
	tasks at the highest levels of Webb's Depth	most likely to be assessed on the FCAT 2.0		Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and	Team-Up and SES tutoring mini	
	of Knowledge	on the FCA1 2.0		above on FCIM reading mini	assessment	
	(cognitive complexity)	Use FCIM reading focus		assessments (weekly, monthly,	assessment	
	(cog)	calendars to focus on the		and bi-monthly)		
		lowest FCAT 2.0 reporting				
		categories:				
	Hispanic: None enrolled 3 rd -5 th	Reading Application , Literary		Review the number of		
	Asian: None enrolled 3 rd -5 th	Analysis, and Vocabulary)		students scoring 70% and above on their District		
	Asian. None enfoned 3 *-3	Provide explicit benchmark-focused		Benchmark		
	American Indian: None enrolled]			
	3 rd -5 th	mini lessons				
		Provide safety nets for				
		students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 3				
		FCAT 2.0 level 3				
		Differentiate instruction				
		Enroll FCAT 2.0 level 1				
		and 2s to enroll in Team				
		Up and/or SES tutoring				
		(F/R lunch)				
		Describe in subsequences in				
		Provide in-school push-in tutoring for FCAT 2.0 level 1				
		and 2s				

Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
Black: 117/172 students or 68% Hispanic: NA Asian: NA American Indian: NA	Hispanic: NA Asian: NA American Indian: NA	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
c c v 2g	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.	5C.1.		
Language Learners	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA		
(ELL) not making satisfactory progress							
in reading.							
Reading Goal #5C:		2013 Expected					
	Level of Performance:*	Level of Performance:*					
NA	r criormance.	r criormanec.					
	NA	NA					
	2 42 1	L 42 E					
		5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

5D. Students	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1.	
with Disabilities	[[[
	SWD students		Principal	Review the percentage of	Classroom visitation	
(SWD) not making	are 2	Mainstream as		SWD students scoring 80%	log	
satisfactory progress		many SWD	Reading Coach	and above on theme tests		
in reading.		students as			Teacher Assessment	
	on average	possible to	Reading Interventionist	Review the percentage of	Instrument	
		expose them to	L	SWD students scoring on		
	SWD students		RtI Facilitator	grade level with their DRA	DRAs	
	are used	rigorous	PGE G'. G	(3 rd : 30)	D: D	
	to comprehension	instruction	ESE Site Coach	Review the number of SWD	District Benchmark	
	accommodation		Inclusion and EBD	students scoring 70% and	Assessment	
	s that	Instruction and		above on their District	FCIM mini	
		Guided Reading		Benchmark	assessments	
	on the	daily to		Donomiaik	abscoments	
	FCAT 2.0	increase student		Review the number of SWD	Team-Up and SES	
		reading		students scoring 80% and	tutoring mini	
		ability		above on Reading Mastery	assessment	
				assessments		
		Transition SWD			Reading Mastery Kit	
		students		Review the percentage of		
		to the type of		SWD students scoring 80%	Soar To Success Kit	
		accommodation		and above on FCIM reading		
		S		mini assessments		
		permitted o the FCAT 2.0				
		FCA1 2.0		Review the number of SWD		
		Provide		Students scoring 80% and		
		teachers with		Above on Soar To Success		
		Webb's Depth		assessments		
		of				
		Knowledge				
		training				
		Require				
		teachers to				
		include the level				
		of complexity				
		either within				
		their focus/				
		essential				
		question or in				
		their lesson				
		plan				

Use FCIM			
reading focus			
calendars to			
identify			
Sunshine State			
Standards			
Standards			
most likely to			
be assessed			
on the FCAT			
2.0			
Use FCIM			
reading focus			
calendars to			
focus on the			
lowest FCAT			
2.0 reporting			
2.0 reporting			
categories:			
Reading			
Application,			
Literary			
Analysis, and			
Analysis, and Vocabulary)			
Provide explicit			
instruction			
focused on			
benchmark			
during Reading			
during Reading Mastery lesson			
iviastery ressorr			
Dravida avaliait			
Provide explicit			
instruction			
focused on			
benchmark			
during Soar To			
Success lessons			
Provide safety			
nets for			
students scoring			
below			
FCAT 2.0 level			
3			
Γ			
Differentiate			
instruction			
mstruction			

		Enroll FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s in Team Up and/or SES tutoring (F/R lunch) Provide in- school push-in			
Reading Goal #5D:		tutoring for FCAT 2.0 level 2013 Expected			5
	Level of Performance:*	Level of Performance:*			
	6/8 students or 75%	8/10 students or 80%			

5D.2	.2.	5D.2.	5D.2	5D.2.	5D.2.
Sign disci	nificant I cipline 1 ue with EBD i	Implement Behavioral Fools curriculum to improve classroom management	Principal Reading Coach Reading Interventionist RtI Facilitator ESE Liaison Inclusion and EBD Teachers	Review discipline referrals Review the percentage of SWD students scoring 80% and above on theme tests Review the percentage of SWD students scoring on grade level with their DRA (3rd: 30) Review the number of SWD students scoring 70% and above on their District Benchmark Review the number of SWD students scoring 80% and above on Reading Mastery assessments Review the percentage of SWD students scoring 80% and above on FCIM reading mini assessments	Classroom visitation log Teacher Assessment Instrument DRAs District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini Assessments (weekly, monthly, and bi-monthly) Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment Reading Mastery Kit Soar To Success Kit
				Review the number of SWD Students scoring 80% and Above on Soar To Success assessments	
5D.3	.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
5E. Economically	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	
Disadvantaged			1 1 1 7 5th		a	
students not making	Number of		All K-5 th grade teachers	Review of board configuration	Classroom visitation	
satisfactory progress	reading 1 or	increase student		Configuration	log	
in reading.	more years	reading		Review of lesson plans	Teacher Assessment	
		level			Instrument	
	level	Provide explicit	RtI Team	Teacher observation	DRAs	
		instruction		Review the percentage of	DKAS	
		during reading			District Benchmark	
		mini lessons			Assessment	
		Provide safety		above on theme tests	FCIM mini	
		nets for			assessments	
		students scoring		Economically Disadvantaged		
		below			Team-Up and SES	
		FCAT 2.0 level			tutoring mini assessment	
		3		assessments	assessment	
		Differentiate instruction		Review the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring on grade level with their DRA (3 rd : 30) Review the number of		
				students scoring 70% and above on their District Benchmark		

Reading Goal #5E: The number of 3 rd - 5 th Economically Disadvantaged students no- making learning gains will decrease 3% from 32% to 29%.		2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	55/172 students of 32%	43/151students or 29%					
		5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	
		instructing at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Teachers not	calendars to identify Sunshine State Standards most likely to be assessed on the FCAT 2.0	All K-5 th grade teachers Leadership Team RtI Team	Review the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring 80% and above on theme tests Review the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring 80% and	Classroom visitation log Teacher Assessment Instrument DRAs District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment	
		Students not exposed to tasks at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity			Review the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring on grade level with their DRA (3 rd : 30) Review the number of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring 70% and above on their District Benchmark		

	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	

Reading Professional Development

Professional Development						
(PD) aligned with						
Strategies through						
Professional						
Learning						
Community (PLC)						
or PD Activities						
Please note that each strategy does not require a						
professional development or						
PLC activity.			PD Participants			
PD Content/Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	(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
	All	, ,	School-wide		Align Lesson Plans and	Principal
Knowledge: Cognitive Complexity		Principal			Instructional Focus with Board Configuration Complexity Level	Leadership Team
Complexity					(H-M-L)	
					,	
1	All	,	School-wide		Align Lesson Plans and	Principal
Common Core and Unpacking		Principal			Instructional Focus with Board Configuration Complexity	Leadership Team
Benchmarks					Configuration Complexity	
					Review Lesson Plans for	
					Benchmark and Standard being	
1 P 3 do - 1	A 11	T' (b) T \M/=			Unpacked	5 · · · 1
Individual Professional	All	Timothy T. Warren, Principal	School-wide		Review IPDPs for teacher instructional strategy focus on	Principal
Development Plan		ППСІраї				PDF
(IPDP)		Annette Tobler, PDF	1		reading deficiencies	

FAIR Analysis	Tara Jackson, Reading Interventionist Annett Tobler, Reading Coach	School-wide	Review of DRA for appropriate reading levels Review of Lesson Plans for differentiated instruction based on reading level miscues Review of DRA class profile sheet	Principal Leadership Team School-based RtI Facilitator
Teaching Reading and Math by Benchmark	Annett Tobler, Reading Coach Tara Jackson, Reading Interventionist Tyra Forcine-Mobley, Math Coach Carol Smith, Math Interventionist	School-wide	Review Lesson Plans, Classroom Visitations, Student FCIM Mini Assessment Data, School-wide Progress Monitoring	Principal Leadership Team Literacy Team/Reading Team
Data Analysis: Appropriate Progress Monitoring	Timothy T. Warren, Principal Annette Tobler, Reading Coach Tyra Forcine-Mobley, Math Coach	School-wide	Review Lesson Plans, Classroom Visitations, Student FCIM Mini Assessment Data, School-wide Progress Monitoring	Principal Leadership Team Literacy Team/Reading Team

Reading Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Reading Budget (insert rows as ne	eded)		
Include only school funded activities/			
materials and exclude district funded			
activities/materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Identify and explicitly teach FCAT	Houghton Mifflin	NA	NA
2.0 Reading Reporting Category			
benchmarks within the reading			
series.			
Identify and explicitly teach FCAT	Various authentic and high-interests text	Donors from www.donorschoose.org	NA
2.0 Reading Reporting Category		Volunteers from Hands on Jacksonville	
benchmarks within authentic text.			
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Increase the amount of	Additional SuccessMaker licenses	District Technology/Academic	NA
SuccessMaker usage for students		Services	
identified in the reading low 25%			
_		Leadership Jacksonville Members	
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Provide "Explicit Instruction" training	School-based Academic Coaches	NA	NA
to teachers	District trainers		
Provide "Teaching by Benchmark"	School-based Academic Coaches	NA	NA
training to teachers	District trainers		
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			

Total:		
1 otal.		

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	
proficient in listening/speaking.	1.1.2012 Current Percent of Students	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	
CELLA Goal #1: NA	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Listening/Speaking:					
	NA					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
		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.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	

CELLA Goal #.	2: 2012 Current Percent of Student: Proficient in Reading:					
	NA	2				2.2
		2.2.				2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
		2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	
proficient in writing.						
CELLA Goal #3:	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in Writing:					
NA	Froncient in writing.					
	NA					
		2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.
		2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.

CELLA Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

	la	la ca	I	la a	1	
1A. FCAT 2.0:	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	
Students scoring at		L			L	
Achievement Level 3	Number of				Envisions	
Achievement Level 5	students not	1	teachers	configuration	assessments	
in mathematics.	reading on	groups to				
	grade level		Math Coach	Review of lesson plans	District Benchmark	
		student			Assessment	
	Teachers not		Leadership Team	Teacher observation		
		Use FCIM math			FCIM mini	
	the				assessments	
	highest levels of			students scoring 80% and		
	Webb's Depth			above on math formatives	Classroom visitation	
	of	Sunshine State			log	
		Standards		Review the percentage of	L	
	(cognitive	most likely to be		students scoring 80% and	Teacher Assessment	
		assessed			Instrument	
		on the FCAT		assessments	L	
		2.0			District Benchmark	
	familiar			Review the number of	Assessment	
		Use FCIM math		students scoring 60% and	ron () :	
	Depth of	focus			FCIM mini	
	Knowledge	calendars to		Benchmark	assessments	
	(cognitive	focus on the			n vy Lana	
	complexity)	lowest FCAT			Team-Up and SES	
	G. I	2.0 Reporting			tutoring mini	
	Students not	Categories			assessment	
	exposed to	D 11 11 11				
	tasks at the	Provide explicit				
	highest	instruction				
	levels of	during math				
	Webb's Depth	launen				
	of Knowledge	Provide safety				
		nets for				
	complexity					
		students scoring below				
		FCAT 2.0 level				
		LCAT 2.0 level				
		۲				
			l			

#1A: The number of 3 rd -5 th grade students with a level 3 math proficiency will increase 3% from 56% to 59%.	evel of rformance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
96/ 56%	/172 students or %	101/151 students or 59%					
		New teachers not familiar with math curriculum	Provide teachers with training on the new Envision Math curriculum	.All K-5 grade teachers Math Coach Leadership Team RtI Team Grade level chairperson	Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on math formatives Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on FCIM math mini assessments Review the number of students scoring 60% and above on their District Benchmark	IA.2. Envisions assessments District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Classroom visitation log Teacher Assessment Instrument District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	

1B. Florida	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Alternate							
Assessment:							
Students scoring at							
Levels 4, 5, and 6 in							
mathematics.							
		2013 Expected					
#1B:	<u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>	Level of Performance:*					
NA							
1 1/21							
	NA	NA					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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:	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	
	1	1			11111	
Students scoring at	Number of	Use small	All K-5 grade	Review of board	Envisions	
Achievement Level 3	students not				assessments	
in mathematics.	reading on	groups to		_		
	grade level		Math Coach	Review of lesson plans	District Benchmark	
		student			Assessment	
	Teachers not		Leadership Team	Teacher observation		
		Use FCIM math			FCIM mini	
	the				assessments	
	highest levels of	calendars to		students scoring 80% and		
	Webb's Depth			above on math formatives	Classroom visitation	
	Of V many ladge	Sunshine State Standards		Daview the persenters of	log	
	Knowledge (cognitive	most likely to be		Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and	Teacher Assessment	
	complexity)	assessed		above on FCIM math mini	Instrument	
		on the FCAT		assessments	mstrument	
		2.0			District Benchmark	
	familiar			Review the number of	Assessment	
	with Webb's	Use FCIM math		students scoring 60% and		
	Depth of	focus			FCIM mini	
	Knowledge	calendars to		Benchmark	assessments	
	(cognitive	focus on the				
	complexity)	lowest FCAT			Team-Up and SES	
		2.0 Reporting			tutoring mini	
	Students not	Categories			assessment	
	exposed to	L				
	tasks at the	Provide explicit				
	highest levels of	instruction				
	Webb's Depth	during math				
	of Knowledge					
	(cognitive	Provide safety				
	complexity	nets for				
		students scoring				
		below				
		FCAT 2.0 level				
		3				

#1 A ·	Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:* 101/151 students or 59%					
	1A.2.	1A.2. New teachers not familiar with	Provide teachers with training on the new Envision Math curriculum	teachers Math Coach Leadership Team RtI Team Grade level chairperson	Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on math formatives Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on FCIM math mini assessments Review the number of students scoring 60% and above on their District Benchmark	IA.2. Envisions assessments District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Classroom visitation log Teacher Assessment Instrument District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment IA.3.	

	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Alternate							
Assessment:							
Students scoring at							
Levels 4, 5, and 6 in							
mathematics.							
		2013 Expected					
<u>#1B:</u>	<u>Level of</u> <u>Performance:*</u>	Level of Performance:*					
NA							
1 V./1							
	N7.4	37.4					
	NA	NA					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	
		11.5.	J. J.		10.3.	10.3.	

Based on the analysis	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool	
of student achievement	Barrier		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy		
data and reference to						
"Guiding Questions,"						
identify and define areas						
in need of improvement						
for the following group:						
2A. FCAT 2.0:	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	2A.1.	
Students scoring						
8	Number of	Use small	All K-5 grade	Review of board	Envisions	
at or above	students not	instructional	teachers	configuration	assessments	
Achievement	reading on	groups to				
	grade level	differentiate	Math Coach	Review of lesson plans	District Benchmark	
mathematics.		student			Assessment	
mathematics.	Teachers not	1	Leadership Team	Teacher observation		
	instructing at	Use FCIM math	-		FCIM mini	
	the	focus	RtI Team	Review the percentage of	assessments	
	highest levels of	calendars to		students scoring 85% and		
	Webb's Depth			above on math formatives	Classroom visitation	
		Sunshine State			log	
		Standards		Review the percentage of		
	(cognitive	most likely to be		students scoring 85% and	Teacher Assessment	
		assessed		above on FCIM math mini	Instrument	
	1 3/	on the FCAT		assessments		
	Teachers not	2.0			District Benchmark	
	familiar			Review the number of	Assessment	
		Use FCIM math		students scoring 75% and	1 ISSUSSITION	
	Depth of	focus		above on their District	FCIM mini	
		calendars to		Benchmark	assessments	
	(cognitive	focus on the		Benefittark	assessificites	
		lowest FCAT			Team-Up and SES	
	Complexity)	2.0 Reporting			tutoring mini	
	Students not	Categories			assessment	
	exposed to				assessinent .	
		Provide explicit				
	highest	benchmark-				
	levels of	focused				
		instruction				
		during math				
	(cognitive	launch				
	complexity	i auricii				
	Complexity	Provide safety				
		nets for				
	I	students scoring				
		below				
	I	FCAT 2.0 level				
	I	LECAT 2.0 level				
	L	p	1		1	

#2A: The number of 3 rd -5 th grade students with a level 4 or higher math proficiency will increase 3% from 22% to 25%.	Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		37/151 students or 25%					
		New math curriculum	Provide teachers with training on the new Envision Math curriculum	All K-5 grade teachers Math Coach Leadership Team RtI Team Grade level chairperson	Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on math formatives Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on FCIM math mini assessments Review the number of students scoring 60% and above on their District Benchmark	Envisions assessments District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Classroom visitation log Teacher Assessment Instrument District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment	
		2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	2A.3.	

2B. Florida	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Alternate							
Assessment:							
Students scoring at							
or above Level 7 in							
mathematics.							
		2013 Expected					
#2B:	Level of Performance:*	Level of Performance·*					
NA	r criormance.	r crromance.					
IVA							
	N.7.4	NY 4					
	NA	NA					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	2B.3.	
		ZD.3.	ZD.3.	ZD.3.	ZD.3.	ZD.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 Barrier	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
3A. FCAT 2.0: 3A.1. 3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	
Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Number of students not reading on grade level Use small instructional groups to differentiate student Provide safety	All K-5 grade teachers Math Coach Leadership Team RtI Team	Review of board configuration Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on math formatives Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on FCIM math mini assessments Review the number of students scoring 60% and above on their District Benchmark	Envisions assessments District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Classroom visitation log Teacher Assessment Instrument District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and SES tutoring mini	

Mathematics Goal #3A:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
learning gains will increase 1% from 91% to 92%.							
	156/172 students or 91%	138/151 students or 92%					
		3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	
		instructing at the	calendars to identify Sunshine State Standards	All K-5 grade teachers	Review of board configuration	Envisions assessments	
		Webb's Depth	on the FCAT 2.0		1	District Benchmark Assessment	
		of Knowledge	Use FCIM math focus	Leadership Team	Teacher observation	FCIM mini	
		(cognitive		RtI Team	Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and	assessments	
		Teachers not	Categories			Classroom visitation log	
		familiar with Webb's	Provide explicit benchmark- focused		Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and	Teacher Assessment	
		Depth of	instruction during math mini lessons		above on FCIM math mini	Instrument	
		(cognitive	Provide safety nets for			District Benchmark Assessment	
			students scoring below		students scoring 60% and		
		Students not exposed to	FCAT 2.0 level 3		above on their District Benchmark	FCIM mini assessments	
		tasks at the highest				Team-Up and SES	
		levels of Webb's Depth				tutoring mini assessment	
		of Knowledge				assessinent	
		(cognitive complexity					

	i	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	
		DA.3.	DA.3.	DA.S.	SA.S.	DA.3.	
		New math curriculum	Provide teachers with training on the new Envision Math curriculum	All K-5 grade teachers Math Coach Leadership Team Rtl Team Grade level chairperson	Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on math formatives Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on FCIM math mini assessments Review the number of students scoring 60% and above on their District Benchmark	Envisions assessments District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Classroom visitation log Teacher Assessment Instrument District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and SES tutoring mini	
						assessment	
Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
Mathematics Goal #3B: NA	Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	NA	NA					

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

Based on the analysis	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool	
of student achievement	Barrier		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy		
data and reference to						
"Guiding Questions,"						
identify and define areas						
in need of improvement						
for the following group:						
4A. FCAT 2.0:	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	
Percentage of						
	Number of	Use small	All K-5 grade	Review of board	Envisions	
students in lowest	students not	instructional	teachers	configuration	assessments	
25% making	reading on	groups to				
	grade level		Math Coach	Review of lesson plans	District Benchmark	
	[student		F-20-20	Assessment	
mathematics.	Teachers not		Leadership Team	Teacher observation		
		Use FCIM math			FCIM mini	
	the	focus	RtI Team	Review the percentage of	assessments	
	highest levels of			students scoring 80% and		
	Webb's Depth			above on math formatives	Classroom visitation	
		Sunshine State			log	
		Standards		Review the percentage of	108	
		most likely to be		students scoring 80% and	Teacher Assessment	
		assessed		above on FCIM math mini	Instrument	
	,	on the FCAT		assessments		
	Teachers not	2.0			District Benchmark	
	familiar			Review the number of	Assessment	
		Use FCIM math		students scoring 60% and	rissessment	
	Depth of	focus		above on their District	FCIM mini	
		calendars to		Benchmark	assessments	
	(cognitive	focus on the		Benemiurk	assessificites	
		lowest FCAT			Team-Up and SES	
	complexity)	2.0 Reporting			tutoring mini	
	Students not	Categories			assessment	
	exposed to					
		Provide explicit				
	standards at the					
	highest	focused				
	levels of	instruction				
		during math				
	of Knowledge					
	(cognitive					
		Provide safety				
	complexity)	nets for				
		students scoring				
		below				
		FCAT 2.0 level				
		R 2.0 ICVEI				
	l	٢		<u> </u>		

Mathematics Goal #4A: The number of 3 rd -5 th grade students in the lowest 25% will increase 1% from 95%% to 96%.	Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		144/151 students or 96%					
		New math curriculum		All K-5 grade teachers Math Coach Leadership Team RtI Team Grade level chairperson	Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on math formatives Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on FCIM math mini assessments Review the number of students scoring 60% and above on their District Benchmark	Envisions assessments District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Classroom visitation log Teacher Assessment Instrument District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment	
		4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	

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 Level of	2013 Expected Level of					
#4B:	Performance:*	Performance:*					
NA							
	NA	NA					
		4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	
		4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	

Based on ambitious but achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), identify reading and mathematics performance target for the following years	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	
5A. In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Baseline data 2010-2011	46%	51%	56%	61%	<mark>66%</mark>	71%
Mathematics Goal #5A: The number of 3 rd -5 th grade students math proficiently will increase 6-7% each year from 46% to 71% by 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		

5B. Student	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	5B.1.	
subgroups by						
ethnicity (White,	White: None enrolled	Provide teachers with	All K-5 grade	Review of board	Envisions	
Black, Hispanic,	Black: Teachers not	Webb's Depth of	teachers	configuration	assessments	
	instructing at the	Knowledge training	Math Coach	Review of lesson plans	District Benchmark	
Asian, American	highest levels of	Require teachers to	Watii Coacii	Review of lesson plans	Assessment	
Indian) not making	Webb's Depth of	include the level of	Leadership Team	Teacher observation	Assessment	
satisfactory progress	Knowledge (cognitive	complexity either within	Education P Touri	Toucher coper varion	FCIM mini	
in mathematics.	complexity)	their focus/essential	RtI Team	Review the percentage of	assessments	
		question or in their lesson		students scoring 80% and		
	Teachers not familiar	plan	Grade level	above on math formatives	Classroom visitation	
	with Webb's Depth of		chairperson		log	
	Knowledge (cognitive	v rent de		Review the percentage of		
	complexity)	Use FCIM math focus		students scoring 80% and above on FCIM math mini	Teacher Assessment	
	Students not exposed to	calendars to identify Sunshine State Standards		assessments	Instrument	
	tasks at the highest	most likely to be assessed		assessments	District Benchmark	
	levels of Webb's Depth	on the FCAT 2.0		Review the number of	Assessment	
	of Knowledge			students scoring 60% and	11550555110110	
	(cognitive complexity	Use FCIM math focus		above on their District	FCIM mini	
		calendars to focus on the		Benchmark	assessments	
	New math curriculum	lowest FCAT 2.0 Reporting				
		Categories			Team-Up and SES	
	Hispanic: None enrolled				tutoring mini	
	Asian: None enrolled	Provide explicit benchmark- focused			assessment	
	Asian. None enioned	instruction during math				
	American Indian: None enrolled					
	:					
		Provide safety nets for				
		students scoring below				
		FCAT 2.0 level 3				
		L.,				
		Differentiate instruction				
		Require all FCAT 2.0 level 1				
		and 2s to enroll in Team				
		Up and/or SES tutoring				
		(F/R lunch)				
		Provide in-school push-in				
		tutoring for FCAT 2.0 level 1				
		and 2s				

Mathematics Goal		2013 Expected Level of			
#5B:	Performance:*	Performance:*			
The number of 3 rd -5 th					
grade students making					
learning gains will					
increase 1% from 91% to					
92%.					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.			
		White: Na			
	Black: 156/172 students or 91%				
		Hispanic: NA			
	Asian: NA	Asian: NA			
	American Indian: NA	American Indian: NA			

New math curriculum Provide teachers with training on the new Envision Math curriculum All K-5 grade teachers Math Coach Leadership Team Rul Team Grade level chairperson Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on their District Benchmark Assessments Classroom visitation log Review the number of students scoring 60% and above on their District Benchmark Assessment Teacher Assessment Envisions assessments Envisions All K-5 grade teachers Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on their District Benchmark Assessments Teacher Assessment Envisions Assessments Envisions Envisions Assessments FCIM mini assessments Teacher Assessment FCIM mini assessments Teacher Assessment FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and sesses assessments Team-Up and sesses assessments Team-Up and sesses assessments Teacher Assessment assessments FCIM mini assessment		5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	5B.2.	
assessment		New math curriculum	Provide teachers with training on the new Envision Math curriculum	All K-5 grade teachers Math Coach Leadership Team RtI Team Grade level chairperson	Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on math formatives Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on FCIM math mini assessments Review the number of students scoring 60% and above on their District Benchmark	Envisions assessments District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Classroom visitation log Teacher Assessment Instrument District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and SES	
5B.3. 5B.3. 5B.3. 5B.3.							
		5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	5B.3.	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	NA			5C.1. NA	5C.1. NA		
Mathematics Goal #5C: NA	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	NA	NA 5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	5C.2.	
		5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	5C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

	en i	ED 1	len i	len i	len i	1	
5D. Students	5D.1.	5D.1.	5D.1	5D.1.	5D.1.		
with Disabilities	Y4	M-:	A 11 IV 5 1-	D i 4b	Ei-i		
(SWD) not making	Instruction is based on		All K-5 grade teachers	Review the percentage of SWD students scoring 80%	Envisions assessments		
satisfactory progress	IED gools and	students as	teachers	and above on theme tests	assessments		
			Math Coach	and above on theme tests	District Benchmark		
in mathematics.		expose them to	Iviatii Coacii	Review the percentage of	Assessment		
	which		Leadership Team	SWD students scoring on	Assessment		
			Leadership Team	grade level with their DRA	FCIM mini		
	FCAT 2.0		RtI Team	(3 rd : 30, 4 th : 40, and 5 th 50)	assessments		
	1 CA1 2.0	mstruction	ikti Team	(3 . 50, 4 . 40, and 5 50)	assessments		
	SWD students	Use Explicit	ESE Liaison	Review the number of SWD	Classroom visitation		
	are 2	Instruction and	ESE Elaison	students scoring 60% and	log		
			Inclusion and EBD	above on their District	log .		
	grade level	differentiated		Benchmark	Teacher Assessment		
	on average	instruction to			Instrument		
		increase student		Review the number of SWD			
	SWD students	computation		students scoring 80% and	District Benchmark		
		ability		above on Math mini	Assessment		
	to			assessments			
		Transition SWD	,		FCIM mini		
	accommodation			Review the percentage of	assessments		
	s that	to the type of		SWD students scoring 80%			
		accommodation		and above on FCIM math	Team-Up and SES		
	on the	S		mini assessments	tutoring mini		
	FCAT 2.0	permitted o the			assessment		
		FCAT 2.0					
		Provide teachers	5				
		with					
		Webb's Depth					
		of					
		Knowledge					
		training					
		Require teachers	S				
		to	[
		include the level	Ц				
		of					
		complexity					
		within					
		their Board					
		Configuration					
		and Lesson Plan	4				
		H ECD4					
		Use FCIM math					
		focus					
		calendars to					

identify Sunshine State		
Standards		
most likely to be assessed		
assessed		
on the FCAT 2.0		
2.0		
Provide explicit		
benchmark-		
focused		
instruction		
during math		
launch		
Provide		
additional		
math lesson		
support via SuccessMaker		
SuccessMaker		
and Destination		
Success		
Provide safety		
nets for		
students scoring		
below		
FCAT 2.0 level		
3		
Differentiate		
instruction		
Require all FCAT 2.0 level		
FCAT 2.0 level		
Il land 2g to appell		
and 2s to enroll in Team		
Up and/or SES		
tutoring		
(F/R lunch)		
Provide in-		
school push-in		
tutoring for FCAT 2.0 level		
1 C/11 2.0 (C/C)		

			i	i .	İ	i	
Mathematics Goal	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
#5D:	Level of	Level of					
<u> #3D.</u>	Performance:*	Performance:*					
The number of 3 rd -5 th							
grade Students With							
Disabilities not making							
learning gains in math was							
25%.							
±370°							
1							
1							
	6/8 students or	Enter numerical					
		data for					
1		expected level of					
1		performance in					
		this box.					
		5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	
			[[55. 2 .	25.2.	
			Implement Behavioral	All K-5 grade	Review the number of	Discipline referrals	
1		gg. ,			1	Discipline referrais	
		Significant		teachers	discipline referrals		
		discipline	improve classroom			Envisions	
		issues with EBD	management	Math Coach	Review the percentage of	assessments	
		students			SWD students scoring on		
			Implement Second Step	Leadership Team	grade level with their DRA	District Benchmark	
			'	1		Assessment	
			Train ESE teachers in PCM	RtI Team	(5 . 5 0, 1 . 1 0, und 5 . 5 0)		
			Train ESE teachers in 1 Civi	Team Team	Review the number of SWD	FCIM mini	
				ESE Liaison		assessments	
1				ESE LIAISON	students scoring 60% and	assessments	
1				L	above on their District	L	
1				Inclusion and EBD	Benchmark	Classroom visitation	
1				Teachers	1	log	
1		1			Review the number of SWD		
					students scoring 80% and	Teacher Assessment	
1					above on Reading Mastery	Instrument	
1					assessments	instrument	
1					assessments	District Benchmark	
					n : 41		
		1			Review the percentage of	Assessment]
					SWD students scoring 80%		
		1			and above on FCIM reading	FCIM mini	
		1			mini assessments	assessments]
		1			1	Team-Up and SES	
		1				tutoring mini]
					Students scoring 80% and	assessment	
					Above on Soar To Success		
					assessments		

5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.
New math curriculum	Provide teachers with training on the new Envision Math curriculum	All K-5 grade teachers	Review the number of discipline referrals	Envisions assessments
	Elivision iviati currentiii	Math Coach Leadership Team	Review the number of SWD students scoring 60% and above on their District	District Benchmark Assessment
		RtI Team	Benchmark	FCIM mini assessments
		Grade level chairperson	Review the number of SWD students scoring 80% and above on math assessments	Classroom visitation log
			Review the percentage of SWD students scoring 80% and above on FCIM math	Teacher Assessment Instrument
			mini assessments	District Benchmark Assessment
				FCIM mini assessments
				Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment

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:						

Disadvantaged students not making stindents on the students and making in mathematics. In	5E. Economically	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	
students not making statisfactory progress in mathematics. In minimatics. In mi		J.1.	JE.11.		50.1.		
statisfactory progress progress in mathematics. mathematics. math tasks on a moderate rander and high level of complexity of complexity of the mathematics. Teachers not instruction at the lighest levels of first the complexity of first the mathematics. Review the percentage of anders scoring 80% and above on FCIM math min assessments Review the percentage of anders scoring 80% and above on FCIM math min assessments Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on FCIM math min assessments Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on FCIM math min assessments Review the mumber of scudents scoring 60% and above on FCIM math min assessments Review the number of scudents scoring 60% and above on FCIM math min assessments Review the number of scudents scoring 60% and above on FCIM math min assessments Review the number of scudents scoring 60% and above on FCIM math min assessments Review the mumber of scudents scoring 60% and above on FCIM math min assessments Review the mumber of scudents scoring 60% and above on FCIM math min assessments Review the mumber of scudents scoring 60% and above on FCIM math min assessments Review the mumber of scudents scoring 60% and above on FCIM math min assessments Review the mumber of scudents scoring 60% and above on FCIM math min assessments Review the mumber of scudents scoring 60% and above on FCIM math min assessments Review the mumber of scudents scoring 60% and above on FCIM math min assessments Review the mumber of scudents scoring 60% and above on FCIM math min assessments Review the mumber of scudents scoring 60% and above on FCIM math min assessments Review the mumber of scudents scoring 60% and above on FCIM math min assessments Review the mumber of scudents scoring 60% and above on FCIM math min assessments Review the mumber of scudents scoring 60% and above on FCIM math min assessments Review the mumber of scudents scoring 60% and above on FCIM math min assessments Review the mumber of scudents scoring 60% and above on	Disagvantageg	Number of	Provide teachers	All K-5 grade	Review of board	Envisions	
Mathematics In mathem	students not making	students not	with			assessments	
on a moderate knowledge rand high read light read of complexity level of complexity level of complexity level of reachers not of model the level of suddents serving 80% and above on math formatives of students serving 80% and above on math formatives of students serving 80% and above on math formatives of students serving 80% and above on math formatives of students serving 80% and above on math formatives of students serving 80% and above on their focus of students serving	satisfactory progress	Performing	Webb's Depth				
and high level of complexity level complexity are teachers Rtl Team complexity are to form instructing at the level of instruction above on math formatives. Web's 1 Epoth of Septim Research of the level of instruction above on their District Dentimark Teacher Assessment and above on PCIM math minic assessments Bentimar of the level of instruction and above on their District Dentimark. Teacher Assessment and above on their District Dentimark Teacher Assessment Instrument Assessment ECIM minic assessments Classroom visitation log Teacher Assessment Instrument Assessment FCIM minic assessments Teacher Assessment Faculty the within above on their District Dentimark For the level of the recursion of the provide explicit benchmark- Teacher Assessment Feacher Assessment FCIM minic assessments Figure 1 Feacher Assessment Faculty the minic assessment Figure 2 Feacher Assessment Figure 3 Feacher Assessment Figure 4 Feacher Assess	in mathematics.			Math Coach	Review of lesson plans		
level of complexity level to complexity level to the level of include the level of include the level of the include the l		on a moderate	Knowledge	L	L	Assessment	
complexity Require teachersRd1 Team Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and bove on math formatives Classroom visitation log Complexity Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and baye scoring 80% and baye scoring 80% and baye scoring 80% and baye on FCIM math mini assessments Teacher Assessment Instrument Ins			training	Leadership Team	Teacher observation	non control	
level to suddents scoring 80% and shorter focus' sudents scoring 80% and shorter focus' sessential sessential sessential sessential semblants and sudents scoring 80% and shorter focus' sessential sessential sessential sessential semblants scoring 60% and shorter focus' sudents scoring 60% and shorter focus' sessential sudents scoring 60% and shove on their District senchmark Teachers not sessential sessential sessential sudents scoring 60% and shove on their District senchmark Teachers not sessential se			D 1	D.J. T.	D : 41		
include the level Teachers not instructing at the either within sudents scoring 80% and highest levels official focus? Web's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Teachers not familiar with Web's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Provide explicit benchmark: Superfloor of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Assessment (course) Provide explicit benchmark: Superfloor of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Assessment (course) Benchmark Superfloor of Knowledge (cognitive course) Benchmark Superfloor of			Require teachers			assessments	
Teachers not instructing at the cither within highest levels of their focus? Webb's Depth of Complexity Teachers not familiar with Web's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Provide afety nets for students scoring below FLOAT 2.0 level 3 Differentiate instruction Require all FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s to enroll in Team Up and/or SIS tutoring to the complexity of the complexity o		levei	include the level			Classroom visitation	
instructing at the chemistry in the chem		Teachers not			above on main formatives		
the either within highest levels of their focus/ Webb's Depth of guestion or in Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Teachers not familiar with Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Provide explicit benchmark familiar with Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Depth of Standard					Review the percentage of	log	
highest levels of their focus/ Webb's Depth sesential question or in Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Teachers not familiar with Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Differentiate instruction Require all FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 25 to enroll in Team Up and/or SES tutoring Instrument above or FCIM math mini assessments District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment District Benchmark FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment Team-Up and or SES tutoring mini assessment Differentiate instruction Require all FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 25 to enroll in Team Up and/or SES tutoring						Teacher Assessment	
Web's Depth of executial question or in Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Teachers not familiar with Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Defined a sessment storing below FCAT 2.0 level 3 Differentiate instruction Require all FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s to enroll in Team Up and 07 SES tuttoring to the form of the fo					above on FCIM math mini		
of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Teachers not familiar with Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Teachers not familiar with Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) To be a complexity Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) The complexity Depth of Knowledge (cognitive cognitive complexity) The complexity Depth of Knowledge (cognitive cognitive complexity) The complexity Depth of Knowledge (cognitive cognitive cognitive cognitive cognitive cognitive cognitive cognitive complexity Cognitive c					assessments		
Coognitive complexity Plan Students scoring 60% and above on their District Provide explicit Benchmark Indicate the provide explicit Benchmark Indicate the provide explicit Benchmark Indicate the provided explicit Benchmark Indicate the provided explicit Indicate the pro		of	question or in				
complexity) Provide explicit benchmark- focused instruction with Web's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Provide safety nets for students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 3 Differentiate instruction Require all FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s to enroll in Team Up and/or SES tutoring mini assessment FCIM mini assessments FCIM mini assessments FCIM mini assessment FCIM mini assessments FCIM mini assessment FCIM						Assessment	
Provide explicit Teachers not benchmark familiar with Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Provide safety nets for students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 3 Differentiate instruction Require all FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s to enroll in Team Up and/or SES tutoring mini assessment Benchmark Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment Require all FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s to enroll in Team Up and/or SES tutoring		(cognitive	plan				
Teachers not familiar focused instruction during math launch (cognitive complexity) Provide safety nets for students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s to enroll in Team Up and/or SES tutoring during math launch (some part of the state		complexity)					
familiar with Webb's instruction Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Provide safety nets for students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 3 Differentiate instruction Require all FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s to enroll in Team Up and/or SES tutoring		T. 1			Benchmark	assessments	
with Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Provide safety nets for students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 3 Differentiate instruction Require all FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s to enroll in Team Up and/or SES tutoring						T II LOFO	
Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Provide safety nets for students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 3 Differentiate instruction Require all FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s to enroll in Team Up and/or SES tutoring							
Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Provide safety nets for students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 3 Differentiate instruction Require all FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s to enroll in Team Up and/or SES tutoring							
(cognitive complexity) Provide safety nets for students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 3 Differentiate instruction Require all FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s to enroll in Team Up and/or SES tuttoring						assessment	
complexity) Provide safety nets for students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 3 Differentiate instruction Require all FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s to enroll in Team Up and/or SES tutoring							
nets for students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 3 Differentiate instruction Require all FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s to enroll in Team Up and/or SES tutoring		complexity)	Provide safety				
below FCAT 2.0 level 3 Differentiate instruction Require all FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s to enroll in Team Up and/or SES tutoring							
FCAT 2.0 level 3 Differentiate instruction Require all FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s to enroll in Team Up and/or SES tutoring							
Differentiate instruction Require all FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s to enroll in Team Up and/or SES tutoring							
instruction Require all FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s to enroll in Team Up and/or SES tutoring			FCAT 2.0 level				
instruction Require all FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s to enroll in Team Up and/or SES tutoring			3				
instruction Require all FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s to enroll in Team Up and/or SES tutoring			Differentiate				
Require all FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s to enroll in Team Up and/or SES tutoring							
FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s to enroll in Team Up and/or SES tutoring			instruction				
FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s to enroll in Team Up and/or SES tutoring			Require all				
1 and 2s to enroll in Team Up and/or SES tutoring							
in Team Up and/or SES tutoring			1				
Up and/or SES tutoring							
tutoring							
tutoring (F/R lunch)							
(F/K luncn)			tutoring				
			(F/K lunch)				
Provide in-			Provide in-				

#5E:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	school push-in tutoring for FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s 2013 Expected Level of Performance;*					
	25%	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	5E.2.	
		math curriculum	the Envision Math curriculum	teachers Math Coach Leadership Team RtI Team ESE Liaison Inclusion and EBD Teachers	configuration Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on math formatives Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on FCIM math mini assessments Review the number of students scoring 60% and above on their District Benchmark	Envisions assessments District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Classroom visitation log Teacher Assessment Instrument District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment	

5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3.	5E.3
expose	nts not ded to calendars to identify Sunshine State Standards	All K-5 grade teachers	l	Envisions assessments
benchn the hig	marks at most likely to be assessed on the FCAT 2.0	Math Coach	·	District Benchmark Assessment
levels of Depth	of Webb's Use FCIM math focus	Leadership Team	Teacher observation	FCIM mini
	nowledge calendars to focus on the	RtI Team	Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and	assessments
comple			above on math formatives	Classroom visitation log
			Review the percentage of	Teacher Assessment
			above on FCIM math mini	Instrument
				District Benchmark
			students scoring 60% and	Assessment
				FCIM mini assessments
				Team-Up and SES
				tutoring mini assessment

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

Middle School Mathematics Goals

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

	Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achievem ent						
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.		IA.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.		
Mathematics Goal #1A: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	data for expected level of performance in this box.					
		1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	

-2011011011	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.	1B.1.		
Alternate							
Assessment:							
Students scoring at							
Levels 4, 5, and 6 in							
mathematics.							
		2013 Expected					
#1B:	Level of Performance:*	Level of Performance:*					
Enter narrative for the							
goal in this box.							
	Enter numerical	Enter numerical					
	data for current level of	data for expected level of					
	performance in	performance in					
		this box.	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	
		1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	1B.2.	
		1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	1B.3.	

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

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

		_				•	
Based on the analysis	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.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.	3A.1.		
Percentage of							
students making							
learning gains in							
mathematics.	2012 0						
Mathematics Goal	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
#3A:	Level of	Level of					
	Performance:*	Performance:*					
Enter narrative for the							
goal in this box.							
	Enter numerical	Enter numerical					
	data for	data for					
	current level of	expected level of					
	performance in	performance in					
	this box.	this box.					
		3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	3A.2.	
		J. 1.2.		511.2.	51.1. 2 .	[
		3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	3A.3.	
3B. Florida	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.	3B.1.		
Alternate							
Assessment:							
Percentage of							
students making							
learning gains in							
mathematics.							
mathematics.							

Mathemati #3B: Enter narrati goal in this b	tive for the		2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		data for current level of performance in	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	3B.2.	
			3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	3B.3.	

D 1 4 1 1	1	C	D D :::	D 11 11 D :			
Based on the analysis	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
of student achievement	Barrier		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
data and reference to							
"Guiding Questions,"							
identify and define areas							
in need of improvement							
for the following group:							
	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.	4A.1.		
Percentage of							
students in lowest							
25% making							
learning gains in							
mathematics.							
Mathematics Goal	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
#Λ Δ ·	Level of	Level of					
####.	Performance:*	Performance:*					
Enter narrative for the							
goal in this box.							
50							
	Enter numerical	Enter numerical					
	data for	data for					
	current level of	expected level of					
	performance in	performance in					
	this box.	this box. 4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	4A.2.	
		711.2.	77.2.	77.2.	77.1.2.	77.2.2.	
		4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	4A.3.	
4B. Florida	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.	4B.1.		
.2.1.01144	[D.1.	пD.1.	TD.1.	TD.1.	TD.1.		
Alternate							
Assessment:							
Percentage of							
students in lowest							
25% making							
learning gains in							
mathematics.							
				l	1		

Ma #4]	R·		2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	er narrative for the l in this box.							
		current level of performance in	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
			4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	4B.2.	
			4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	4B.3.	

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

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
5E. Economically Disadvantaged	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.	5E.1.		
students not making							
satisfactory progress							
in mathematics.							
#5F·	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.2.	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]).

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
Assessment: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.		3.1.	3.1.	3.1.	3.1.		
in in the contract of the cont	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	3.2.	
						3.3.	
						J.J.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

4. Florida Alternate 4	1.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.	4.1.		
Assessment:							
Percentage of							
students in lowest							
25% making							
learning gains in							
mathematics.							
Mathematics Goal #4: 2	2012 Current Level of	2013 Expected Level of					
		Performance:*					
goal in this box.							
		Enter numerical					
		data for expected level of					
p	performance in his box.						
t)			4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	4.2.	
		1.2.	1.2.		1.2.	11.2.	
		4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	4.3.	

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

End of Algebra 1 EOC Goals

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

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

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

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
3C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Geometry.		3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.	3C.1.		
Geometry Goal #3C:	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. 3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	3C.2.	
		3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	3C.3.	
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		

3D. Students	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.	3D.1.		
with Disabilities							
(SWD) not making							
satisfactory progress							
in Geometry.							
Geometry Goal #3D:		2013 Expected					
E4		Level of Performance:*					
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.							
5							
		Enter numerical					
		data for expected level of					
	performance in this box.	performance in this box.					
			3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	3D.2.	
		3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	3D.3.	

			i	1		İ	
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:							
3E. Economically	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.	3E.1.		
Disadvantaged **							
students not making							
satisfactory progress							
in Geometry.							
Geometry Goal #3E:	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
		Level of					
Enter narrative for the	Performance:*	Performance:*					
goal in this box.							
	Enter numerical	Enter numerical					
		data for					
	current level of	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

Profess	ional			
Develop	ment			
(PD) align	ed with			
Strategies	through			
Profess				

				•	İ	
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
Webb's Depth of Knowledge: Cognitive Complexity		Timothy T. Warren, Principal	School-wide		Align Lesson Plans and Instructional Focus with Board Configuration Complexity Level (H-M-L)	Principal Leadership Team
Lesson Planning: Common Core and Unpacking Benchmarks	All	Timothy T. Warren, Principal	School-wide		Align Lesson Plans and Instructional Focus with Board Configuration Complexity Review Lesson Plans for Benchmark and Standard being Unpacked	Principal Leadership Team
Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP)	All	Timothy T. Warren, Principal Annette Tobler, PDF	School-wide		Review IPDPs for teacher instructional strategy focus on targeted student population with reading deficiencies	Principal PDF
Teaching Math by Benchmark	All	Timothy T. Warren, Principal Tyra Forcine- Mobley, Math Coach Carol Smith, Math Interventionist	School-wide		Review Lesson Plans, Classroom Visitations, Student FCIM Mini Assessment Data, School-wide Progress Monitoring	Principal Leadership Team

Data Analysis:	All	Timothy T.	School-wide	Review Lesson Plans, Classroom	Principal
Appropriate Progress		Warren,		Visitations, Student FCIM Mini	Leadership Team
Monitoring		Principal		Assessment Data, School-wide	
				Progress Monitoring	
		Tyra Forcine-			
		Mobley,			
		Math Coach			
		Carol Smith,			
		Math			
		Interventionist			

<u>Mathematics Budget</u> (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
Identify and explicitly teach FCAT 2.0 Math Reporting Category benchmarks within the math curriculum resources	Envision Math, Investigations Math, SuccessMaker, destination Success	NA	NA
Identify and explicitly teach FCAT 2.0 Math Reporting Category benchmarks utilizing authentic materials	Various authentic and high-interests resources	NA	NA
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Increase the amount of SuccessMaker usage for students identified in the math low 25%	Additional SuccessMaker licenses	NA	NA
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Webb's Depth of Knowledge: Cognitive Complexity	Webb's Depth of Knowledge chart	NA	NA
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

Subtotal:		
Total:		

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]).

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

1A. FCAT 2.0:	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	1A.1.	
Students scaring at						
Achievement Level 3	Number of	Use science	All 5 th grade teachers	Review of lesson plans	District Benchmark	
in science.		leveled readers	M 1/2 : C 1		Assessment	
in science.	performing tasks with	to differentiate instruction	Math/Science Coach	Teacher observation	FCIM mini	
	moderate and	ilistruction	Principal	Review the percentage of	assessments	
		Provide	Timeipai	students scoring 80% and	assessments	
	levels of	teachers with	Assistant Principal	above on math formatives	Teacher Assessment	
	complexity	Webb's Depth			Instrument	
		of	RtI Team	Review the percentage of		
		Knowledge			District Benchmark	
		training		above on FCIM science mini	Assessment	
		Di		assessments	T II CEC	
		Require teachers to		Review the number of	Team-Up and SES tutoring mini	
		include the leve		students scoring 60% and	assessment	
		of		above on their District		
		complexity		Benchmark		
		either within				
		their focus/				
		essential				
		question or in their lesson				
		plan				
		Pium				
		Differentiate				
		instruction				
Science Goal #1A:	2012 Current	2013 Expected				
	Level of	Level of				
The number of 5th grade	Performance:*	Performance:*				
students achieving						
proficiency will increase 3% from 12% to 16%						
5 % from 12 % to 10 %						
	5/61 students or	7/48 students or				
	12% proficient	16%proficient				

	i	1	l	l	l	1
		1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.
		Students not sufficiently exposed to science standards	Use science leveled readers to differentiate instruction Provide explicit benchmark-focused instruction during science engage lesson Provide science safety nets	Math/Science Coach Principal Assistant Principal RtI Team	Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on science formatives Review the percentage of students scoring 80% and above on science mini assessments Review the number of	District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Teacher Assessment Instrument District Benchmark Assessment Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.
		111.3.	111.0.	111.0.	111.5.	111.5.
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.	1B.1.	1B.1.	IB.1.	IB.1.	IB.1.	
Science Goal #1B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*				
	NA	NA .				
		1B.2.	1B.2.	IB.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: 2A. FCAT 2.0:	Anticipated Barrier 2A.1.	Strategy 2A.1.	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring 2A.1.	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool 2A.1.	
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in science.	students not performing task with moderate and high levels of complexity Students not sufficiently exposed to science standards K-4	leveled readers to differentiate instruction Provide explicit benchmark- focused	Assistant Principal RtI Team	Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 85% and above on science formatives Review the percentage of students scoring 85% and above on FCIM science mini assessments Review the number of students scoring 75% and above on their District Benchmark	District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Teacher Assessment Instrument District Benchmark Assessment Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment	

Science Goal #2A: The number of 5th grade students achieving level 4 and above increase 3% from 0% to 3%	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	0/61 students or 0%.	1/48 students or 1%					
		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 science.	2B.1.		2B.1.	2B.1.	2B.1.		
Science Goal #2B:	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013Expected Level of Performance:*					
	NA	NA					
		2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	2B.2.	
		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.		
Science Goal #1: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	Level of	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	Enter numerical data for current level of performance in this box.	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance in this box.					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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

End of Florida Alternate Assessment High School Science Goals

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

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

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

			<u>i</u>	<u>i</u>	<u> </u>	•	
	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.							
Brotogy 1 Gour #1.	2012 Current Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
goai in inis box.							
	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.		

En	nter narrative for the al in this box.	Level of Performance:*	2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
		current level of performance in	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	Grade Level/	PD Facilitator	PD Participants	Target Dates (e.g., Early		Person or Position Responsible for
and/or PLC Focus	Subject	and/or	(e.g., PLC, subject, grade	Release) and Schedules (e.g.,	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Monitoring
	jeev	PLC Leader	level, or school-wide)	frequency of meetings)		

Webb's Depth of Knowledge: Cognitive Complexity	All :	Timothy T. Warren, Principal	School-wide	Align Lesson Plans and Instructional Focus with Board Configuration Complexity Level (H-M-L)	Principal Leadership Team
Lesson Planning: Common Core and Unpacking Benchmarks	All	Timothy T. Warren, Principal	School-wide	Align Lesson Plans and Instructional Focus with Board Configuration Complexity Review Lesson Plans for Benchmark and Standard being Unpacked	Principal Leadership Team
Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP)	All	Timothy T. Warren, Principal Annette Tobler, PDF	School-wide	Review IPDPs for teacher instructional strategy focus on targeted student population	Principal PDF
Teaching Science by Benchmark	All	Timothy T. Warren, Principal Tyra Forcine- Mobley, Math Coach Carol Smith, Math Interventionist	School-wide	Review Lesson Plans, Classroom Visitations, Student FCIM Mini Assessment Data, School-wide Progress Monitoring	Principal Leadership Team
Data Analysis: Appropriate Progress Monitoring	All	Timothy T. Warren, Principal Tyra Forcine- Mobley, Math Coach	School-wide	Review Lesson Plans, Classroom Visitations, Student FCIM Mini Assessment Data, School-wide Progress Monitoring	Principal Leadership Team

Science Budget (Insert rows as needed)

8 \	,	
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 Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

	Problem- Solving Process to Increase Student Achievem ent					
Based on the analysis of student achievement data and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.	Number of students not exposed to authentic texts writing on grade level	sunshine state Standards for writing Expose students	RtI Team	1A.1. Review of board configuration Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review monthly writing assessments Review weekly writing assignments Review district writing assessments	IA.1. Classroom visitation log Teacher Assessment Instrument District Writing Assessment Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment	

		2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	48/61 students or 80%	50/61 students or 83%					
		1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	1A.2.	
		1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	1A.3.	
1B. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.		1B.1.	IB.1.	IB.1.	IB.1.		
		2013 Expected Level of Performance:*					
	NA	NA					
		1B.2.	1B.2.	IB.2.	1B.2.	1B.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 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
Using Rubrics to teach writing	K-5	Principal	K-5	Monthly after school 3:15pm-4:0pm	Review monthly writing prompt classroom profiles	Principal, Leadership Team

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
NA	NA	NA	NA
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA	NA	NA	NA

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

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:	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
	Level of	Level of					
Enter narrative for the	Performance:*	Performance:*					
goal in this box.							
goat in this box.							
	Enter numerical	Enter numerical					
	data for	data for					
	current level of	expected level of					
	performance in	performance in					
	this box.	this box.					
	11113 00%	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
1							
1	1	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis	Anticipated	Strategy	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
of student achievement	Barrier	June 19	Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy	Z variation 1001		
data and reference to	Darrier		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
"C : 1: O : "							
"Guiding Questions,"							
identify and define areas							
in need of improvement							
for the following group:							
	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
at or above							
Achievement Levels							
4 and 5 in Civics.							
Civics Goal #2:	2012 Current	2013 Expected					
	Level of	Level of					
Enter narrative for the	Performance:*	Performance:*					
goal in this box.							
goui in inis vox.							
	Enter numerical	Enter numerical					
	data for	data for					
				1		ĺ	
	current level of	expected level of					
	current level of performance in	expected level of performance in					
		expected level of performance in this box.					
	performance in	performance in this box.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
	performance in	performance in this box.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	
	performance in	performance in this box.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	2.2.	

	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.	2.3.						
Civics Profession	ivics 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]).

U.S. History 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:		Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

		,		•	•		i
	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.		
at Achievement							
Level 3 in U.S.							
History.							
	2012 C	2012 F 4 1					
U.S. History Goal #1:	2012 Current Level of	2013 Expected Level of					
	Performance:*	Performance:*					
Enter narrative for the	remormance.	remormance.					
goal in this box.							
	Entan mum on!1	Enter numerical					
	Enter numerical data for	enter numerical data for					
	current level of	expected level of					
	performance in	performance in					
	this box.	this box.					
		1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
		1.2		1.0			
		1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	
Based on the analysis	Anticipated	Ctuata	Person or Position	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool		
of student achievement	Barrier	Strategy	Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation 1001		
data and reference to	Darrier		Responsible for Monitoring	Effectiveness of Strategy			
"Guiding Questions,"							
identify and define areas							
in need of improvement							
for the following group:							
	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.	2.1.		
at or above							
Achievement Levels							
4 and 5 in U.S.							
History.	2012 G	2012 F					
U.S. History Goal #2:	Level of	2013 Expected Level of					
	ii evel oi	n everor		1	1		
	Derformance:*	Performance:*					
Enter narrative for the	Performance:*	Performance:*					
Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	Performance:*	Performance:*					
	Performance:*	Performance:*					
	Performance:*	Performance:*					
	Performance:*	Performance:*					

data for current 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)

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

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.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	
	Family mobility	Recommend carpooling	Teachers	Student sign-in log	District Attendance Report	
	Lack of reliable transportation	Identify early	Guidance Counselor	OnCourse attendance	AIT meetings	
		attendance problem	Assistant Principal	Genesis	OnCourse	
		patterns and schedule AIT meetings	Principal		Genesis	
		Increase referrals to Truancy Office				
		Use School Messenger automated				
		messages to notify parents o absences	f			
Attendance Goal #1: Increase the Average Daily Attendance (ADA) rate 3% from 70585 days students were present at school compared to 77034students were enrolled.	Attendance Rate:*	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:*				
		94%				
	Number of	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)				
	161/430 students or 40%	151/360 students or 37%				

Students with	Number of Students with Excessive					
	more)					
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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
Using OnCourse to take attendance	School-wide	Tomia Hodge	School-wide	Grade level meetings	Monitor student attendance through OnCourse and Genesis	Teachers

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
Use the School Messenger automated call system to notify parents of their child's daily attendance	District	NA	NA
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

Use the School Messenger automated call system to notify parents of their child's daily attendance	District	NA	NA
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
NA	NA	NA	NA
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			

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)	Problem- solving Process to Decrease Suspension					
Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of improvement:	Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	

1. Suspension	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	
ar Suspension						
	High crime area	Implement Character	All teachers	Decrease in the number	Student discipline	
	D 11 : 41	Education		of students sent to the	referrals	
	Bullying on the way to/from school			office on Class II discipline referral	School Discipline	
	to/from school	Step	Counselor	discipline referral	Report form Genesis	
	Bullying at the bus	Anti-bullying	Assistant	Decrease in the number	report form denesis	
	stop	and bunying		of students suspended for	Girl Matters attendance	
	Бтор	Implementation of	Timolpui	fighting or bullying	and exit log	
	Poor teacher-student		Principal	3 - 3		
	relationships	CHAMPs		Increase in the number of		
				female students successfully		
		Train teachers on		exited from Girl Matters		
	experienced teachers					
		relationships with				
		students				
		NT 410 4				
		Notify the				
		community officer and school				
		transportation to				
		closely monitor				
		school bus stops				
		Have teachers use				
		classroom Class I				
		referrals prior to				
		Class II				
		Increase the number				
		of male students being mentored from				
		4 to 6				
		Increase the number				
		of female students				
		being counseled				
		by "Girl Matters"				
		intervention				
		counseling				

of In —School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions					
0	0					
of Students Suspended	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In -School					
Ω	0					
Number of Out-of- School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions					
305	296					
<u>of Students</u> Suspended	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School					
<u>110</u>	107					
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	

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
Foundations	Training, books, CDs	District	One representative (K-5)	Sept. 20 th	Student discipline referrals	Teachers, Guidance Counselor, Principal
CHAMPS	Training, books, CDs	District	One representative (K-5)	Jan. 16 th and 24 th	Student discipline referrals	Teachers, Guidance Counselor, Principal

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
Continue to refer female students in the	City of Jacksonville	NA	NA
Girl Matters counseling program			
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount

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

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				, , <u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>	
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.	

	2012 Current Dropout Rate:*	2013 Expected Dropout Rate:*					
	data for dropout	Enter numerical data for expected dropout rate in this box.					
2	2012 Current Graduation Rate:*	2013 Expected Graduation Rate:*					
	data for graduation rate in	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			

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

Dropout Prevention Budget (Insert rows as needed)

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

Subtotal:		
Total:		

End of Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

* When using percentage	es, include the	e number of s	tudents the percentage	e represents next to the p	ercentage (e.g. 70%)	o (35)).	
Parent Involvement Goal(s) Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions," identify and define areas in need of			Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine	Evaluation Tool	o (33)).	
improvement:							
	education No loyalty to school due to high mobility	Provide engaging activities for	SAC Chairperson PTA President	Parent Involvement activities Better coordinated parent Involvement activities	1.1. Sin-in log for Parent Involvement activities Sign-in logs for SAC meetings Sign-in logs for PTA meetings SchoolMessenger logs		
Involvement activities will	2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:*	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:*					

6 parents	7 parents				
	meetings conflict with parent work schedules	1.2. Principal Parent Volunteer Liaison SAC Chairperson PTA Chairperson	SAC and PTA meetings	1.2. Sin-in log for Parent Involvement activities Sign-in logs for SAC meetings Sign-in logs for PTA meetings	
	receive "person and direct" communication from teachers regarding	1.3. All K-5 teachers Principal	SAC and PTA meetings Increased participation with Parent Involvement	Sign-in logs for SAC meetings Sign-in logs for PTA meetings	

Parent Involvement Professional Development

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

professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Effective Reading Strategies	K-5	Principal and Reading Coach	Provide parents with training and resources	October 25 th	Sign in log	Principal
Effective Writing Strategies	K-5	Principal and Reading Coach	Provide parents with training and resources	November 29 th	Sign in log	Principal
How to help your child in Math at Home	K-5		Provide parents with training and resources	December 20 th	Sign in log	Principal
Explore science with Your Child	K-5		Provide parents with training and resources	January 24 th	Sign in log	Principal
FCAT 2.0 Night	3 rd -5 th		Provide parents with training and resources	February 21st	Sign in log	Principal

Parent Involvement Budget

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

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: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.					1.1.
	1.2.			1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

STEM Professional Development

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

professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

STEM Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Total:			
Subtotal:			
	1		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Other			
Subtotal:			
	r. sarata and a		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Professional Development			
Subtotal:			
Strategy	Description of Resources	1 unumg Source	Amount
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Technology			
Subtotal:			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
funded activities /materials.			
activities/materials and exclude district			
Include only school-based funded			

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: Enter narrative for the goal in this box.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.
	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.	1.2.
	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.	1.3.

CTE Professional Development

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

professional development or PLC activity.						
PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

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)).

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

Additional Goals Professional Development

Professional Development (PD) aligned with Strategies through Professional Learning Community (PLC) or PD Activity Please note that each Strategy does not require a professional development or						
PLC activity. PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/ Subject	PD Facilitator and/or 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
		T EC Ecauci	School-wide)	requeries of meetings)		

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

Include only school-based funded			
activities/materials and exclude district			
funded activities /materials.			
Evidence-based Program(s)/Materials(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Amount
Subtotal:			
Total:			
		1	

End of Additional Goal(s)

Final Budget (Insert rows as needed)

Please provide the total budget from each section.	
Reading Budget	
	Total:
CELLA Budget	
	Total:
Mathematics Budget	
Trumemutes Budget	Total:
Science Budget	1,1,1,1
Science Buuget	
	Total:
Writing Budget	
	Total:
Civics Budget	
	Total:
HOH! A D L (1 Otal.
U.S. History Budget	
	Total:
Attendance Budget	
	Total:
Suspension Budget	
Suspension Budget	Total:
	10(a);
Dropout Prevention Budget	
	Total:
Parent Involvement Budget	
	Total:
STEM Budget	
STEM Budget	TD 4.1
	Total:
CTE Budget	
	Total:
Additional Goals	
	Total:
	1 Otal:

2012-2013 Sc	hool Improvement	Plan (SIP)-Form SIP-1

Grand Total:

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability (DA) Compliance

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

School Differentiated Accountability Status		
□Priority	□Focus	□Prevent

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

School Advisory Council (SAC)

SAC Membership Compliance

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

□ Yes □ No

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

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

- Promote the benefits of students wearing school uniforms and present all stakeholders with a comprehensive and democratic process for potentially transitioning the school to school uniforms.
- Provide the principal with a business/news channel mentorship for 4th and 5th grade students to further develop the TV production lab and consider TV production as a viable career.

Describe the projected use of SAC funds.

Amount

Purchase student planners to increase parent involvement and to notify parents of their child's academic and social progress, along with keeping	\$440.51
parents informed about school/district events.	