

# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



Pam Stewart, Commissioner  
Florida Department of Education  
325 West Gaines Street  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

School Name: NEPTUNE BEACH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Duval

Principal: Elizabeth Kavanagh

SAC Chair: Chantelle Quick

Superintendent: Ed Pratt-Dannals

Date of School Board Approval: November 5, 2012

Last Modified on: 11/9/2012

## PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

### STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

<a href="#">School Grades Trend Data</a>
<a href="#">Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data</a>
<a href="#">High School Feedback Report</a>
<a href="#">K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan</a>

### ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Elizabeth Kavanagh	MAT in Educational Leadership  Areas of certification include: School Principal, Educational Leadership, Elementary Education 1-6, ESOL Endorsement, Nursery-Kindergarten	3	10	A school grade of A has been earned each year beginning 2001-2002 school year. 2011-2012 Neptune Beach decreased 25 points in the state grading system while maintaining an A School Grade. Achievement Data: Reading 69%, Math 76%, Writing 67%, Science 66%, Reading Gains 75%, Math Gains 81% Bottom Quartile Reading 73%, Bottom Quartile Math 77%. 2010-2011 Neptune Beach increased 52 points in the state grading system and maintained the letter grade of A. Elizabeth Kavanagh transferred to Neptune Beach Elementary August 2010. Elizabeth previously served 7 years as Principal at Lone Star Elementary.
					A school grade of A has been earned each year beginning 2001-2002 school year.

Assis Principal	E. Jean Aikens	MAT in Educational Leadership Areas of certification include: Educational Leadership, Reading K-12 Elementary Education 1-6,	3	5	2011-2012 Neptune Beach decreased 25 points in the state grading system while maintaining an A School Grade. Achievement Data: Reading 69%, Math 76%, Writing 67%, Science 66%, Reading Gains 75%, Math Gains 81% Bottom Quartile Reading 73%, Bottom Quartile Math 77%. 2010-2011 Neptune Beach increased 52 points in the state grading system and maintained the letter grade of A. Jean Aikens transferred to Neptune Beach Elementary in August 2010. Jean previous served as Assistant Principal at North Shore Elementary K-8 for 2 years.
-----------------	----------------	--	---	---	---

## INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)

## EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	Regular meetings of new teachers with Principal	Principal	Ongoing	
2	Recruitment per local colleges, universities and high performing schools (public & private)	Principal	Ongoing	
3	Partnering new teachers with veteran teachers (mentoring)	Principal, PDF	Ongoing	
4	Orientation to school, policies and expectations	Principal, PDF	Ongoing	
5	Open door policy for questions and concerns	Principal and Assistant Principal	Ongoing	
6	Support from school PTA.	Principal/PTA	Ongoing	
7	Provide professional development to all teachers.	Principal/Assistant Principal/PDF	Ongoing	
8	Increase technology in the classroom by use of iPads, MimioTeach and docking stations.	Principal/Media Specialist/School Technology Team	Ongoing	

## Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
None	

## 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
63	4.8%(3)	9.5%(6)	34.9%(22)	50.8%(32)	34.9%(22)	100.0%(63)	3.2%(2)	4.8%(3)	65.1%(41)

## 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
Karen Anthes	Joshua Gray	MINT Program-mentor is veteran teacher with experience on the grade level	Planning, Student Assessment, Collaboration, Peer Observation, etc.
Michelle Atkins	Lauren Kantor	MINT Program-mentor is veteran teacher with experience on the grade level	Planning, Student Assessment, Collaboration, Peer Observation, etc.
Brooke Forte	Rachel Fox	MINT Program-mentor is veteran educator with experience in behavior management	Planning, Student Assessment, Collaboration, Peer Observation, etc.
Marilyn Halker	Coral Noble	MINT Program-mentor is veteran teacher with experience writing and implementing Individual Education Plans.	Planning, Student Assessment, Collaboration, Peer Observation, etc.
Carolyn Peterson	Brett Roberts	MINT Program-mentor is veteran teacher with experience on the grade level.	Planning, Student Assessment, Collaboration, Peer Observation, etc.

## ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

### Coordination and Integration

**Note: For Title I schools only**

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Elizabeth Kavanagh, Jean Aikens, Marylou Graham, Brooke Forte, Adrienne Janssen, Lisa Aimone, Sue Kuterka, Sangita Cody

Responsibilities include: Principal/Assistant Principal, provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making; ensures that the school-based team is implementing RtI; conducts assessment of RtI skills of school staff; ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation requirements; ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities. Leadership Team: Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches; identifies systematic patterns of student needs while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk"; assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery

of professional development; supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring. RtI Facilitator: Participates on Building Leadership Team; acts as liaison for implementation of RtI at the school level; receives ongoing RtI training and delivers information to school; provides direct intervention services to an identified group of students and tracks student progress; guides school in using data to make decisions about interventions and strategies that support RtI. School Counselor: Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students; links community agencies to schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success; provides consultation services to general and special education teachers, parents and administrators; provides group and individual student intervention; and conducts direct observation of student behavior. Select General Education Teachers: Provide information about core instruction in student data collection; deliver Tier 1 instruction/interventions; collaborate with other staff to implement Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 interventions; and integrate Tier 1 materials/ instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. Select ESE Teachers: Participate in student data collection; assist in determination for further assessment; integrate core instructional activities/materials into Tier 2 and or Tier 3 instruction; and collaborate with general education teachers through activities such as facilitation and consultation. Foundations Team Chair: Provides information about school-wide and class-wide behavior curriculum and instruction; participates in behavioral data collection; provides professional development principles of Foundations to faculty and staff; and collaborates with staff to implement behavioral interventions. Select ESOL Teachers: Educate the team in the role that second language acquisition plays in the learning process and collaborates with the general education teacher. Provides Tier 2/3 interventions to select ESOL students. Select personnel with technical expertise: Develop or broker technology necessary to manage and display data; provide professional development to teachers and staff regarding data management and display.

Describe how the school-based MTSS Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?

The school-based RtI Leadership Team will meet monthly. The meetings will be designed to review screening data and to help in plans and instructional decisions, review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development and resources. The team will also collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skills. The team will facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation. The aforementioned team (or select members thereof) will review all Tier II/III, Overage & One Plus year retained students. Formative and summative diagnostic material will be reviewed to determine areas of focus and to develop prescriptive measures. Evaluation will then occur, and the cycle will repeat or expand as needed. Any student referred to MRT for consideration of ESE will be reviewed by the RtI leadership team for supporting documentation.

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

The RtI Team and Leadership Team met to discuss data and how to best meet the needs of students. This information was then presented to faculty for review of data with input from other teams. The initial draft of the SIP was created. The draft was then presented to the School Advisory Council for review and recommendations. The SIP becomes the guiding document for the work of the school. The Leadership Team regularly revises and updates the plans as the needs of students change throughout the school year. The plan includes a formal review process which demonstrates how the school has used the RtI to inform instruction and make midcourse adjustments as data are analyzed.

#### 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.

Diagnostic Data: Envisions Summative, District Benchmark, Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), DRA. Prescriptive Monitoring: PMRN, Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM), FCAT Simulation, District Writing Prompts, K-2 Common Core Assessments Evaluative Data: FAIR, Envisions Summative, FCAT, District Writing Prompts. Behavioral Data: Behavior contracts, FBA, Classroom rituals and routines

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional development from our RtI facilitator, Guidance Counselor and other trained staff will be held through Vertical Alignment Teams and Early Release Days, Professional Learning Communities, Collaborative Planning, Book Study and Lesson Study

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Weekly grade level data meetings with leadership team will provide support to individuals which will carry into the classroom instruction. Implementation of grade level RtI. Classroom observations with feedback. Looking at student work to prescribe instruction and next steps.

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).  
Elizabeth Kavanagh-Principal  
E. Jean Aikens-Assistant Principal  
Sarah Hall-5th Grade ELA teacher (Literacy Team Leader)  
Cindy Kennon-Kindergarten Teacher  
Jen Parker-Kindergarten Teacher  
Holly Robertson-1st Grade Teacher  
Rebecca Howell-2nd Grade Teacher  
Alane Wright-2nd Grade Teacher  
Armedra Merkison-3rd Grade Teacher  
Carolyn Peterson-3rd Grade Teacher  
Joshua Gray-4th Grade Teacher  
Rachel Fox-ESE Teacher  
Lydia Bowie-ESOL Teacher  
Nancy DeCandis-Resource Teacher

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

Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The team meets monthly, both as a leadership team (Fridays) and as facilitators of the weekly Data Discussion Groups including all teachers. The purpose of the Data Discussion Groups is to review and disaggregate data, plan literacy instruction based on the data, and reflect on the impact on student achievement.

In addition, the Literacy Team, a PLC that is part of our Academic Learning Teams, meets the 2nd Tuesday of the month. Their main goal is to unpack the New Generation Sunshine State Standards and Common Core Standards, as well as continuously address instructional rigor.

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

What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?  
Through the use of Data Discussion Groups and Academic Learning Teams (PLC), the LLT will:

1. Maintain reading gains for all students
2. Increase rigor for all students
3. Maintain use of formative assessment in reading and writing
4. Increase teacher understanding of curriculum/Common Core Standards
5. Increase rigor in writing in all grade levels
6. Provide writing connections for Book of the Month

## Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification  
No Attachment

## \*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

**\*Grades 6-12 Only**

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

**\*High Schools Only**

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

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

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

**Postsecondary Transition**

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

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

## PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

### Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.  Reading Goal #1a:	In 2013, students in level 3 will improve three percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
3rd grade 23.0% (30) 4th grade 27.1% (32) 5th grade 24.7% (36)	3rd grade 26.0% (37) 4th grade 30.1% (33) 5th grade 27.7% (32)

#### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Implementation of Florida's Next Generation Sunshine State Standards	1.1. Instruct students in learning how to meet the expectations of benchmarks for each of the NGSSS.	1.1. Principal	1.1. Classroom observations and lesson plans.	1.1. Formative and summative assessment.
2	1.2. Students new to FCAT 2.0.	1.2. Provide students with test experiences that mirror FCAT 2.0 in both content and form.	1.2. Teachers	1.2. Student performance on teacher created tests, benchmark assessments, etc.	1.2. Formative and summative assessment, district benchmark data and FCAT results.
3	1.3 Implementation of Common Core Standards in K-2.	1.3 Instruct students in meeting expectations of Common Core Standards.	1.3 K-2 Teachers	1.3 Student performance on formative and summative assessment.	1.3 Formative and summative assessment.
4	1.4 Insufficient exposure to non-fiction literature.	1.4 Provide students with greater exposure to non-fiction reading material.	1.4 Teachers	1.4 Analysis of student book counts, reading records and DRA information.	1.4 Achieve 3000, FCAT 2.0 results and other formative and summative assessments.
5	1.5 Teachers new to grade level and FCAT 2.0 specs.	1.5 Provide district and school based training as well as peer teacher support.	1.5 Principal	1.5 Evidence of teacher workshops and implementation in classrooms.	1.5 Formative and summative assessment.

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.  Reading Goal #1b:	In 2013, students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading will increase by one percentage point.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
19% (4) students scored at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading.	20% (4) will score at a Level 4, 5 or 6 in reading.



Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	100% of students are functioning on the supported or participatory level of academics.	Increase use of Unique Learning Systems with fidelity, increase communication skills, increase vocabulary with pictures.	SLA and PLA Teachers	Unique Learning Systems Testing, Formal Observations with recorded data	Florida Alternate Assessment, Teacher made tests and observations

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading.  Reading Goal #2a:	In 2013, students scoring at or above Achievement Level for in reading will increase by three percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
3rd grade level 4 28.5% (37) 3rd grade level 5 13.1% (17) 4th grade level 4 28.0% (33) 4th grade level 5 13.6% (16) 5th grade level 4 29.5% (43) 5th grade level 5 13.7% (20)	3rd grade level 4 31.5% (45) 3rd grade level 5 16.1% (23) 4th grade level 4 31.0% (33) 4th grade level 5 16.6% (18) 5th grade level 4 32.5% (38) 5th grade level 5 16.7% (19)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. Students difficulty in proficiently and independently reading a variety of complex text.	2.1. Increase both the amount of reading complex texts and the number of moderate and high complexity questions/tasks in daily workshops and assessment. Use of Webb's Depth of Knowledge to guide questioning.	2.1. Principal	2.1. Analysis of school based assessment, curriculum, instruction and performance tasks.	2.1. FCAT 2.0 Results, Achieve 3000 Data, Houghton Mifflin Unit Tests
2	2.2 Lack of enrichment resources and materials that correlate with Common Core (K-2) and NGSS (3-5)	2.2 Increase the amount of appropriate enrichment materials and experiences for high level students. (Achieve 3000, Non-fiction text, etc.)	2.2 Principal	2.2 Analysis of assessment based on enrichment experiences and materials.	2.2 FAIR, DRA 2, FCAT 2.0, grade level rubric assessment

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading.  Reading Goal #2b:	In 2013, students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading will increase one percentage point.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
19% (4) scored at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading.	20% (4) students will score at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of social interactions with non-disabled peers.	Increase opportunities for mainstreaming in the general education setting.	ESE Lead Teacher	IEP Review	Teacher Observation, IEP Review

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	In 2013, students making learning gains in reading will increase three percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
77% (317) students made learning gains in reading.	80% (294) of students will make learning gains in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3.1. Student incapacity for the greater demands of FCAT 2.0 in both text complexity and reading stamina.	3.1. Increase instructional rigor and length of independent reading time in classrooms.	3.1. Principal	3.1. Analysis of instruction measured against FCAT 2.0 specifications; analysis of student progress in meeting these goals.	3.1. Formative and Summative Assessment.
2	3.2. Instruction and performance tasks not aligned with rigor of FCAT 2.0	3.2. School wide collaborative training in knowledge of reading standards.	3.2. Principal	3.2. Quality instruction aligned with standards and assessments as assessed through CAST.	3.2. Formative and Summative Assessment.

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	In 2013, students making learning gains in reading will increase one percentage point.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
64% (9) students made learning gains in reading.	65% (9) students will make learning gains in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Increased complexity of cognitive requirements.	Continued use of Unique Learning Systems with fidelity. Use of PCI Reading, implementation	ESE Lead Teacher	Unique Learning Systems Assessment, Teacher Observation	Florida Alternative Assessment

	of Book of the Month with reading strategies.		
--	---	--	--

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	In 2013, students in the lowest quartile making learning gains in reading will increase three percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
77% (79) students in the lowest quartile made learning gains in reading.	80% (73) students in the lowest quartile will make learning gains in reading.

**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	4.1. Documented low student performance on varying FCAT 2.0 strands.	4.1. Intentional, deficit specific instruction in classroom and RTI instruction.	4.1. Principal	4.1. Quality data driven instruction aligned with standards and assessments, RtI assessment and tracking, FAIR	4.1. FCAT 2.0 Results
2	4.2. Lack of involvement in children's education by some parents.	4.2. Incentives and multiple learning opportunities for families with specific focus on learning expectations and strategies to assist in the learning process.	4.2. Assistant Principal	4.2. Measure attendance and involvement in classroom and school based events.	4.2. FCAT 2.0 Results, Survey Results, parent participation sign-in sheets

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal #					
	In 2013, students will increase the percentage of students who meet the Annual Measurable Objective by 3%.					
5A :						
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	69	72	75	77	80	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	In 2013, student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian) not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease four percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Current 4th grade: White 14.71% (10) Black 63.64% (7) Hispanic 53.33% (8) Asian 25% (1) Current 5th grade: White 19.23% (15) Black 66.67% (6) Hispanic 81.25% (13) Asian 33.33% (1)	Current 4th grade: White 10.00% (1) Black 59.64% (7) Hispanic 49.33% (8) Asian 20.0% (1) Current 5th grade: White 15.23% (13) Black 59.67% (9) Hispanic 77.25% (14) Asian 29.33% (1)
--	---

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5.B.1. Lack of alternative strategies and materials to use with students needing Tier II and Tier III interventions.	5.B.1. Lowest quartile students will be provided with support during the readers workshop and during extended times designated for Tier II and Tier III interventions.	5.B.1. RTI Leadership Team	5.B.1. Weekly data meetings with teachers.	5.B.1. DRA, FAIR, FCAT 2.0
2	5.B.2. Effective teaching strategies, proper data management and deficit analysis, adequately providing small group instruction based on student needs, correlation with state required tests to interim assessments (Benchmark, district provided formative and summative assessments, Limelight).	5.B.2. Provide effective large and small group instruction based on Duval County mandated curriculum. Provide assessments, analyze data, provide small group instruction (based on need and level) in order to reteach and remediate, reassess to determine effectiveness of remediation and continue making decisions based on increased results.	5.B.2. Classroom Teacher	5.B.2. Use of data analysis of district mandated benchmark tests, formative and summative tests, curriculum provided chapter and unit tests as well as teacher/grade-level created assessments.	5.B.2. Benchmark tests, FCAT 2.0, teacher made tests

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.  Reading Goal #5C:	English Language Learners not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease five percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Currently 100% of ELL students are not making satisfactory progress (0) in reading.	5% (2)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5.C.1. Students with limited English acquisition.	5.C.1. Students are pulled to work in small groups with ELL teachers.	5.C.1. Principal, Classroom Teacher, ELL Teacher	Data analysis of CELLA, FCAT 2.0, FAIR, DRA, district and teacher formative and summative assessment.	CELLA, FCAT 2.0
2	5.C.2. Students with limited success with English acquisition.	5.C.2. Students are pulled into additional small groups for RTI outside of the ELL block.	5.C.2. RTI Team	RTI data analysis	Cella, FCAT 2.0

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	In 2013, Students with Disabilities not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease twenty percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41% (17) Students with Disabilities did not make satisfactory progress in reading.	In 2013, 61% of Students with Disabilities will make satisfactory progress in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5.D.1. Increased text complexity and increased rigor with Common Core Standards	S.D.1. Differentiated instruction, Tiered intervention Reading Mastery, Corrective Reading, Six Minute Solution	5.D.1. ESE Teacher	Weekly Data Meetings to discuss progress monitoring, Classroom Assessments, District Assessments	FCAT 2.0, FAIR

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	In 2013, Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease twenty percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
62% (23) Economically Disadvantaged students did not make satisfactory progress in reading.	60% of Economically Disadvantaged Students will make satisfactory progress in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5.E.1. Increased text complexity and increased rigor with Common Core Standards.	5.E.1. Increase reading stamina by providing concentrated independent reading time daily, expose students to informational texts including functional reading materials encountered in real world situations.	Classroom Teacher, Principal, Assistant Principal	Data meetings to discuss progress monitoring, benchmarks, formative and summative data	FCAT 2.0 and FAIR

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core State Standards	K-5	Jackie Jenkins/Juliann Gaus-Graeser	School-Wide	Sept. 19, 2012	Classroom Observations	Principal and Assistant Principal
Achieve 3000 Reading	K-5	Judy Gould	All Grade-Level Teachers	Aug. 13, 2012/Oct. 26, 2012/Jan. 13, 2013	Monitoring thru weekly data meetings and monthly reports to Principal	Principal and Assistant Principal
Adding rigor to Reader's Workshop	K-5	Literacy Team	School-Wide	Early Dismissal	Classroom visit with focus on small group instruction and lesson plan review	Principal and Assistant Principal
Weekly Data Discussion meetings	K-5	Leadership Team	All Grade-Level Teachers	On-going Weekly	Weekly Discussion, Review of current data	Leadership Team

Reading Budget:

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

End of Reading Goals

## Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	In 2013, students scoring proficient in listening/speaking will increase four percentage points.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
50% (15) students scored proficient in Listening and Speaking on the CELLA.	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. New and incoming ELL students with little to no English (esp. in grades 1-5, when second languages can be more difficult to acquire).	1.1. Daily oral language development in sheltered ESOL language arts using district approved programs and methods.	1.1. ESOL Teachers Principal/Assistant Principal	1.1. Speaking/Oral language, observational matrix	1.1. CELLA
2	1.2. Students with limited English acquisition.	1.2. Immersion in English Language in both sheltered ESOL language arts and daily school-wide activities.	1.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Classroom Teachers, ESOL Teachers	1.2. Unit vocabulary/language assessments (Avenues)	1.2. CELLA
3	1.3 Parents have difficulty communicating with school and understanding school issues	1.3 PTA will appoint bilinugal PTA liason to help with parent/student/teacher communication	1.3 PTA	1.3 Parent Sign-In Sheets	1.3 Cella

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.

2. Students scoring proficient in reading.

CELLA Goal #2:

In 2013, 23.9% of the students will score proficient on the reading portion of the CELLA.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

21.9% (7) scored proficient in reading on the CELLA.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. New and incoming ELL students with little or no English (especially in grades 1-5, when second languages can be more difficult to acquire).	2.1. Use of leveled books and progress monitoring. 2.2. Rich literature based environments with intense differentiation based on proficiency level.	2.1. ESOL Teachers, Classroom Teachers	2.1. Analysis of DRA	2.1. CELLA, FCAT 2.0

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

In 2013, 60.0% of students taking CELLA will be proficient in writing.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

62.5% (20) students scored proficient in writing on the CELLA.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3.1. New and incoming students with little or no English (especially in grades 1-5, when second languages can be more difficult to acquire).	3.1. Daily modeling and conferencing with rigorous expectation of product (approaching and reaching Common Core Standards)	3.1. ESOL Teachers	3.1. Writing prompts K-5, writing conferences	3.1. CELLA, FCAT Writes!

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals



# Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal # 1a:	In 2013, students scoring a level 3 in math will improve three percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
3rd grade 25.6% (33) 4th grade 21.2 (25) 5th grade 26.0% (38)	3rd grade 28.6% (41) 4th grade 24.2% (26) 5th grade 29.0% (34)

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Gaps in benchmarks from Next Generation Sunshine State Standards to Common Core State Standards.	1.1. Introduce and utilize the instructional alignment chart from the Dana Center-learning trajectories.	1.1. Math Team Members, Principal, Assistant Principal	1.1. Data from teachers, observations.	1.1. FCAT 2.0 and district assessments, Benchmarks
2	1.2. Not all grade levels implement effective Tier II strategies.	1.2. Implement a plan for RtI math for each grade level.	1.2. Grade level Teams	1.2. Monthly review of RtI Data	1.2. RtI data and benchmark scores

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal # 1b:	In 2013, students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics will increase one percentage point.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
10% (2) students scored at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.	11% (2) students will score at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Problem-solving deficits.	Provide concrete models and strategies to help children with problem solving skills.	Classroom Teacher	Review Number Worlds Pre- and Post-Test Data	Florida Alternate Assessment

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal # 2a:	In 2013, students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics will increase three percentage points.
--	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
3rd grade level 4 31.8% (41) 3rd grade level 5 20.9% (27) 4th grade level 4 33.9% (40) 4th grade level 5 23.7% (28) 5th grade level 4 26.0% (38) 5th grade level 5 16.4% (24)			3rd grade level 4 34.8% (50) 3rd grade level 5 23.9% (34) 4th grade level 4 36.9% (40) 4th grade level 5 26.7% (29) 5th grade level 4 29.0% (34) 5th grade level 5 19.4% (23)		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.A.1. Maintaining and/or increasing student achievement levels due to lack of rigor.	2.A.1. Increase the number of moderate and high complexity questions and activities for students in daily workshop, expectations and assessments.	2.A.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Classroom Teacher	2.A.1. Analyzing school-based assessments and performance tasks.	2.A.1. FCAT 2.0, Benchmarks

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #2b:	In 2013, students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics will increase one percentage point.
--	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
19% (4) students scored at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics.	20% (3) students will score at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Increased difficulty in complex problem solving.	Use of Number Worlds with fidelity.	ESE Lead Teacher, Classroom Teacher	Number Worlds Assessments	Florida Alternate Assessment

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #3a:	In 2013, students making learning gains in mathematics will increase two percentage points.
---	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
82% (338) of students made learning gains in mathematics.	84% (308) of students will make learning gains in mathematics.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

1	3.A.1. Differentiating instruction to meet the needs of all students.	3.A.1. Track student progress from EnVisions Summative and BMA then plan focus groups based on data. 3.A.2. Provide Teacher training for differentiating instruction	3.A.1. Classroom Teachers 3.A.2. Principal	3.A.1. Data Meetings and Grade Level Meetings. 3.A.2. Classroom Observations, Data	3.1. Envision and Benchmark Assessments, Summatives, FCAT 2.0 3.A.2. FCAT 2.0, Teacher Data
---	---	---	---	---	--

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal # 3b:	In 2013, students making learning gains in mathematics will increase one percentage point.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71% (10) students made learning gains in mathematics.	72% (12) students will make learning gains in mathematics.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Increased difficulty with complex problem solving.	Provide student opportunities for hands-on math experiences. (blocks, clay, food, etc.)	ESE Lead Teacher, Classroom Teacher	Number Worlds Assessments, Teacher Observation	Florida Alternate Assessment

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #4:	In 2013, the students in the lowest 25% making gains in mathematics will increase two percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
81% (83) students in the lowest quartile made learning gains in mathematics.	83% (76) students in the lowest quartile will make learning gains in mathematics.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	4.1. Lack of students' knowledge in the category of Geometry and Measurement on the FCAT.	4.1. Utilize Math Investigations, EnVisions, RtI Block, Problem of the Day in grades K-5 to determine remediation needs. Track student progress and create differentiated groups.	4.1. Classroom Teachers	4.1. Class visits, POD/Math journals, data logs, debriefs with next steps.	4.1. Formatives, summatives, POD, journals, FCAT 2.0, benchmark assessments
2	4.2 Students missing basic concepts in mathematics	4.2 Utilize Math Navigator to pull small groups to reteach missed concepts.	4.2 Classroom Teachers	4.2 Class visits, data, Math Navigator Pre and Post Tests	4.2 FCAT 2.0, Benchmark Assessments

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Elementary School Mathematics Goal # In 2013, students who meet the Annual Measurable Objective will increase by 3%.				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	73	76	78	81	83	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #5B:	In 2013, subgroups by ethnicity (White, Hispanic, Asian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics will decrease one percentage point.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
4th grade: White 10.11% (6) Black 45.45% (3) Hispanic 50% (5) Asian 25% (1) 5th Grade: White: 16.46% (11) Black: 55.56% (2) Hispanic: 43.75% (4) Asian: 0	4th grade: White: 5.11% (4) Black: 41.45% (5) Hispanic: 46% (8) Asian: 21% (1) 5th Grade: White: 11.46% (10) Black: 41.56% (5) Hispanic: 39.75% (7) Asian: 0

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5.B.1. Limited exposure to mathematical concepts, lack of real world application to problem solving. Lack of home support.	5.B.1. Provide students with repeated concrete examples of mathematical concepts that relate to real world problems. Provide parent programs to help parents understand math curriculum and strategies to support.	5.B.1. Classroom Teacher	5.B.1. Unit Tests, Formative and Summative Assessments, Parent sign-in for programs	5.B.1. FCAT 2.0, benchmark assessments

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #5C:	In 2013, English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics will decrease two percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
90% (45) of ELL students are not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	12% of English Language Learners will make satisfactory progress in mathematics.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students with limited English proficiency,	Provide math vocabulary practice, continue differentiation of instruction.	Classroom Teacher, ELL Teacher	Benchmark, FCAT 2.0, formative and summative data	FCAT 2.0

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #5D:	In 2013, Students with Disabilities not making satisfactory progress in mathematics will decrease two percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
32% (27) of Students with Disabilities did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics.	In 2013, 70% of Students with Disabilities will make satisfactory progress in mathematics.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5.D.1. Students several grade levels behind in reading grade level texts (story problems) with emergent understanding of math concepts.	5.D.1. Scaffold instruction based on needs as identified through on-going assessment. Designate additional blocks of time for Tier II and Tier III interventions.	5.D.1. Leadership Team, RtI Team, ESE Teacher, Classroom Teacher	5.D.1. On-going progress monitoring	5.D.1. PMA's, Benchmark assessments, FCAT 2.0

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

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal E:	In 2013, Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics will decrease ten percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
38% (65) Economically Disadvantaged students did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics.	72% of Economically Disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in mathematics.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5.E.1. Increased cognitive complexity on FCAT 2.0 is challenging.	5.E.1. Scaffold instruction with concentration on vocabulary and math concepts.	5.E.1. Classroom Teacher, RtI Team	5.E.1. Data Discussion, Benchmarks, Formatives, Summatives	5.E.1. FCAT 2.0
2	5.E.2. Students missing important foundations of basic math concepts.	5.E.2. Scaffold instruction by using small group instruction with	5.E.2. Classroom Teacher	5.E.2. Math Navigator Pre and Post Tests	5.E.2. FCAT 2.0

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
Study and analyze the Common Core Assessments/Bench Assessments	K-5	Classroom Teachers and Leadership Team	School-Wide	Weekly Data Meetings	Classroom observation of Instruction	Principal and Assistant Principal
Math Navigator	2	Classroom Teachers Grade 2	Grade 2	Weekly Grade-Level Meetings	RtI documentation	RtI Team
Use of technology and EnVision online resources	K-5	Math Team	School-Wide	Monthly	Review lesson plans for implementation of interactive activities	Principal and Assistant Principal
Differentiated strategies for advanced learners	K-5	Math Team	School-Wide	Early Release Training	Review lesson plans for differentiated groups	Principal and Assistant Principal

Mathematics Budget:

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

## Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.  Science Goal #1a:	In 2013, students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Science will increase 2 percentage points.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
34.9% (51) students scored at Achievement Level 3 in science.	36.9% (43) students will score at Achievement Level 3 in science.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.A.1. Using an inquiry-based approach to cover all science benchmarks (supplies and resources).	1.A.1. Utilize explicit instruction of Science vocabulary at each grade level. Continue Implementation of "hands-on" engagement. Explicit benchmark instruction.  Gizmos	1.A.1. Grade-level Science Team member, Classroom Teacher	1.A.1. Classroom teacher observation, e.g. ESOL students utilizing Science vocabulary in discussion and writing, formative assessment after each unit of study, performance task throughout instruction, use of 5 E model labs.	1.A.1. Benchmarks, observations in lab, FCAT 2.0

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.  Science Goal #1b:	In 2013, students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science will increase one percentage point.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
37.5% (3) students scored at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.	38.5% (3) students will score at a Level 4, 5 or 6 in science.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Some students struggle to participate in and understand hands-on science activities.	Increase use of concrete examples for students. Use of Unique Learning Systems program with fidelity.	ESE Lead, Classroom Teachers	Unique Learning Systems Assessments, Teacher Observations	Unique Learning Systems Assessments, Florida Alternate Assessment, Teacher

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.  Science Goal #2a:	In 2013, the number of students scoring at or above Achievement level 4 in science will increase two percentage points.
---	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27% (40) students scored at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.	29% (34) students will score at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.A.1. Deep questioning by teachers and test question complexity	2.A.1. Increase the number of high complexity questions to encourage deep thinking. Continue writing in the content area through science journals.	2.A.1. Science Team, Classroom Teacher	2.A.1. Classroom assessments, benchmarks, as observed in classroom visits	2.A.1. FCAT 2.0, Core Curriculum Assessments, Benchmarks
2	2.A.2. Lack of hands-on materials/models	2.A.2. Prescribe Gizmos activities for students to complete as opportunities for extension of the 5E model.	2.A.2. Science Team, Classroom Teacher	2.A.2. Gizmo Report of student progress	2.A.2 FCAT 2.0, Benchmarks

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science.  Science Goal #2b:	In 2013, Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science will increase one percentage point.
--	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
25% (2) students scored at or above Achievement Level 7 in science.	26% (2) students will score at or above Achievement Level 7 in science.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2 B.1. Students level of cognition.	2.B.1. Increased use of hands-on science experiments.	2.B.1. ESE Lead, Classroom Teacher	2.B.1. Pre and Post Unique Learning Systems Tests.	Florida Alternate Assessment

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



Gizmo Training	K-5	Science Team/Owen	School-Wide	Faculty Meeting	Classroom Observations	Principal/Assistant Principal, Peer Monitoring
Webb's Depth of Knowledge/Test Item Complexity	K-5	Principal	School-Wide	Pre-planning	Classroom Observations	Principal/Assistant Principal
Looking at Student Work	K-5	Leadership Team	School Wide	Weekly Data Meetings	Benchmarks, formative, summative, unit tests	Leadership Team

Science Budget:

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

End of Science Goals

## Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.  Writing Goal #1a:		In 2013, students scoring at Achievement Level 3 or higher will increase seven percentage points.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
68% (79) of students scored at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.		75% (81) students will score at Achievement Level 4 and higher in writing.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	1.A.1. Define FCAT 2.0	1.A.1. Writing Process	1.A.1. Writing	1.A.1. Classroom visits,	1.A.1. District

1	Specifications, Lack of time to implement full writers workshop with fidelity	will be used daily, writing portfolios maintained for growth, Learning Schedule, and use of Houghton/Mifflin Writing Resources. A master schedule has been created to block time for writers workshop. Data discussion will allow for regular time to look at student work and create explicit instruction from student work.	Teachers	District Writing Prompts, Portfolio reviews, Source Books, etc.	Writing Scores with Rubric, Released FCAT Items, student work review, 4th Grade FCAT Writing Results, etc.
2	1.A.2. Conferencing with individual students to provide feedback in order to strengthen student writing	1.A.2. Looking at student work K-5. Use of Write Score in grade 4. Student conferences will be tracked in lesson plans.	1.A.2. Leadership Team	1.A.2. Classroom visits, District Writing Prompts, Portfolio reviews, Write Score feedback and Data Meetings	1.A.2. District Prompt Writing Scores, 4th Grade FCAT Writing Results
3	1.A.3. Students who are not trained in writing process	1.A.3. Tier 1 students use writing process daily. Writing portfolio maintained for growth. Tier 2 Supplemental determined by student needs. Small group instruction as needed (engaging, beginning, supporting details, etc.) RtI Facilitators Review. Tier 3 Review Tier 2 Intervention Plan via MRT.	1.A.3. Writing Team	1.A.3. Classroom visits, District Writing Prompts, Portfolio reviews, Source Books, etc.	1.A.3. District Writing Scores with Rubric, Released FCAT Items, 4th Grade FCAT Writing Results, etc.
4	1.A.4. Teachers don't know what "good enough" papers look like.	1.A.4. Use released anchor papers to train teachers and model for students.	1.A.4. Principal	1.A.4. Classroom Visits, weekly data meetings	1.A.4. Florida Writing Results

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.  Writing Goal #1b:	In 2013, Students scoring at a 4 or higher in writing on Florida Alternate Assessment will increase one percentage point.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0) students scored a 4 or higher in writing on the Florida Alternate Assessment.	1% (1) student will score at a 4 or higher in writing on Florida Alternate Assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.B.1. Physical disabilities prohibit fine motor skills.	1.B.1. Teacher will allow alternative ways to communicate information. (communication boxes, verbal, sign language)	1.B.1. Classroom Teacher	1.B.1. Observations and District Evaluations	Florida Alternate Assessment

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 Improve Student Writing	K-5	Leadership Team	PLC	Weekly Data Meetings	Looking at Student Work, District Writing Prompts, Focus Lessons	Principal/Assistant Principal
Use of Write Score service	4	Write Score Consultant	4th Grade Writing Teachers	Oct.	Monitor lesson plans, observe writing conferences, review quarterly writing prompts	Principal/Assistant Principal
Conferencing	K-5	Principal/Assistant Principal	PLC	Weekly Data Meetings	Conference Observation	Principal/Assistant Principal/Peer Observation

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s) /Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Write Score Service for Writing	Purchased Service	School Improvement Funds	\$1,582.68
			Subtotal: \$1,582.68
			Grand Total: \$1,582.68

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal # 1:	In 2013, 98% of Neptune Beach Elementary students will be present for at least 161 days.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:

95.16%	98% (807)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
33% (285)	31% (255)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
13% (111)	11% (91)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Children with on-going illness that require extensive medical treatments, large population of students who require supportive and participatory level assistance, 10% of enrollment classified as medically fragile	1.1. Rtl leadership team will meet with families of students with excessive absences to develop a plan to decrease the number of absences. The district attendance officer will meet with parents of students who miss 5 or more unexcused days in a 30 day oeriod period to develop a plan.	1.1. Attendance Clerk, Guidance Counselor, District personnel	1.1. Monthly review of attendance data	1.1. Attendance Rosters, Completed Parent Contracts with attendance officer
2	1.2. Student circumstances and parental control.	1.2. Letterhead notice home to offending families encouraging them to get to school on time. List classes that have perfect attendance in the Manatee Times (PTA Newsletter) Random announcements and incentives for perfect attendance and arriving at school on time.	1.2. Guidance Counselor, Attendance Clerk, Assistant Principal	1.2. Monthly review of attendance data	1.2. Tardy Data, Attendance Data
3	1.3. Unexcused Tardies and Unexcused Absences	1.3. Provide awards for attendance at the end of each quarter, conduct a raffle for perfect attendance at the end of the year, provide incentives for punctuality	1.3. Classroom Teacher	1.3. Monthly review of attendance data	1.3. Attendance Data, Tardy Data

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Foundations Training	K-5	Foundations Team	School-Wide	Quarterly	Observation/Survey	Principal/Assistant Principal/Foundations Team
Student Code of Conduct Training	K-5	Assistant Principal	School-Wide	Early Release	Attendance Data/Committee Debriefs	Principal/Assistant Principal/Cultural Arts Committee

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Incentives for attendance and punctuality	Purchased incentives	Unknown	\$250.00
			Subtotal: \$250.00
			Grand Total: \$250.00

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal # 1:	In 2012, the student suspension rate will decrease by 2%.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
<1% (6)	<1% (6)
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
6	6

2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
4% (34)	2% (16)
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
1.4% (28)	<1% (14)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Parental lack of involvement, 3 classes of EBD students who exhibit impulsive and explosive behaviors at times	1.1. Implementation of Foundations and CHAMPS with fidelity, planning and implementation of social skill lessons for children with impulsive behaviors, teachers implement second step program, behavior contracts, Incentive programs, assemblies	1.1. Foundations Team, Guidance Counselor, District Personnel, Behavior Support Site Coach	1.1. Foundations Team reviews monthly referral data.	1.1. Suspension Statistics

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/CHAMPS Training on behavior	K-5	Foundations Team	K-5 Teachers	Quarterly	Review discipline data, monitor implementation of expectations	Principal/Assistant Principal/ESE Lead, Guidance Counselor, Behavior Support Site Coach
Behavior Tools	ESE Teachers	District	Workshop	2 day in-service	Implementation of Behavior Tools	Principal/Assistant Principal, ESE Lead, Behavior Support Site Coach

Suspension Budget:

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

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

## Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Parent Involvement					
Parent Involvement Goal #1:		Increase the number of parents who volunteer in the school from 15% to 17%.			
<i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>					
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:		2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:			
133 Volunteers, 7217 hours		17% (140)			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Working parents, Economic strain	1.1. Provide parents with opportunities that do not cost for parents to participate, use PTA and SAC as venue to recruit parents to visit school and participate.	1.1. PTA, SAC, Principal	1.1. Monitor PTA membership, monitor volunteer hours as evidenced by volunteer log	1.1. PTA membership, Volunteer log

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
Volunteer Orientation	K-5 Teachers	Assistant Principal	School-Wide	Early Release	Classroom Rituals and Routines	Classroom Teacher
Volunteer Orientation/Business Partner Orientation	Parents, Business Partners	Assistant Principal	Parent and school volunteers	Oct.	Review of volunteer log	Assistant Principal

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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



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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

## Additional Goal(s)

### Community Engagement Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1. Community Engagement Goal Community Engagement Goal #1:		To participate in the Jacksonville Sharks Community reading program.			
2012 Current level:		2013 Expected level:			
No data available		We expect to have students participate and complete the Sharks reading program at least two of three quarters.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students who have difficulty reading, lack of parental support	To obtain volunteers who will read, motivate and mentor students monthly as we participate in the Sharks reading program both at the school level and the community level.	SAC/Leadership Team, Classroom Teachers/Jacksonville Sharks	Evaluate the number of Students Achieving the 25 book goal	Overall participation in Sharks program as documented thru participation in quarterly incentives, FCAT 2.0 reading scores, DRA, FAIR

### 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
School/District Reading Goals and Jacksonville Sharks Community Reading Program	K-5	Principal/Jacksonville Sharks	School-Wide	Pre-planning	Reading Records	Classroom Teacher/Leadership Team

Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

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

End of Community Engagement Goal(s)

## School Safety Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1. School Safety Goal					
School Safety Goal #1:		To provide a safe learning environment for all students.			
2012 Current level:		2013 Expected level:			
.23% of the 2011-2012 enrollment data were SESIR reportable incidents.		SESIR reports will remain at .23% or lower.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1 Three classes of students with emotional behavior disorder. 1.2 Large number of students are transported to and from school by bus (16 buses). 37% of referrals come from inappropriate conduct and disruptions on school buses.	1.1 Teachers will implement the Second Step Curriculum in all grades. 1.2 Guidance Counselor will implement Students Success Skills to promote a community of caring, support and encouragement. 1.3 Foundations will train the faculty in areas of positive behavior and implementation of CHAMPS	Teachers, Guidance Counselor, Foundations Team	1.1 Chair will analyze SESIR data 1.2 Analyze safety survey and monitor discipline referrals	1.1 SESIR reports generated from Genesis 1.2 Foundations Team Safety Survey from faculty and sample population of student body.

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
Review of Foundations/Champs	K-5	Foundations Team	School-Wide	Quarterly	Surveys/Observations	Foundations Team

Budget:

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

End of School Safety Goal(s)

# FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Writing	Write Score Service for Writing	Purchased Service	School Improvement Funds	\$1,582.68
Attendance	Incentives for attendance and punctuality	Purchased incentives	Unknown	\$250.00
				Subtotal: \$1,832.68
				Grand Total: \$1,832.68

## Differentiated Accountability

### School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------

Are you a reward school:  Yes  No

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

No Attachment

## School Advisory Council

### School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
	\$1,582.68

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

SAC will participate in the development of educational priorities, assessment of the school's needs and identification of local resources. SAC will continue to be kept abreast of student data at each monthly meeting and provide input and direction when and where applicable. SAC also assists in the preparation and evaluation of the school improvement plan, the school budget and the mid-year stake holder's assessment.

# AYP DATA

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

## SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Duval School District NEPTUNE BEACH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	83%	89%	91%	76%	339	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	71%	69%			140	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	66% (YES)	75% (YES)			141	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					620	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Duval School District NEPTUNE BEACH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	81%	86%	83%	71%	321	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	62%	66%			128	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	51% (YES)	68% (YES)			119	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					568	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested