

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: BAYVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Duval

Principal: Kerwyn F. Neal

SAC Chair: Joe Chesek

Superintendent: Ed Pratt-Daniels

Date of School Board Approval: November 5, 2012

Last Modified on: 11/16/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

School Grades Trend Data
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data
High School Feedback Report
K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
					<p>2011-2012 - Principal of Bayview Elementary School; Grade B, Reading Mastery: 56% Math Mastery: 54%, Writing Mastery: 69%, Science Mastery: 72%. Disadvantaged did not meet target in reading (53%) or math (49%); white did not meet target in Reading (66%) or Math (69); SWD did not meet target in reading (48%).</p> <p>2010-2011 - Principal of Highlands Elementary School; Grade F, Reading Mastery: 50% Math Mastery: 57%, Writing Mastery: 34%, Science Mastery: 29%. Disadvantaged did make AYP (Reading - Yes - 50%; Math - Yes - 61% in reading and math.</p> <p>2009-2010 - Principal of Highlands Elementary; School Grade C, Reading Mastery: 58%, Math Mastery: 53%, Writing Mastery: 73%, Science Mastery: 23% AYP: 85%, Blacks and Economically Disadvantaged did make AYP in reading</p>

Principal	Kerwyn F. Neal	<p>BS-Health and Physical Education (Florida A&M University)</p> <p>M.Ed. – Educational Leadership (Nova Southeastern University)</p> <p>Mathematics Certification (grades 5-9)</p> <p>Physical Education Certification (K-12)</p> <p>School Principal Certification (all Levels)</p>	1	12	<p>and math. Top 6th place for reading gains in district.</p> <p>2008-2009 – Principal of Highlands Elementary; School Grade C, Reading Mastery: 56%, Math Mastery: 55%, Writing Mastery: 60%, Science Mastery: 31%. AYP: 90%, Blacks did not make AYP in reading. Blacks and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in math.</p> <p>2001-2008 – Principal of Cedar Hills Elementary 2007-2008; School Grade C, Reading Mastery: 80%, Math Mastery: 67%, Writing Mastery: 62%, Science Mastery: 44% AYP: 100%</p> <p>2006-2007; School Grade A, Reading Mastery: 67%, Math Mastery: 66%, Writing Mastery: 77%, Science Mastery: 41% AYP: 95%, SWD did not make AYP in reading and math.</p> <p>2005-2006; School Grade D, Reading Mastery: 65%, Math Mastery: 49%, Writing Mastery: 60% AYP: 77%, Blacks, Economically Disadvantaged, and SWD did not make AYP in reading and math.</p> <p>2004-2005; School Grade C, Reading Mastery: 65%, Math Mastery: 49%, Writing Mastery: 81% AYP: 80%, SWD did not make AYP in reading. Blacks, Economically Disadvantaged, and SWD did not make AYP in math.</p> <p>2003-2004; School Grade A, Reading Mastery: 73%, Math Mastery: 48%, Writing Mastery: 85%. AYP: 83%, Blacks and Economically Disadvantaged, and SWD did not make AYP in math.</p> <p>2002-2003; School Grade B, Reading Mastery: 67%, Math Mastery: 39%, Writing Mastery: 85% AYP: 95%</p> <p>2001-2002; School Grade B, Reading Mastery: 70%, Math Mastery: 49%, Writing Mastery: 74% AYP: 100%</p>
-----------	----------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---	----	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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)
					<p>2011-2012-Coach position eliminated at Highlands Elementary. Served as 2nd grade teacher at Martin Luther King Elementary School.</p> <p>2010-2011 - Grade F, Reading Mastery: 50% Math Mastery: 57%, Writing Mastery: 34%, Science Mastery: 29%. Disadvantaged did make AYP (Reading - Yes - 50%; Math - Yes - 63% in reading and math. Learning gains Reading 50% Math 61%; Learning gains of lowest 25%, reading 50% and math 63%</p> <p>2009-2010 – Highlands Elementary; School Grade C, Reading Mastery: 58%, Math Mastery: 53%, Writing Mastery: 73%, Science Mastery: 23% AYP: 85%, Blacks and Economically</p>

Math Science Reading	Marion Chesek		7	<p>Disadvantaged did make AYP in reading and math. Top 6th place for eading gains in district.</p> <p>2008-2009: School Grade C, Reading Mastery: 56%, Learning Gains: 72%, Lowest 25%: 73%. AYP: Blacks did not make AYP in reading. Math Mastery: 55%, Learning Gains: 54%, Lowest 25%: 47%. AYP:</p> <p>Math Coach: 2006-2008</p> <p>2007-2008: School Grade B, Math Mastery: 64%, Learning Gains: 66%, Lowest 25%: 60% AYP: Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in math.</p> <p>2006-2007: School Grade C, Math Mastery: 53%, Learning Gains: 74%, Lowest 25%: 87% AYP: All subgroups made AYP in math.</p>
----------------------	---------------	--	---	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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	Book Study K-5 Explicit Instruction Rigor is Not a Four-Letter Word	Principal/Site Coach All Autistic Teachers	Ongoing	
2	Regular bi-monthly Grade Level Meetings (K-5)during resource time (40 min) one day per week	Principal/Std Coach	Ongoing	
3	Weekly classroom walk through with an emphasis on high quality student work	Principal/Std Coach	Ongoing	
4	Bi-Monthly early release in-services on Reading/Writing/Math/Science/Technology K-5 using student work	Std Coach Grade Levels	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
0	0

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
26	3.8%(1)	23.1%(6)	46.2%(12)	30.8%(8)	34.6%(9)	100.0%(26)	3.8%(1)	3.8%(1)	19.2%(5)

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
Mrs. Rock	Adriene Reid	Ms. Reid's first year in public school system. Provide classroom support.	Model classroom instruction. Provide training and feedback.

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 A- Services are provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through after school tutoring and or summer school. Title I also assists in teacher/staff development throughout the year as needed.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part C- Migrant- At present, Bayview has no migrant families.

Title I, Part D

Title I, Part D- Bayview Elementary receives slots for the Drop-Out prevention program called STAR at West Riverside Elementary. Second through fifth grade students who have failed and are over-age are eligible for this program or the program at Rufus E. Payne Elementary School.

Title II

Title II- FCAT 2.0 Test Maker Plus will be used by grades 3/4/5 so that teachers can use high complexity test questions for high quality bimonthly scrimmages. Compass Odyssey and Desitnation Success will be used for additional technological instruction.

Write Score will be used to analyze student data.

Title III

Title III- DCSB provides services and educational materials to improve the education of our ELL students. FCAT Test Maker Plus will be used so that teachers in grades 3/4/5 can use high complexity test questions for bi-monthly scrimmages. Compass Odyssey will be used as an additional technological instructional program for reading and math.

Title X- Homeless

Title X- Homeless- DCSB Homeless Social Worker provides resources for families in need with the help of various community agencies. (Full Service, Bright Holidays)

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)- SAI funds are use to provide tutoring. Tutoring will be performed by highly qualified staff as instructors and materials are provided by the school.

Violence Prevention Programs

Violence Prevention Programs- Bayview Elementary works with the Foundations program to decrease negative behavior of children. This program provides each teacher with CHAMPS and behavior plans for large common areas of the school such as the cafeteria and before and after school dismissal plans. Second Step program is implemented in grades K-5. Guest speakers will be hired to speak with students about bullying.

Parent Involvement workshops will be made available to parents on how to speak to their children about bullying and how to

reinforce positive behavior.

Nutrition Programs

Students were served breakfast in the classroom with great success. This will continue in 2012-2013. Mr. Tracy Smith, dietitian from St. Vincent's Outreach program, will be scheduled to speak with parents and children about nutrition.

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

Other

The Parent Involvement resource room located in the media center will have information for parents who need additional training and information on how to get in touch with Work Source.

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Kerwyn Neal (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, ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities. The staff has been presented with a general overview of RtI during the school year and continued training is on-going. A 30 minute RtI block of time has been provided in the daily schedule for all classroom teachers.

Misty Motion (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 interventions, and conducts direct observation of student behavior.

Marion Chesek (Academic Coach): Identifies and analyzes scientifically based curriculum and behavior assessment and determines appropriate intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies, assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervention 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 implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans, and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.

RtI Facilitator Michelle Worthy – Participates on Building Leadership Team; acts as liaison for implementation of MTSS/RtI at the school level, receives ongoing MTSS/RtI training and delivers information to staff. 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.

Select General Education Teachers – Provide information about core instruction, participate in student data collection, deliver Tier 1 instruction and interventions, collaborate with other staff to implement Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions, and integrate Tier 1 materials and instruction with Tiers 2 and 3 activities.

Sheri Schwerdtfeger Select Special General Education Teacher - works with select general education teachers to collect student data. She assists in determining if further assessment is required, integrates core instructional activities and

materials in to Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through co-teaching, facilitation, and consulting.

Miqueta Chalmers, School Psychologist - helps collect and analyze data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention, fidelity, and documentation plans. She also provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation and provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities which includes data collection, data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation. Data-based decision making activities are also provided by the school psychologist.

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

Von Easton, Is a district ESE representative who supervises the MTSS/RtI process at MRT meetings. The liaison helps the school guidance counselor at various times in the target and/or MTSS/RtI process. DCPS attendance social worker works with families to develop plans to improve student attendance.

Michelle Crumbley (Foundations Team Chair): Provides information about student 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.

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 Leadership Team will focus meetings around one question: How do we develop and maintain a problem-solving system to bring out the best in our school, our teachers and in our students?

The Leadership Team will focus meetings around one question: How do we develop and maintain a problem-solving system to bring out the best in our school, our teachers, and in our students?

The team meets a minimum of two times a month to engage in the following activities: review data and link to instructional decisions, review progress monitoring data at the grade-level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting or exceeding benchmarks, and those who may be high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on data collected the team will identify professional development and resources. They will also collaborate regularly to resolve issues, share effective practices, and evaluate implementation.

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 MTSS/RtI chairperson (Michelle Worthy) will meet with the School Advisory Council (SAC) and principal to help develop the SIP. The team will provide data on: Tier 1, 2, and 3 stats, academic, social, and emotional areas that need to be addressed, help set clear expectations for instruction (rigor, relevance, relationship), and facilitate development of a systemic approach to teaching (Gradual Release, Essential Questions, Activating Strategies, Teaching Strategies, Extending, Refining, and Summarizing) and aligned process and procedures.

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.

Baseline Data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), FAIR, Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) and Duval County Benchmarks three times per year.

Progress Monitoring: PMRN, AIMS web, Compass Odyssey & Destination Success

Midyear: Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Diagnostic Assessment for Reading (DAR), Early Reading Diagnostic Assessment (ERDA) Duval County Benchmarks, Reading and Math CCSS-K-2nd

End of Year: FAIR, FCAT, Benchmarks and CCSS Math

Frequency of Data Days: Twice a month for data analysis

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The school's Professional Development Plan must support continuous learning for all educators that results in increased student achievement and includes evidence of scaffolded RtI professional learning that is results-driven, standards-based, school-centered and sustained over time. School Instructional Leadership Teams must establish protocols for on-going assessment and adjusting of the plan to meet school needs. Training will include sessions on RtI implementation, Compass Odyssey, Best Practices to engage learners, Rigor in the classroom, writing instruction, and Common Core training.

RTI Professional Development should include more than scheduled workshops. In addition to traditional RTI training during the summer, pre-planning, early dismissal, and faculty meetings, RTI learning should be job-embedded and occur Technology Training to help teachers enhance instruction through engaging technology - Smart Board, iPad, Excel tips, conducted by Trainers from CCS, Amber Pringle & Bayview teachers.

Analyze student work at grade level meetings.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Teachers will have opportunity to attend classes at the Schultz Center, FDLRS, and learn from guest speakers during early release and planning days.

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).

One member of each grade level K-5, an autistic representative, resource representative will serve on the Literacy Leadership Team each year.

Principal – Kerwyn Neal

1st Grade – Georgette Litzie

2nd Grade – Aurora Isele

3rd Grade - Ms. Rock

4th Grade – Ms. Schwardtfeger

5th Grade – Ms. Earley

Autistic – Ms. Malcolm

Resource Rep - Ms. Tripp

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

The committee meets on the first Thursday of each month at 8:00 am. Discussions include: book of the month, reading goals for students, literacy kick off in September, quarterly reading goals and celebrations at the end-of-the-year reading goals and celebration. Lesson sheets and goals for the book of the month are also provided by the committee.

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

Teachers will use FCRR strategies from Empowering teachers to improve reading skills, they will include Compass Odyssey during skills block to differentiate reading instruction to goals based on data.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification

[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 10/19/2012)

*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.

Within the first month of school, all kindergarten students are assessed using FLKRS. FLKRS assesses basic skills, school readiness, oral language, letter knowledge, number recognition. These students will be tested using FAIR three times a year on basic skills, phonics, phonemic awareness, and vocabulary, to measure their progression in reading. The data from both FLKRS and FAIR will be used to plan daily academic, social, and emotional instruction for all students. Group or individual instruction will be provided to students who need intervention beyond core instruction. Instruction includes direct instruction, modeling, guided practice, and independent practice in all academic areas.

*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.

N/A

*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?

N/A

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?

N/A

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](#)

N/A

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 grades 3/4/5 increase percent of student scoring Level 3 by 10%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29% (35) of students performed at Level 3.	33% (39) students will meet the expected 10% increase.

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	1.1. Students lack background knowledge.	1.1. Read alouds 2-3 times a week on morning news.	1.1. Principal (Kerwyn Neal) Teachers (K-5)	1.1. Classroom observations Lesson plans	1.1. Classroom Walk thru and direct observations by coaches and administration
3	1.2. Lack of understanding vocabulary.	1.2. Introduce new vocabulary found in the learning schedule. Vocabulary word of the week on morning news.	1.2. Principal (Kerwyn Neal) Teachers (K-5)	1.2. Classroom observations Lesson plans	1.2. Lesson Plans and Word Wall Anchor Charts
4	1.3. Inconsistent analysis of guided reading data to drive next step.	1.3. Train staff how to analyze data and use various interventions available during ramp up, remediation, and enrichment.	1.3. Principal (Kerwyn Neal) Teachers (K-5) Coach (Marion Chesek)	1.3. Guided Reading data, then analysis of data then next lesson.	1.3. Guided Reading Lesson Plans with anecdotal notes at least 3x a week.

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:	50% (2 students out of 4)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (2)	50% (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	Lack of background knowledge	Modeling and practice	Teachers	Observation and IEP Goals	PCI reading ULS

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	Increase percent of students scoring at or above achievement Level 4 by 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
22% (26) of 119 students scored at or above Level 4.	24% (29) students will meet the required 10% increase.

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 lack background knowledge.	2.1. Teacher will model at least one read aloud daily.	2.1. Principal (Kerwyn Neal) Teachers (K-5)	2.1. Classroom observations Lesson plans	2.1. Classroom Walk thru and direct observations by coaches and administration Field trips, hands-on inquiry-based student work.
2	2.2. Lack of understanding vocabulary.	2.2. Introduce new vocabulary found in the learning schedule.	2.2. Principal (Kerwyn Neal) Teachers (K-5)	2.2. Classroom observations Lesson plans	2.2. Lesson Plans and Word Wall Four squares "Word Work" Anchor Chart
3	2.3. Consistent analysis of reading data to drive next step.	2.3. Train staff how to analyze data	2.3 Principal (Kerwyn Neal) Teachers (K-5)	2.3. Reading data, then analysis of data then next lesson. FAIR, DRAZ, Word Analysis, Soar to Success, ORF, Techology	2.3. Guided Reading Lesson Plans with anecdotal notes at least 2x a week. Anecdotal printed reports

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	50% (2of 4)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (2)	50% (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	Lack of focus	Modeling and repetition	Teacher	Observation and IEP goals	PCI Reading and ULS

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:	Students making learning gains will increase from 77% to 82% of all students will make learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
77% of students made learning gains in reading, or 92 students.	82% (98) of students will make learning gains.

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. Lack of student proficiency in using Reading strategies to comprehend difficult texts.	3.1. Teachers will plan whole class lessons and create ad hoc groups focusing on the "Super Six" Reading strategies (Making Connections, Predict and Prove, Questioning, Summarizing, Inference, and Visualization) from the "Read it Forward Jax" initiative.	3.1. Principal (Kerwyn Neal) Teachers (K-5)	3.1. Principal will complete formal and informal observations. Teachers will administer mini-assessments correlated to each strategy and graph the results to show growth towards proficiency.	3.1. Data Wall Formal and informal classroom observations completed by the principal. Mini-assessments administered by the teachers. Anchor Charts Journals
2	3.2. Remediation Time	3.2. Daily 30 min RtI Block Track Establish specific nurture groups	3.2. Principal (Kerwyn Neal) Coach (Marion Chesek)	3.2. Focus Walk Monitoring the progress of the nurture group students after various assessments	3.2. Analysis of data results from the assessments. Data Wall
3	3.3. Non-differentiation of Instruction	3.3. Share methods of differentiation in grade level meetings	3.3. Principal (Kerwyn Neal) Coach (Marion Chesek)	3.3. Lesson plans and CAST observations	3.3. Professional development logs

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:	50% (2)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

average 8	50% (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	Lack of focus	Modeling and repetition	Teachers	Observations and IEP goals	PCI Reading and ULS

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 grades 3/4/5 increase percent of students in lowest 25% making learning gains from 77% to 82%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
77% (23) students in grades 3/4/5 made learning gains	82% (25) students bottom quartile in reading will make learning gains.

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. Inconsistent use of the Problem Solving Model to determine areas of focus for use with FCIM lessons.	4.1. Teachers will collaborate to analyze data and problem-solve to plan for mini-lessons using FCIM.	4.1 Teachers (K-5)	4.1. Teachers will formally and informally assess students and graph the data gained from these assessments to determine next steps in the Problem Solving Model.	4.1. Formal and informal assessments given to students to determine proficiency.
2	4.2. Time constraints for allowing students in the lower 25% to gain proficiency while still maintaining focus on the learning schedule and critical FCAT areas.	4.2. Teachers will continue to use FCIM for additional instruction on skills/concepts. Tier II and Tier III intervention for students in the lowest 25% not making gains with emphasis on critical FCAT areas.	4.2 Principal Kerwyn Neal Coach (Marion Chesek)	4.2. Formal and informal assessments to determine if students have gained proficiency. Principal and grade level chair focus wks to determine effectiveness of small group instruction.	4.2. Formal and informal assessments given to students to determine if proficiency has been met.
3	4.3. Limited vocabulary background knowledge.	4.3. Teachers will participate in professional development to learn how to implement explicit, research-based vocabulary instructional practices in their Reading lessons including, but not limited to teaching words in context, explicitly teaching formal, content-specific words, and revisiting vocabulary throughout the school	4.3. Principal Kerwyn Neal Coach (Marion Chesek)	4.3. Classroom observations by the principal to determine if full implementation of explicit, research-based vocabulary instructional strategies has occurred. Lesson plans will be checked weekly by the principal to monitor planning of lessons to include explicit vocabulary strategies.	4.3. Formal and informal observations. Lesson plan checks. Pre and post assessments.

	year.		Pre and post assessments given by teachers to assess student vocabulary proficiency.
--	-------	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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 #
	5A : <input type="text"/>

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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 grades 3/4/5 white student will increase AYP through Safe Harbour guidelines.
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

White: 66% of 69 students or 46 students made satisfactory progress	White: 74% of 69 or 51 students will make satisfactory progress. (AMO reading goal 2013)
---------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1					
2	5A.1. Black: Lack understanding of complexity of benchmarks 5A.2. Lack of understanding vocabulary. 5A.3. Consistent analysis of guided reading data to drive next step.	5A.1. Increase high complexity of understanding of benchmarks. 5A.2. Introduce new vocabulary found in the learning schedule. 5A.3. Train staff how to analyze data.	5A.1. Teachers Coach Principal District Literacy Coach 5A.2. Principal Teacher 5A.3. Teacher Coach Principal	5A.1. Monitoring Assessment and checking for high complexity of understanding benchmarks. 5A.2. Classroom Observations Lesson Plans 5A.3. Guided Reading Data then analysis of data then next lesson.	5A.1. Lesson Plan and Assessments 5A.2. Word Wall Analysis of assessments 5A.3. Guided Reading Lesson Plans with antidotal notes at least 3x a week.
3	5A.1. Black: Lack understanding of complexity of benchmarks.	5A.1. Increase high complexity of understanding of benchmarks.	Principal 5A.1. Kerwyn Neal Coach (Marion Chesek) Teachers (K-5) District Literacy Coach	5A.1. Monitoring Assessment and checking for high complexity of understanding benchmarks.	5A.1. Lesson Plan and Assessments
4	5A.2. Lack of understanding vocabulary.	5A.2. Introduce new vocabulary found in the learning schedule.	5A.2. Principal Kerwyn Neal Teachers (K-5)	5A.2. Classroom Observations Lesson Plans	5A.2. Word Wall Analysis of assessments

5	5A.3. Consistent analysis of guided reading data to drive next step.	5A.3. Train staff how to analyze data.	5A.3. Principal Kerwyn Neal Coach (Marion Chesek) Teachers (K-5)	5A.3. Guided Reading Data then analysis of data then next lesson.	5A.3. Guided Reading Lesson Plans with antidotal notes at least 3x a week.
---	-------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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:	Students will increase 24%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33% (17) SWD made satisfactory progress	57% of SWD students will make satisfactory progress.

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	5D.1. Lack of instructional rigor	5D.1. Increase rigor of instruction	5D.1. Teachers (K-5) Coach (Marion Chesek) Principal (Kerwyn Neal)	5D.1. ESE Teacher Lesson Plans Inclusion Model	5D.1. Assessment (Scrimmage, Formative and Benchmark)
2	5D.2. No differentiation of instruction.	5D.2. Share various methods of differentiation in grade level meetings and monitor closely.	5D.2. Principal Kerwyn Neal Coach (Marion Chesek)	5D.2. Lesson plans and observations.	5D.2. Professional development logs.
3	5D.3. Lack of use of math vocabulary.	5D.3. Understanding multiple meanings of math vocabulary using Text Talk and Frayer Word Webs.	5D.3. Teachers (K-5)	5D.3. Lesson Plans	5D.3. Focus Walks

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 grades 3/4/5 increase % of students scoring Level 3 through Safe Harbor Guidelines.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
53% of ED students made satisfactory progress.	59% of ED students are expected to score Level 3 or above on 2013 test.

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	5E.1. Lack understanding of complexity of benchmarks.	5E.1. Increase high complexity of benchmarks.	5E.1. Teachers (K-5)	5E.1. Monitoring Assessment and checking for high complexity of understanding of benchmarks.	5E.1. Lesson Plans and Assessments
2	5E.2. Students lack background knowledge.	5E.2. Teacher will model at least one read aloud daily Read alouds 2-3 times a week on the morning news.	5E.2. Principal (Kerwyn Neal) Teachers (K-5)	5E.2. Classroom observations Lesson plans	5E.2. Classroom Walk thru and direct observations by coaches and administration
3	5E.3. Lack of understanding vocabulary.	5E.3. Text Talk Frayer Word Webs	5E.3. Principal (Kerwyn Neal) Teachers (K-5)	5E.3. Classroom observations Lesson plans	5E.3. Lesson Plans and Word Wall/Assessments

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
CAST	K-5	Coach	All	Early Release	Informal & Formal Observations	Principal
Common Core	K-2	Coach	All	Early Release	Walk Thrus	Principal

Reading Budget:

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

Read-alouds 2-3 times a week	Scholastic Text talk Book Club	General	\$1,675.00
Lack of understanding of vocabulary	Text talk Kits A, B, C	General	\$1,343.97
Lack of understanding of vocabulary	Capstone Products	Title 1	\$243.25
			Subtotal: \$3,262.22
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Aid with differentiated instruction	Mouse - 5x17.95	General	\$89.75
Aid with differentiated instruction	Keyboard - 6x22.95	General	\$137.70
			Subtotal: \$227.45
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Increase high complexity of benchmarks	CAST training 3x \$45.40		\$136.20
			Subtotal: \$136.20
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$3,625.87

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:				
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.	
CELLA Goal #2:	
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:	

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

CELLA Budget:

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

No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1a:	In grades 3/4/5 35 students that score Level 3 will increase by 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 3/4/5 35 students or 29% scored a Level 3.	10% increase in the number of students scoring Level 3 from 35 to 39 students (29% to 33% of total students).

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Lack of understanding of complexity of benchmarks	1.1. Increase high complexity of understanding of benchmarks	1.1. Teachers (K-5) Principal (Kerwyn Neal) Coach (Marion Chesek) District Math Coach	1.1. Monitoring Assessments and checking for high complexity of understanding of benchmarks	1.1. Lesson Plans Assessments
2	1.2. Data analysis and probability Taught after FCAT on learning schedule	1.2. Knowledge of data analysis and probability content taught before March 2011	1.2. Principal (Kerwyn Neal) Coach (Marion Chesek)	1.2. Lesson Plans and Classroom Focus Walls	1.2. Scrimmages Formatives Benchmarks
3	1.3. Teachers need greater understanding of math differentiated groupings	1.3. To develop differentiated instructional plans to meet student needs during grade level meetings with Standards Coach	1.3. Coach (Marion Chesek) Teachers (K-5)	1.3. Lesson Plans and Classroom Focus Walls	1.3. Lesson plans anecdotal notes
4	1.4 Students' inability to remain beyond daily school hours due to lack of transportation.	1.4 SES, Saturday School, Identify websites to use at home and at public library and post to school website or teacher blogs (BrainPop, Gizmo, Reflex). Provide identified students with individual or small group instruction	1.4 RtI Facilitator, Intervention Teacher, College Volunteers	1.4 Consistent student participation	1.4 Student grades improve
5	1.5 Teachers' inability to remain beyond daily school hours for a variety of reasons.	1.5 Two sessions of RtI 8:45-9:15 9:55-10:25	1.5 Teachers	1.5 Number of students taking advantage of time schedule.	1.5 Student grade improvement
6	1.6 Parents may not desire to participate due to lack of personal knowledge, limited ability levels, or possible time constraints	1.6 Conduct sessions for parents on 'how to help your child in math'.	1.6 Parent Involvement workshop Tips at PTA meetings	1.6 Relevance of materials	1.6 Number of parents receiving training

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:	None of our ESE students will be expected to perform at this level. Students are not developmentally capable of performing at Level 7.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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:	Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 was 10% (12) students. The goal for 2013 is 11% (13).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
10% or 12 students scored a Level 4 in math.	Students scoring at Level 4 or above will increase from 12 to 13, or 11%.

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. Lack of understanding of complexity of benchmarks	2.1. Increase high complexity of understanding of benchmarks	2.1. Teachers (K-5) Coach (Marion Chesek) Principal (Kerwyn Neal) District Math Coach	2.1. Monitoring Assessments and checking for high complexity of understanding from students and ensure that teachers select complex reading	2.1. Lesson Plans Assessments
2	2.3 Teachers need deeper understanding of math differentiation grouping	2.3 To develop differentiation instruction to meet student needs via grade level meetings.	2.3. Teachers (K-5)	2.3 Lesson Plans and Classroom Focus Walls	2.3 Lesson plans anecdotal notes
3	2.2. Student lack of proficiency with the fundamental skill sets (multiplication, division) that are the foundation of Mathematics in the FCAT grade.	2.2. Teachers begin teaching these skill sets (not just the concept) in earlier grades to provide opportunities for students to master the skill prior to entering the FCAT grades	2.2. Principal (Kerwyn Neal) Teachers (K-5)	2.2. Pre and post skill assessments are given at the beginning and end of each school year to determine if proficiency has been met o	2.2. Formal and informal assessments given by the teacher to determine proficiency. Pre and post assessments from

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:	None for this year
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/a	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are not developmentally capable of performing at level 7.				

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 grades 3/4/5 students making learning gains will increase by 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
57% or 68 students made learning gains in math.	Students making gains will increase from 68 to 75, or 63%.

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. Not a visible system of tracking data.	3.1. Track Establish specific nurture groups	3.1 Principal (Kerwyn Neal) Coach (Marion Chesek) Teachers (K-5)	3.1. Monitoring the progress of the nurture group students from various assessments	3.1. Data Wall
2	3.3. Non-differentiation of Instruction	3.3. Share differentiated strategies in grade level instruction meetings	3.3. Principal (Kerwyn Neal) Coach (Marion Chesek)	3.3. Lesson plans and observations	3.3. Professional development log
3	3.2. Lack of Remediation Time	3.2. Teachers more consistently utilize Destination Math resources for Tier I, II, and III students.	3.2. Principal (Kerwyn Neal) Coach (Marion Chesek)	3.2. Focus Walk	3.2. Focus Walk looking at student work

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:	50% (2) students made learning gains in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (2) made gains	75% (3) students are expected to make learning gains this year.

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 focus	Modeling and repetition	Teacher	Obersvations and IEP goals	Number worlds and ULS

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 grades 3/4/5 there will be a 10% increase in students making gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 3/4/5 57% or 17 out of 30 students of the lowest quartile made learning gains.	In grades 3/4/5, 19 students or 63% of the lowest 25% will make learning gains.

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. Not a visible system of tracking data.	4.1. Track Establish specific nurture groups	4.1. Principal (Kerwyn Neal) Coach (Marion Chesek) Teachers (K-5)	4.1. Monitoring the progress of the nurture group students	4.1. Data Wall
2	4.2. Remediation Time	4.2. Daily 30 min RtI Block	4.2. Principal (Kerwyn Neal) Coach (Marion Chesek)	4.2. Focus Walk	4.2. Focus Walk track student work
3	4.3. Non-differentiation of Instruction	4.3. Use of scrimmages to practice for Benchmark	4.3. Principal (Kerwyn Neal) Coach (Marion Chesek)	4.3. Analysis of Assessment	4.3. Lesson Plans and Assessment Analysis of scrimmages.

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	Elementary School Mathematics Goal #
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------

school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		5A :				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	White subgroups did not make satisfactory progress in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56% of 69 or 39 white students made satisfactory progress in math. 49% of ED students made satisfactory progress in math.	In 2013 72% or 50 white subgroup will make satisfactory progress in math. 58% of ED subgroup will make satisfactory progress in math.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1					
2	5A.2. White: Inconsistent communication between parents and teachers to address areas of need in support of maintaining proficiency in Math.	5A.2. Teachers will communicate with parent via class websites and weekly homework sheets sent home in order for parents to be able to reinforce classwork at home.	5A.2. Teachers (K-5)	5A.2. Weekly assessments of skills and concepts to determine if proficiency is reached. Homework checked weekly by the classroom teacher.	5A.2. Weekly assessments. Homework checks.
3	5A.1. Black: Insufficient prior knowledge and experience in completing higher order conceptual thinking tasks and answering challenging questions.	5A.1. Differentiated Instruction with scaffolding to teach strategies for completing higher order conceptual thinking tasks and answering higher order challenging questions.	5A.1. Principal (Kerwyn Neal) Teachers (K-5)	5A.1. Formal and informal assessments given to students to assess growth towards proficiency in completing higher order tasks. Focus Walks completed by the principal to check for implementation of differentiated groups.	5A.1. Formal and informal assessments. Focus Walks

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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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:	SWD will continue to meet AMO in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
61% of 10 students or 6 students SWD made satisfactory progress in math.	54% of 10 SWD will continue to meet AMO of at least 54% in math.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Inability to Focus	Modeling and repetition	Teacher	Observations and IEP goals	Number Worlds and ULS

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:	ED students will increase satisfactory progress from 49% to 58% in 2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
49% of students made satisfactory progress.	Target AMO math is 58% in 2013.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5D.1. Lack of instructional rigor	5D.1. During grade level meetings/PLC's. Teachers will establish groups to ramp up student knowledge of math skills and concepts. Foster more inquiry based learning and less teacher dependency.	Teachers (K-5) Coach (Marion Chesek) Principal (Kerwyn Neal)	5D.1. ESE Teacher Lesson Plans Inclusion Model	5D.1. Assessment (Scrimmage, Formative and Benchmark)
2	5D.2. No differentiation of instruction.	5D.2. Provide multiple opportunities for practice of benchmarks	5D.2. Teachers (K-5) Coach (Marion Chesek)	5D.2. Analysis of Assessments	5D.2. Lesson Plans and Assessment Analysis
	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.	5D.3.

3	Lack of understanding of math vocabulary	Understanding multiple meanings of math vocabulary	Teachers (K-5)	Lesson Plans	Focus Walks
---	------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------	----------------	--------------	-------------

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
Text Complexity questions		Principal, Coach	PLC	Monthly during early release	Visits to classroom	Principal and coach

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
modeling and repetition	Supplies for Calendar Math	General	\$284.37
			Subtotal: \$284.37
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
develop differentiated instruction	Explicit Instructions	Title 1	\$178.50
			Subtotal: \$178.50
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
differentiated instruction; offering students opportunities to master math skills.	Tutors Coach \$37x12 hours Teachers \$10x10 hours	Title 1	\$544.00
offering students opportunities to master math skills	Timers	General	\$98.70
			Subtotal: \$642.70
			Grand Total: \$1,105.57

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.O: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	Students in grade 5 scoring 3 or above will increase 10%.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41.9% or 18 students scored Level 3.	47% or 20 students will score a Level 3 in 2013.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Lack of student background knowledge in physical/chemical biological sciences.	1.1. Differentiated instruction-levelled readers Utilize science curriculum guide with emphasis on the 5 E's. Provide real world science experiments demonstration and GIZMO activities. Teachers in K-5 follow science learning schedule. 100 minutes per week of science in grades K/1/2. 150 minutes of science per week in grades 3/4/5.	1.1. Principal (Kerwyn Neal) Science Lead Teacher	1.1. Lesson Plans	1.1. Benchmark Assessments Scrimmages
2	1.2. Lack of Science Vocabulary	1.2. Science vocabulary included in Word Walls in the classroom. Pictures included with vocabulary words to ensure student understanding for all learners. Differentiated instruction-levelled readers	1.2. Coach (Marion Chesek) Principal (Kerwyn Neal)	1.2. Lesson plans checked for science curriculum, classroom walk throughs.	1.2. Classroom Walk Throughs
3	1.3. Lack of science hands on experiments	1.3. Increased hands-on activities Use technology in grades K-5. Provide real world science experiments and demonstrations Co-teach Brain Pop	1.3. Coach (Marion Chesek) Principal (Kerwyn Neal) Science Lead Teacher	1.3. Analysis of scrimmages/benchmark results. Technology usage report	1.3. Classroom walk throughs, data from scrimmages and benchmarks.
4	1.4 Lack of professional Development	1.4 Science Academy	1.4 Coach (Marion Chesek) Principal (Kerwyn Neal) Science Lead Teacher	1.4	1.4

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.	N/A
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----

Science Goal #1b:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
N/A		N/A		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	Increase students scoring a Level 4 by 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
14% or 6 students scored greater than or equal to Level 4.	16% or 7 students will score greater than or equal to Level 4.

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. Lack of student background knowledge in physical/chemical biological sciences.	2.1. Utilize science curriculum guide with emphasis on the 5 E's. Provide real world science experiments demonstration and technology activities.	2.1. Principal (Kerwyn Neal)	2.1. Lesson Plans	2.1. Benchmark Assessments Scrimmages
2	2.2. Lack of Science Vocabulary	2.2. Teachers in K-5 follow science learning schedule. 100 minutes per week of science in grades K/1/2. 150 minutes of science per week in grades 3/4/5.	2.2. Coach (Marion Chesek) Principal (Kerwyn Neal)	2.2. Lesson plans checked for science curriculum, classroom walk throughs.	2.2. Classroom Walk Throughs
3	2.3. Lack of science hands on experiments	2.3. Use of GIZMO in grades K-5. Provide real world science experiments and demonstrations	2.3. Principal (Marion Chesek)	2.3. Analysis of scrimmages/benchmark results. GIZMO usage report	2.3. Classroom walk throughs, data from scrimmages and benchmarks. GIZMO usage report.

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.	N/A

Science Goal #2b:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
N/A		N/A		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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
Academy of Science Foundations of Science	K-5	Academic Coach	Grade level		Principal review	Principal Academic coach

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Provide 150 minutes of science per week.	National Geographic science sets	General	\$6,862.48
			Subtotal: \$6,862.48
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Provide 150 minutes of science per week.	Teach Webspiration	General	\$100.00
			Subtotal: \$100.00
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: \$6,962.48

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:		To increase the number of FCAT Write scores of 4.0 or higher			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
67% (22) of students scored at Level 3 or above in writing.		75% (25) of students will score at Level 3 or higher.			
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. Students are not Writing Daily	1.1. Students will use the writing process daily. All writing will be recorded in a work folder for further monitoring of growth over time. Follow district learning schedule. Interactive Word Wall Word of the Week Vocabulary, Grammar, Conventions taught daily.	1.1. Teachers (K-5) Coach (Marion Chesek)	1.1. Writing prompts will be administered and analyzed for mastery, Lesson Plans will reflect analysis. Teacher/student/peer conferencing Teachers will analyze writing monthly in grade level meetings and keep a profile of student growth	1.1. Writing Portfolio Conference loop Exit tickets/ slips
2	1.2. Students do not understand 6 point rubric	1.2. The Florida State rubric for FCAT writing will be taught so that individual students can grade themselves using the 6 point rubric	1.2. Teachers (K-5) Coach (Marion Chesek)	1.2. Use of 6 point rubric to determine mastery	1.2. Grade Practice FCAT Writing Prompts Using State Rubric
3	1.3. In K-5 the writing benchmarks not being addressed daily Students not writing across content area.	1.3. In K-5 the FL Benchmarks are taught daily in a 60 min writer's workshop. Students write during other content instruction. Cross grade-level "writing buddies"	1.3. Teachers (K-5) Principal (Kerwyn Neal) Coach (Marion Chesek)	1.3. Writing Portfolio Teachers will analyze writing monthly in grade level meetings and keep a profile of student growth	1.3. Lesson Plans Instructional Focus Calendar
4					
5	1.4 Common Core Implementation	1.4 Currently, train and implement K-2 Plans drafted for 3-5.	1.4 Teachers (K-5) Principal Academic Coach	1.4 Review lesson plans	1.4 Observation and 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:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	Sdd
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% of students taking alternate assessment scored at Level 4 or higher.	14% () students will score at Level 4 or higher.

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
Step Up to Writing	K-5	CROWN	K-5	ER 2x October & November	Student work	Principal (Kerwyn Neal) Coach (Marion Chesek)
Analyzing writing	K-5	Principal (Kerwyn Neal) Coach (Marion Chesek)	K-5	Grade-level September-March 1 a month	Student writing portfolio	Principal (Kerwyn Neal) Coach (Marion Chesek)
Writing in content area	K-5	Coach (Marion Chesek)	K-5	Grade-level October-March 1 a month	Student Writing Portfolio Core Source Book	Principal (Kerwyn Neal) Coach (Marion Chesek)
6-point FCAT 2.0 Rubric	K-5	Writing Committee	K-5	Oct/Nov/March	Use of 6-point rubric on writing assignment	Teachers (K-5)
Nancy Prizito	K-5		K-5			Nancy Prizito

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
Students will use the writing process daily.	Primary Comp Tool Kits	General	\$498.75
All writing will be recorded in a work folder for further monitoring of growth over time.	Binders	General	\$82.80
Assessment tool for writing	Writescore	General	\$1,016.12
			Subtotal: \$1,597.67
			Grand Total: \$1,597.67

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		To reduce the number of students absent 10 days or more from 48% to 47%.			
Attendance Goal #1:					
2012 Current Attendance Rate:		2013 Expected Attendance Rate:			
93%		95%			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)			
27%		22%			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)			
19%		10%			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	1.1. Children not attending school	1.1. Track absenteeism every 2 weeks-cumulative 1.1.2	1.1. Parent, Student, Teacher	1.1. Teachers track attendance using Oncourse. Data will be graphed to show	1.1. Attendance data monitored by teacher

1		Letter after five total absences (doesn't have to be consecutive) Note in agenda or phone call after 2 absences After 10 total unexcused absences - conference		changes in attendance	Monthly attendance progress reports sent to parents.
2	1.2. Children not valuing importance of attendance	1.2. Create positive incentive for improving on-time attendance Class with highest on-time attendance wins a traveling trophy and Friday treat.	1.2 Classroom teacher School Counselor (Misty Motion)	1.2 Teacher enter attendance in OnCourse. Analyze data weekly	Analyze attendance data twice a year.
3	1.3 Parents in need of alternate communication	1.3 Develop consistent communication in person/newsletter/Automated calling, email, and text.	1.3 Principal (Kerwyn Neal) Coach (Marion Chesek)	1.3 Improve parent communication	1.3 Survey parents to determine best method of communication.

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
1.2 Traveling trophy, Friday treats	1.2 Trophy and snacks	1.2 PTA	\$150.00
			Subtotal: \$150.00
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

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:	To decrease the number of students committing class 2 infractions by 20%
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
14	11
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
12	10
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
28	22
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
16	13

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. Inconsistent implementation of CHAMPS/Foundations established rules, rituals and routines.	1.1. Teachers will familiarize themselves with CHAMPS/Foundations rules, rituals, and routines from the first day of school and consistently remind students of these behavior initiatives through their lessons and transitions.	1.1. Foundations Committee Principal (Kerwyn Neal)	1.1. Principal, Foundations Team and mentors will monitor the implementation of CHAMPS/Foundations with focus walks.	1.1. Fewer Referrals and increased academic success.
2	1.2. Student understanding of expectations, routines, rituals	1.2. Use of refocus areas within classroom or another classroom. -behavior contract CICO Tier II	1.2. Teachers (K-5) Principal (Kerwyn Neal) Counselor (Misty Motion)	1.2. Teachers will exhibit an understanding of strategies being used.	1.2. Fewer Referrals and increased academic success.
	1.3. A wide range range of	1.3. Teachers will receive	1.3. Teachers (K-5)	1.3. Teachers will exhibit an	1.3. Fewer Referrals

3	trivial offenses on a referral	behavior tools training.	Principal (Kerwyn Neal)	understanding of strategies learned.	and increased academic success.
4	1.4 Lack of self-esteem and respect.	1.4 Place intermediate students in Student Success Skills groups. A+ Club for 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade boys to encourage respect and responsibility. F.A.C.E.(The Karate Man - Westside Resource Center 3, 4, 5th grade boys) Implement Check-in/check-out program Consistent use of second-step by classroom teachers	1.4 Guidance Counselor (Misty Motion) Male Mentors (Kirk Farber) Misty Motion Misty Motion	1.4 Monitoring positive behavior of group members Analyzing CICO data Collect documentation sheets	1.4 Fewer Referrals and increased academic success.

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
Mentoring Literacy	All Grades	Coach	All Grades	Early release	Observation	Principal

Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Model acceptable behavior	Model Me Kits, emotions, time for schedules & organization	Title 1	\$1,157.70
modeling good behavior	Capstone Products	Title 1	\$208.00
			Subtotal: \$1,365.70
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
Professional development for working with children	Mentoring Literacy	Title 1	\$545.40
			Subtotal: \$545.40
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
To increase self esteem and self respect - Implement CICO Program	Student Success Skills Positive Incentives for Friday rewards.	PTA	\$125.00

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: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	To increase parent involvement from 20% to 30% by using various school activities and parent workshops.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
20%	30%

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 Lack of transportation for families to attend various events.	1.1 Find alternative transportation for parents who want to be involved	1.1 Principal (Kerwyn Neal) Coach (Marion Chesek) PTA President (Marolyn Sanford) SAC Chair (Joe Chesek)	1.1 Use newsletters and flyers to let parents know assistance is available. Pilot program to communication with parents using Email	1.1 Increase in number of parents who come to activities that use this service.
2	1.2 Mobility Rate of families	1.2 Develop a relationship with parents to develop strategies to keep children in the same school.	1.2 Principal (Kerwyn Neal) Coach (Marion Chesek)	1.2 Increase communication with highly mobile parents to proactively brainstorm strategies as a team.	1.2 Determine the number of students from highly mobile families who complete the school year.
3	1.3 Lack of Education of parents	1.3 Modeling academic strategies with parents. Provide training and manipulatives for each strategy. Workshop for parents of CSS students during the month of April. Back to School Parent workshop for entire school with a variety of academic and parenting skills speakers	1.3 School Coach Grade Level Teachers CSS teachers & administrators	1.3 At grade level performance, model strategies for parents and provide manipulatives for parents. Develop questionnaire for parents to answer.	1.3 Sign in sheets at each grade level performance. Parent attendance and feedback surveys. Parent attendance and feedback.

4	1.4 Parent Involvement funds cannot be spent on feeding children or for activities.	1.4 Solicit private resources for funds or in-kind donations.	1.4 Principal (Kerwyn Neal) Parent Involvement Liaison (Penny Smith)	Sign-in at events	Increase in parents attending parent involvement workshops.
---	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
1.4 Private funding to pay for food and resource for children during Parent Involvement workshops.	1.4 Food, activities, and child care workers	1.4 Target grant	\$2,000.00
			Subtotal: \$2,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Lack of education of parents	Provide computer so parents can be shown how to look up information to monitor student learning and resources to teach them how to help students	School funds	\$1,000.00
			Subtotal: \$1,000.00
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
Fund transportation to school events.	Vouchers for transportation	Parent Involvement	\$245.00
Lack of communication between school and home	Newsletters and flyers	Parent Involvement	\$660.00
Lack of education	Parent workshops to teach parents to help their children	Parent Involvement	\$2,231.58
			Subtotal: \$3,136.58
			Grand Total: \$6,136.58

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:		All grade levels will incorporate educational websites provided by the district to increase student involvement and growth.			
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 Time	1.1 Provide web resources and ideas for teachers and parents	1.1 Teachers/ computer lab instructor	1.1 Reviewing checkpoint data and presenting next step	1.1 Checkpoints and formal and informal observations
2	1.2 Teacher & parent comfort level with technology	1.2 Provide parents with a kiosk to learn how to look up grades and learn about available websites.	1.2 Principal (Kerwyn Neal) Parent Involvement Liaison (Penny Smith)	1.2 Number of parents utilizing service	1.2 Observation and sign-in sheets

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
Technology trainings	K-5	Technology Director	School-wide early release	AM training PM training	Technology trainer available as needed	Technology Director

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)

Safety goals: 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. Safety goals: Goal Safety goals: Goal #1:	Emergency evacuation procedures - 100% of teachers will have red emergency backpacks hanging at doorways. Bags contain red flipcharts with emergency procedures, class lists with names & contact information, first aid kits, & red and green cards to signal missing or present students.			
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:			
100%	100%			
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						

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 Safety goals: Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Read-alouds 2-3 times a week	Scholastic Text talk Book Club	General	\$1,675.00
Reading	Lack of understanding of vocabulary	Text talk Kits A, B, C	General	\$1,343.97
Reading	Lack of understanding of vocabulary	Capstone Products	Title 1	\$243.25
Mathematics	modeling and repetition	Supplies for Calendar Math	General	\$284.37
Science	Provide 150 minutes of science per week.	National Geographic science sets	General	\$6,862.48
Attendance	1.2 Traveling trophy, Friday treats	1.2 Trophy and snacks	1.2 PTA	\$150.00
Suspension	Model acceptable behavior	Model Me Kits, emotions, time for schedules & organization	Title 1	\$1,157.70
Suspension	modeling good behavior	Capstone Products	Title 1	\$208.00
Parent Involvement	1.4 Private funding to pay for food and resource for children during Parent Involvement workshops.	1.4 Food, activities, and child care workers	1.4 Target grant	\$2,000.00
				Subtotal: \$13,924.77
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Aid with differentiated instruction	Mouse - 5x17.95	General	\$89.75
Reading	Aid with differentiated instruction	Keyboard - 6x22.95	General	\$137.70
Science	Provide 150 minutes of science per week.	Teach Webspiration	General	\$100.00
Parent Involvement	Lack of education of parents	Provide computer so parents can be shown how to look up information to monitor student learning and resources to teach them how to help students	School funds	\$1,000.00
				Subtotal: \$1,327.45
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Increase high complexity of benchmarks	CAST training 3x \$45.40		\$136.20
Mathematics	develop differentiated instruction	Explicit Instructions	Title 1	\$178.50
Suspension	Professional development for working with children	Mentoring Literacy	Title 1	\$545.40
				Subtotal: \$860.10
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Mathematics	differentiated instruction; offering students opportunities to master math skills.	Tutors Coach \$37x12 hours Teachers \$10x10 hours	Title 1	\$544.00
Mathematics	offering students opportunities to master math skills	Timers	General	\$98.70
Writing	Students will use the writing process daily. All writing will be	Primary Comp Tool Kits	General	\$498.75

Writing	recorded in a work folder for further monitoring of growth over time.	Binders	General	\$82.80
Writing	Assessment tool for writing	Writescore	General	\$1,016.12
Suspension	To increase self esteem and self respect - Implement CICO Program	Student Success Skills Positive Incentives for Friday rewards.	PTA	\$125.00
Parent Involvement	Fund transportation to school events.	Vouchers for transportation	Parent Involvement	\$245.00
Parent Involvement	Lack of communication between school and home	Newsletters and flyers	Parent Involvement	\$660.00
Parent Involvement	Lack of education	Parent workshops to teach parents to help their children	Parent Involvement	\$2,231.58
				Subtotal: \$5,501.95
				Grand Total: \$21,614.27

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

<input checked="" type="radio"/> Priority	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Focus	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Prevent	<input checked="" type="radio"/> 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 (Uploaded on 10/19/2012)

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
Tutoring	\$333.00

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

SAC members will receive monthly updates on testing scores and their relationship to student success. They will help make decisions about the parent involvement program and how Title I funds should be spent.

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 BAYVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	72%	71%	66%	51%	260	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%	69%			131	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?	57% (YES)	60% (YES)			117	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					508	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Duval School District BAYVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	74%	67%	80%	41%	262	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	61%	53%			114	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	60% (YES)	53% (YES)			113	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					489	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested