FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER ELEMENTARY

District Name: Duval

Principal: Timothy T. Warren

SAC Chair: Frankie Parsons

Superintendent: Ed Pratt Dannals

Date of School Board Approval: November 5, 2012

Last Modified on: 1/2/2013

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)
					Principal: George Washington Carver Elementary 2010-2011 FCAT Grade: D Reading proficiency was 42%, math proficiency 58%, writing proficiency 82%, and Science proficiency 9%. There are less than ten students in the White, Hispanic, ELL, and Indian. Blacks, SWD, and Economically Disadvantage students did not make AYP in reading, while SWDs did not AYP in math. All other applicable NCLB subgroups made AYP. Principal: George Washington Carver Elementary 2009-2010 FCAT Grade: C Reading proficiency was 43%, math proficiency 55%, writing proficiency 96%, and Science proficiency 35%. There are less than ten students in the White, Hispanic, ELL, and Indian. Blacks, SWD, and Economically Disadvantage students did not make AYP in reading, while SWDs

| Principal | Timothy T. Warren | Bachelor of Science in Music Education, Master of Science in Educational Leadership | 3 | 9 | did not AYP in math. All other applicable NCLB subgroups made AYP.
Principal: Arlington Elementary Principal: George Washington Carver Elementary 2008-2009
FCAT Grade: B
Reading proficiency was 44%, math proficiency 55%, writing proficiency 88%, and Science proficiency 32%. There are less than ten students in the White, Hispanic, ELL, and Indian. Blacks, SWD, and Economically Disadvantage students did not make AYP in reading, while SWDs did not AYP in math. All other applicable NCLB subgroups made AYP.
Principal: Arlington Elementary 2007-2008
FCAT Grade: A
Reading proficiency was 73%, math proficiency was 76%, writing proficiency was 73%, and science was 44%. 100% of the criteria were met by all applicable NCLB subgroups.
Principal: Arlington Elementary 2006-2007
FCAT Grade: B
Reading proficiency was 66%, math proficiency was 65%, writing proficiency was 75%, and science was 41%. Economically Disadvantaged and SWDs did not make AYP in reading, while SWDs did not make AYP in math. All other NCLB subgroups made AYP.
Principal: Arlington Elementary 2005-2006
FCAT Grade: A
Reading proficiency was 70%, math proficiency was 57%, and writing proficiency was 63%. Blacks, SWDs, and Economically Disadvantaged students did not make AYP in math. All other
Reading proficiency |

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)
All	Tara Jackson	Bachelor of Science in Early Childhood Education		1	Instructional Coach: Andrew Robinson Elementary 2010-2011 FCAT Grade: C Reading proficiency was 60%, math proficiency 50%, writing proficiency 80%, and Science proficiency 33%. There are less than ten students in the White, Hispanic, ELL, and Indian. Blacks, SWD, and Economically Disadvantage students did not make AYP in reading, while SWDs did not AYP in math. All other applicable NCLB subgroups made AYP. Instructional Coach: George Washington Carver Elementary
					Reading Coach: George Washington Carver Elementary 2010-2011 FCAT Grade: D Reading proficiency was 42%, math proficiency 58%, writing proficiency 82%, and Science proficiency 9%. There are less than ten students in the White, Hispanic, ELL, and Indian. Blacks, SWD, and Economically Disadvantage students did not make AYP in reading, while SWDs did not AYP in math. All other applicable NCLB subgroups made AYP Reading Coach: George Washington Carver Elementary 2009-2010 FCAT Grade: C Reading proficiency was 43%, math

					proficiency 55%, writing proficiency 96%, and Science proficiency 35%. There are less than ten students in the White, Hispanic, ELL, and Indian. Blacks, SWD, and Economically Disadvantage students did not make AYP in reading, while SWDs did not AYP in math. All other applicable NCLB subgroups made AYP
Reading	Annett Tobler 1-6	Elementary Ed	3	3	Reading Coach: George Washington Carver Elementary 2008-2009 FCAT Grade: B Reading proficiency was 44%, math proficiency 55%, writing proficiency 88%, and Science proficiency 32%. There are less than ten students in the White, Hispanic, ELL, and Indian. Blacks, SWD, and Economically Disadvantage students did not make AYP in reading, while SWDs did not AYP in math. All other applicable NCLB subgroups made AYP Reading Coach: Long Branch Elementary 2007-2008 FCAT Grade: D Reading proficiency was 44%, math proficiency 43%, writing proficiency 61%, and Science proficiency 19%. There are less than ten students in the White, Hispanic, ELL, and Indian. Blacks and Economically Disadvantage students did not make AYP in reading or math. Reading Coach: Long Branch Elementary 2006-2007 FCAT Grade: D Reading proficiency was 36%, math proficiency 39%, writing proficiency 78%, and Science proficiency 6%. There are less than ten students in the White, Hispanic, ELL, and Indian. Blacks, SWD, and Economically Disadvantage students did not make AYP in reading or math.
Math	Tyra Mobley	Elementary Ed MAster of Science in Educational Leadership	3	5	Math Coach: George Washington Carver Elementary 2010-2011 FCAT Grade: D Reading proficiency was 41%, math proficiency 58%, writing proficiency 82%, and Science proficiency 9%. There are less than ten students in the White, Hispanic, ELL, and Indian. Blacks, SWD, and Economically Disadvantage students did not make AYP in reading, while SWDs did not AYP in math. All other applicable NCLB subgroups made AYP Math Coach: George Washington Carver Elementary 2009-2010 FCAT Grade: C Reading proficiency was 43%, math proficiency 55%, writing proficiency 96%, and Science proficiency 35%. There are less than ten students in the White, Hispanic, ELL, and Indian. Blacks, SWD, and Economically Disadvantage students did not make AYP in reading, while SWDs did not AYP in math. All other applicable NCLB subgroups made AYP Math Coach: George Washington Carver Elementary 2008-2009 FCAT Grade: B Reading proficiency was 44%, math proficiency 55%, writing proficiency 88%, and Science proficiency 32%. There are less than ten students in the White, Hispanic, ELL, and Indian. Blacks, SWD, and Economically Disadvantage students did not make AYP in reading, while SWDs did not AYP in math. All other applicable NCLB subgroups made AYP Math Coach: Norwood Elementary 2007-2008 FCAT Grade: B No data available-school closed

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	1. Weekly teacher meetings with Academic Coaches	Tara Jackson, Instructional Coach: Annett Tobler, Reading Coach; and Tyra Mobley, Math Coach	5/11	
2	1. Mentoring and Induction for Novice Teachers (MINT)	Annett Tobler, Professional Development Facilitator (PDF)	5/11	
3	1. Initial Screening Observation meetings	Timothy T. Warren, Principal; Natasha Clark, Assistant Principal	1/11	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

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

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
31	12.9%(4)	38.7%(12)	51.6%(16)	19.4%(6)	45.2%(14)	87.1%(27)	6.5%(2)	3.2%(1)	19.4%(6)

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
Melissa Newell	Holtie Murphy	Mentor has 94% on grade level instructional rate for reading and math Mentor has over 9 year of experience teaching primary grades	Lesson planning Classroom Observations Co-Teaching Opportunities

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

NA

Title I, Part C- Migrant

NA

Title I, Part D

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

Title II

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

Title III

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

Title X- Homeless

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

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

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

Violence Prevention Programs

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

Nutrition Programs

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

Housing Programs

NA

Head Start

George Washington Carver Elementary uses a total of four (4) VPK and Title I Pre-K units to ensure all students are provided with an adequate educational foundation to ensure success in school.

Adult Education

NA

Career and Technical Education

NA

Job Training

NA

Other

NA

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

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

- Timothy T. Warren, Principal
- Natasha Clark, Assistant Principal
- Nikki Watson, Guidance Counselor
- Tara JAckson, school Instructional Coach
- Tyra Mobley, Math/Science Coach
- Annett Tobler, Reading Coach
- Leslie Townsend, ESE Liaison
- Robert Poole, School Psychologist
- Shivonne Troy, Behavioral Interventionist

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

- RTI Leadership Team meets bi-weekly in conjunction with the assessment schedule established at the school to facilitate a cohesive and comprehensive battery of district assessments
- Meetings begin with analysis of reading and math classroom profiles that indicate the number of students scoring 70% and above on each assessment, the skill/concept being evaluated, and the percentage of students mastering each skill/concepts.

- Students not demonstrating mastery or are 25% below classroom averages are identified and progress monitored bi-weekly using a variety of assessments, including assessments from the district's Learning Village/River Deep website, along with assessments created from the Florida Achieves website
- RTI Leadership Team collects progress monitoring data on students that do not show mastery or lack significant growth (less than 30% growth) between assessments
- Guidance Counselor/RTI Liaison uses an excel spreadsheet to manage all RTI progress monitoring information
- RTI Leadership Team analyzes student performance, teacher instruction, curriculum, and environmental factors in the classroom to determine causation and to provide an effective intervention
- Provides a common vision for the use of data-based analysis and instruction
- Ensures the school-based RtI Team is implementing and monitoring RtI
- Develops assessments and provides documentation which ensures implementation of intervention support
- Collaborates in the design and delivery of professional development
- Communicates with parents and the community regarding school-based RtI plans and activities
- Collaborates with colleagues to constantly evaluate and review students' performances
- Recommends instructional strategies to teachers that include reflective practices, analyzing student data, and differentiating instruction
- Implement intense interventions for Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 students
- Serves as liaison between teachers, students, and parents
- Models teaching and reflective practices and interventions for all school-based educators
- Encourages students to take an active role in their learning
- Identifies and monitors student progress using data to make decisions about interventions and strategies regarding the effectiveness of RtI.

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

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

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

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

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

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

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

- Timothy T. Warren, Principal
- Tara Jackson, School Instructional Coach
- Annett Tobler, Reading Coach
- Victoria Karst, 5th Grade Reading Teacher
- Vanessa Tussey, 4th Grade Teacher
- Tomia Hodge, 3rd Grade Reading Teacher
- Lynn Dewolf, 2nd Grade Teacher
- Georgia Waddups, 1st Grade Teacher
- Lori Newell, Kindergarten

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

- Literacy Leadership Team meets monthly in conjunction with the assessment schedule established at the school
- Meetings begin with analysis of reading classroom profiles that indicate the number of students scoring 70% and above on each assessment, the skill/concept being evaluated, and the percentage of students mastering each skill/concepts.
- Students not demonstrating mastery or are 25% below classroom averages are identified and progress monitored bi-weekly using a variety of assessments, including assessments from the district's Learning Village/River Deep website, along with assessments created from the Florida Achieves website
- The Literacy Leadership Team reviews progress monitoring data on students that do not show mastery or lack significant growth (less than 30% growth) between reading assessments
- The Literacy Leadership Team analyzes student performance, teacher instruction, curriculum, and environmental factors in the classroom to determine causation and to provide an effective intervention
- Utilizes triangulated data from DRAs, theme tests, and curriculum-based benchmark to determine
- Recommend professional development
- Collaborates with colleagues to constantly evaluate and review students' performances
- Recommends instructional strategies to teachers that include reflective practices, analyzing student data, and differentiating instruction
- Models teaching and reflective practices and interventions for all school-based educators

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

- Establish a culture of collaboration within the faculty through Professional Learning Communities
- Identify, develop and support teacher leaders

- Continue FAIR analysis
- Continue DRA miscue and comprehension analysis
- Develop deeper understanding of Guided Reading

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.

George Washington Carver Elementary Offers four (4) Title 1 Pre-K programs. The Pre-Kindergarten Criterion Referenced Test is administrated to all preschoolers as an initial diagnostic, a middle of the year update and a final assessment tool as they prepare to transition to kindergarten. Low-performing students are targeted early. Once identified, certified teachers and assistants work with low-performing students to build these basic skills. Funding to support academic materials and field trips is provided through the Title I office. Staff provides parents with packets of kindergarten activities, registration materials and workshops to train parents to assist their children at home. George Washington Carver Elementary provides all students with a packet of materials to use throughout the school year to assist students with making a smooth transition to kindergarten.

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

NA

*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?

NA

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?

NA

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

NA

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:	The number of 3rd-5th grade students achieving reading proficiency will increase 3%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33% or (21/172 students)	36% or (54/151 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	Number of students reading 1 or more years below grade level	Use Guided Reading to increase student reading level	All K-5th grade teachers Leadership Team RtI Team	Review of board configuration Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 70% and above on theme tests Review the percentage of students scoring on grade level with their DRA (3rd: 30, 4th: 40, and 5th 50) Review the percentage of students scoring 70% and above on FCIM reading mini assessments Review the number of students scoring 60% and above on their District Benchmark	Houghton Mifflin Theme Tests DRAs District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments
	Teachers not instructing at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Teachers not familiar with Webb's Depth of	Use FCIM reading focus calendars to identify Sunshine State Standards most likely to be assessed on the FCAT 2.0 Use FCIM reading focus	All K-5th grade teachers Reading Coach Reading Interventionist RtI Team	Review of board configuration Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of	Houghton Mifflin Theme Tests DRAs District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini

| | 2 | Knowledge (cognitive complexity)

Students not exposed to tasks at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) | calendars to focus on the

lowest FCAT 2.0 Reporting Categories

Provide explicit instruction during reading

mini lessons

Provide safety nets for students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 3

Differentiate instruction | | students scoring 70% and
above on theme tests

Review the percentage of

students scoring on grade
level with their DRA (3rd: 30,
4th: 40, and 5th 50)

Review the percentage of

students scoring 70% and
above on FCIM reading mini
assessments

Review the number of students scoring 60% and
above on their District Benchmark | assessments |

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

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

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	The number of 3rd-5th grade students scoring FCAT level 4 or 5 will increase 3%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
9% (15/172 students)	12% (18/151 students)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
		Person or	Process Used to	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teachers not instructing at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Teachers not familiar with Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Students not exposed to tasks at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity)	Teachers not instructing at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Teachers not familiar with Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Students not exposed to tasks at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Provide explicit benchmark-focused instruction during reading mini lesson	Principal Reading Coach Reading Interventionist Grade level chairperson	Review of board configuration Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 70% and above on theme tests Review the percentage of students scoring on grade level with their DRA (3rd: 30, 4th: 40, and 5th 50) Review the percentage of students scoring 70% and above on FCIM reading mini assessments Review the number of students scoring 60% and above on their District Benchmark	Classroom visitation log CAST Houghton Mifflin Theme Tests DRAs District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessments

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	The number of 3rd-5th grade students making learning gains will increase 3%

	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
	68% (117/172 students)	71% (107/151 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	Teachers not instructing at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Teachers not familiar with Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Students not exposed to tasks at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity)	Provide teachers with Webb's Depth of Knowledge training Require teachers to include the level of complexity either within their focus/essential question or in their lesson plan Use FCIM reading focus calendars to identify Sunshine State Standards most likely to be assessed on the FCAT 2.0 Use FCIM reading focus calendars to focus on the lowest FCAT 2.0 Reporting Categories Provide explicit benchmark-focused instruction during reading mini lessons Provide safety nets for students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 3 Differentiate instruction Require all FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s to enroll in Team Up and/or SES tutoring (F/R lunch) Provide in-school push-in tutoring for FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s	Principal Reading Coach Reading Interventionist Grade level chairperson	Review of board configuration Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 70% and above on theme tests Review the percentage of students scoring on grade level with their DRA (3rd: 30, 4th: 40, and 5th 50) Review the percentage of students scoring 70% and above on FCIM reading mini assessments Review the number of students scoring 60% and above on their District Benchmark	Classroom visitation log CAST Houghton Mifflin Theme Tests DRAs District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	

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

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	The number of 3rd-5th grade students in the Lowest 25% making learning gains will increase 3%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
82% (141/172 students)	85% (128/151 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	Teachers not instructing at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Teachers not familiar with Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Students not exposed to tasks at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity)	Provide teachers with Webb's Depth of Knowledge training Require teachers to include the level of complexity either within their focus/essential question or in their lesson plan Use FCIM reading focus calendars to identify Sunshine State Standards most likely to be assessed on the FCAT 2.0 Use FCIM reading focus calendars to focus on the lowest FCAT 2.0 Reporting Categories Provide explicit benchmark-focused instruction during reading mini lessons	Principal Reading Coach Reading Interventionist Grade level chairperson	Review of board configuration Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 70% and above on theme tests Review the percentage of students scoring on grade level with their DRA (3rd: 30, 4th: 40, and 5th 50) Review the percentage of students scoring 70% and above on FCIM reading mini assessments Review the number of students scoring 60% and above on their District	Classroom visitation log CAST Houghton Mifflin Theme Tests DRAs District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment

		Provide safety nets for students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 3		Benchmark	
		Differentiate instruction			
		Require all FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s to enroll in Team Up and/or SES tutoring (F/R lunch)			
		Provide in-school push-in tutoring for FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s			

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 # The number of 3rd-5th grade students reading proficiently will increase 6-7% each from from 33% to 61% by 2017. 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 reading. Reading Goal #5B:	The number black students not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease 3% from 32% to 29%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
68% or (117/172 Black students),White: NA, Hispanic: NA, Asian: NA, American Indian NA:	Black: 71% or (107/151 Black students), White: NA, Hispanic: NA, Asian: NA, American Indian: NA

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
	White: None enrolled 3rd-5th Black: Teachers not instructing at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Teachers not familiar with Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Students not exposed to tasks at the highest levels of Webb's Depth	Provide teachers with Webb's Depth of Knowledge training Require teachers to include the level of complexity either within their focus/essential question or in their lesson plan Use FCIM reading focus calendars to identify Sunshine State Standards most likely to be	Principal Reading Coach Reading Interventionist Grade level chairperson	Review of board configuration Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 70% and above on theme tests Review the percentage of students scoring on grade level with their DRA (3rd:	Classroom visitation log CAST Houghton Mifflin Theme Tests DRAs District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and SES

				30, 4th: 40, and 5th 50)	tutoring mini assessment
1	of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Hispanic: None enrolled 3rd-5th Asian: None enrolled 3rd-5th American Indian: None enrolled 3rd-5th	assessed on the FCAT 2.0 Use FCIM reading focus calendars to focus on the lowest FCAT 2.0 Reporting Categories Provide explicit instruction during reading mini lessons Provide safety nets for students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 3 Differentiate instruction Require all FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s to enroll in Team Up and/or SES tutoring (F/R lunch) Provide in-school push-in tutoring for FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s			Review the percentage of students scoring 70% and above on FCIM reading mini assessments Review the number of students scoring 60% and above on their District Benchmark	

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

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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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:	The number of SWD students not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease 3%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
6/8 or 75% of SWD students made satisfactory progress in reading	8/10 or 80% of SWD students will make satifactory progress in reading

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Instruction is based on IEP goals and not grade level standards which are assessed on FCAT SWD students are 2 years below grade level on average SWD students are used to comprehension accommodations that cannot be used on the FCAT	Mainstream as many SWD students as possible to expose them to more rigorous instruction Use Direct Instruction and Guided Reading daily to increase student reading ability Transition SWD students to the type of accommodations permitted o the FCAT 2.0 Provide teachers with Webb's Depth of Knowledge training Require teachers to include the level of complexity either within their focus/essential question or in their lesson plan Use FCIM reading focus calendars to identify Sunshine State Standards most likely to be assessed on the FCAT 2.0 Use FCIM reading focus calendars to focus on the lowest FCAT 2.0 Reporting Categories Provide explicit instruction during Reading Mastery lesson Provide explicit benchmark-focused instruction during Soar To Success lessons Provide safety nets for students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 3 Differentiate instruction Require all FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s to enroll in Team Up and/or SES tutoring (F/R lunch) Provide in-school push-in	Principal Assistant Principal RtI Facilitator ESE Liaison Inclusion and EBD Teachers	Review the percentage of SWD students scoring 70% and above on theme tests Review the percentage of SWD students scoring on grade level with their DRA (3rd: 30, 4th: 40, and 5th 50) Review the number of SWD students scoring 60% and above on their District Benchmark Review the number of SWD students scoring 70% and above on Reading Mastery assessments Review the percentage of SWD students scoring 70% and above on FCIM reading mini assessments Review the number of SWD Students scoring 70% and Above on Soar To Success assessments	Classroom visitation log CAST Houghton Mifflin Theme Tests DRAs District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment Reading Mastery Kit Soar To Success Kit

			tutoring for FCAT level		

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:	The number of Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress will decrease 3% from 32% to 29%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
68% or (117/172 students)	71% or (107/151 students)

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anticipated Barrier</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td>
<td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td>
<td>Evaluation Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Number of students reading 1 or more years below grade level</td>
<td>Use Guided Reading to increase student reading level

Provide explicit instruction during reading mini lessons

Provide safety nets for students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 3

Differentiate instruction</td>
<td>All K-5th grade teachers

Leadership Team

RtI Team</td>
<td>5D.1.

Review of board configuration

Review of lesson plans

Teacher observation

Review the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring 70% and above on theme tests

Review the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring 70% and above on FCIM reading mini assessments

Review the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring on grade level with their DRA (3rd: 30, 4th: 40, and 5th 50)

Review the number of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring 60% and above on their District Benchmark

5D.2.

Review of board</td>
<td>Classroom visitation log

CAST

Houghton Mifflin Theme Tests

DRAs

District Benchmark Assessment

FCIM mini assessments

Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment</td>
</tr>
</table>

				configuration
				Review of lesson plans
				Teacher observation
				Review the percentage of
				Economically Disadvantaged students scoring 70% and above on theme tests
				Review the percentage of
				Economically Disadvantaged students scoring 70% and above on FCIM reading mini assessments
				Review the percentage of
				Economically Disadvantaged students scoring on grade level with their DRA (3rd: 30, 4th: 40, and 5th 50)
				Review the number of Economically Disadvantaged students scoring 60% and above on their District Benchmark

---

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
Webb's Depth of Knowledge: Conitive Complexity	All	Principal	School-wide	Early Release Days (bi-weeky) and grade level meetings (weekly)	Aligned Lesson Plans, Instrucitonal Focus on Board Configuartion with Leve of COmplexity	Principal, Leaderhsip Team
Lesson Planning: Common Core and Unpacking Benchmarks	All	Principal	School-wide	Early Release Days (bi-weeky) and grade level meetings (weekly)	Align Lesson Plans and Instructional Focus with Board Configuration Complexity Review Lesson Plans for Benchmark and Standard being Unpacked	Principal, Leadership Team
					Review IPDPs for teacher instructional strategy focus on targeted student population with reading deficiencies	

Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP) FAIR Analysis	All	Timothy T. Warren, Principal Annette Tobler, PDF	School-wide	Early Release Days (bi-weeky) and grade level meetings (weekly)	Review of DRA for appropriate reading levels Review of Lesson Plans for differentiated instruction based on reading level miscues Review of DRA class profile sheet	Principal, Leadership Team
Teaching Reading and Math by Benchmark	All	Annett Tobler, Reading Coach Tara Jackson, Reading Interventionist Tyra Forcine-Mobley, Math Coach Carol Smith, Math Interventionist	School-wide	Early Release Days (bi-weeky) and grade level meetings (weekly)	Review Lesson Plans, Classroom Visitations, Student FCIM Mini Assessment Data, School-wide Progress Monitoring	Principal Leadership Team Literacy Team/Reading Team
Data Analysis: Appropriate Progress Monitoring	All	Timothy T. Warren, Principal Annette Tobler, Reading Coach Tyra Forcine-Mobley, Math Coach	School-wide	Early Release Days (bi-weeky) and grade level meetings (weekly)	Review Lesson Plans, Classroom Visitations, Student FCIM Mini Assessment Data, School-wide Progress Monitoring	Principal Leadership Team Literacy Team/Reading Team

Reading Budget:

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

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	

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:	The number of students achieving math proficiency will increase 3%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56% or (95/172 students)	59% or (101/151 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	Number of students not reading on grade level Teachers not instructing at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Teachers not familiar with Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Students not exposed to tasks at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity	Use small instructional groups to differentiate student Use FCIM math focus calendars to identify Sunshine State Standards most likely to be assessed on the FCAT Use FCIM math focus calendars to focus on the lowest FCAT Reporting Catergories Provide explicit benchmark-focused instruction during math launch Provide safety nets for students scoring below FCAT level 3	All K-5 grade teachers Math Coach Math Interventionist Leadership Team RtI Team	Review of board configuration Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 70% and above on math formatives Review the percentage of students scoring 70% and above on FCIM math mini assessments Review the number of students scoring 70% and above on their District Benchmark	1.1. Envisions assessments District Benchmark Assessment Classroom visitation log CAST District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment 1.2. Envisions assessments District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Classroom visitation log CAST District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments

					Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment

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

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

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	The number of 3rd-5th grade students scoring FCAT level 4 or 5 will increase 3%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
22% or (37/172 students)	25% or (37/151 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	Number of students not reading on grade level Teachers not instructing at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Teachers not familiar with Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Students not exposed to tasks at the highest levels of Webb's Depth	Use small instructional groups to differentiate student Use FCIM math focus calendars to identify Sunshine State Standards most likely to be assessed on the FCAT 2.0 Use FCIM math focus calendars to focus on the lowest FCAT 2.0 Reporting Categories	All K-5 grade teachers Math Coach Math Interventionist Leadership Team RtI Team	Review of board configuration Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 85% and above on math formatives Review the percentage of students scoring 85% and	Envisions assessments District Benchmark Assessment Classroom visitation log CAST District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments

			above on FCIM math mini	Team-Up and SES
of Knowledge (cognitive complexity	Provide explicit benchmark-focused instruction during math launch		assessments	tutoring mini assessment
	Provide safety nets for students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 3		Review the number of students scoring 80% and above on their District Benchmark	

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	The number of 3rd-5th grade students making learning gains will increase 1%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
91% or (156/172 students)	92% or (138/151 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
	Number of students not reading on grade level	Use small instructional groups to differentiate student Provide safety nets for students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 3 Provide training during weekly teacher meetings to review new math curriculum	All K-5 grade teachers Math Coach Math Interventionist Leadership Team RtI Team	Review of board configuration Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 70% and above on math	Envisions assessments District Benchmark Assessment Classroom visitation log CAST

				formatives	District Benchmark Assessment
				Review the percentage of students scoring 70% and above on FCIM math mini assessments	FCIM mini assessments
					Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment
				Review the number of students scoring 70% and above on their District Benchmark	
1					
2	Teachers not instructing at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Teachers not familiar with Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Students not exposed to tasks at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity	Use FCIM math focus calendars to identify Sunshine State Standards most likely to be assessed on the FCAT 2.0 Use FCIM math focus calendars to focus on the lowest FCAT 2.0 Reporting Category Provide explicit instruction during math launch Provide safety nets for students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 3	All K-5 grade teachers Math Coach Math Interventionist Leadership Team RtI Team	Review of board configuration Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 70% and above on math formatives Review the percentage of students scoring 70% and above on FCIM math mini assessments Review the number of students scoring 70% and above on their District Benchmark	Envisions assessments District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Classroom visitation log Teacher Assessment Instrument District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments

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

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

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

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

	4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	The number of students in the Lowest 25% making learning gains will increase 1%
	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
	95% or (38/40 students)	96% or (39/41 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	Number of students not reading on grade level

Teachers not instructing at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity)

Teachers not familiar with Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity)

Students not exposed to tasks and math standards at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) | Use small instructional groups to differentiate student

Use FCIM math focus calendars to identify Sunshine State Standards most likely to be assessed on the FCAT 2.0

Use FCIM math focus calendars to focus on the lowest FCAT 2.0 Reporting Categories

Provide explicit benchmark-focused instruction during math launch

Provide safety nets for students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 3 | All K-5 grade teachers

Math Coach

Math Interventionist

Leadership Team

RtI Team | Review of board configuration

Review of lesson plans

Teacher observation

Review the percentage of students scoring 70% and above on math formatives

Review the percentage of students scoring 70% and above on FCIM math mini assessments

Review the number of students scoring 70% and above on their District Benchmark | Envisions assessments

District Benchmark Assessment

Classroom visitation log

CAST

District Benchmark Assessment

FCIM mini assessments

Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment |

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

| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | Elementary School Mathematics Goal #

The math proficiency for 3rd-5th grade math will increase 6-7% each year from 46% to 71% by 2017.

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

NA		NA		

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	White: None enrolled Black: Teachers not instructing at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Teachers not familiar with Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Students not exposed to tasks at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity New math curriculum Hispanic: None enrolled Asian: None enrolled American Indian: None enrolled	Provide teachers with Webb's Depth of Knowledge training Require teachers to include the level of complexity either within their focus/essential question or in their lesson plan Use FCIM math focus calendars to identify Sunshine State Standards most likely to be assessed on the FCAT 2.0 Use FCIM math focus calendars to focus on the lowest FCAT 2.0 Reporting Categories Provide explicit benchmark-focused instruction during math launch Provide safety nets for students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 3 Differentiate instruction Require all FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s to enroll in Team Up and/or SES tutoring (F/R lunch) Provide in-school push-in tutoring for FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s	All K-5 grade teachers Math Coach Leadership Team RtI Team Grade level chairperson	Review of board configuration Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 70% and above on math formatives Review the percentage of students scoring 70% and above on FCIM math mini assessments Review the number of students scoring 70% and above on their District Benchmark	Envisions assessments District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Classroom visitation log Teacher Assessment Instrument District Benchmark Assessment Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment
2	New math curriculum	Provide teachers with training on the new Envision Math curriculum	All K-5 grade teachers Math Coach Leadership Team RtI Team Grade level chairperson	Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 70% and above on math formatives Review the percentage of students scoring 70% and	Envisions assessments District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Classroom visitation log Teacher Assessment

				above on FCIM math mini assessments	Instrument
				Review the number of students scoring 70% and above on their District Benchmark	District Benchmark Assessment
					Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment

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

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

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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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:	The number of 3rd-5th grade SWD students not making satisfactory progress will decrease 3%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
6/8 or 75% of SWD students made satifactory progress in math.	8/10 or 80% of SWD students 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
	Instruction is based on IEP goals and not grade level standards which are assessed on FCAT SWD students are 2 years below grade level on average SWD students are used to comprehension accommodations that cannot be used on the FCAT	Mainstream as many SWD students as possible to expose them to more rigorous instruction Use Direct Instruction and Guided Reading daily to increase student reading ability of authentic math passages Transition SWD students to the type of	All K-5 grade teachers Math Coach Math Interventionist Leadership Team RtI Team ESE Liaison Inclusion and EBD	Review the percentage of SWD students scoring 70% and above on theme tests Review the percentage of SWD students scoring on grade level with their DRA (3rd: 30, 4th: 40, and 5th 50)	Envisions assessments District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Classroom visitation log CAST

				Teachers	Review the number of SWD students scoring 60% and above on their District Benchmark	District Benchmark Assessment
1			accommodations permitted o the FCAT Provide teachers with Webb's Depth of Knowledge training Require teachers to include the level of complexity either within their focus/essential question or in their lesson plan Use FCIM reading focus calendars to identify Sunshine State Standards most likely to be assessed on the FCAT Use FCIM math focus calendars to focus on the lowest FCAT Reporting Categories Provide explicit benchmark-focused instruction during math launch Provide explicit instruction during Soar To Success lessons to improve student ability to read authentic math passages Provide safety nets for students scoring below FCAT level 3 Differentiate instruction Require all FCAT level 1 and 2s to enroll in Team Up and/or SES tutoring (F/R lunch) Provide in-school push-in tutoring for FCAT level		Review the number of SWD students scoring 70% and above on Reading Mastery assessments Review the percentage of SWD students scoring 70% and above on FCIM reading mini assessments Review the number of SWD Students scoring 70% and Above on Soar To Success assessments	FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:	The number of 3rd-5th grade students not making satisfactory progress will decrease 1%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
91% or 156/172 of Economically Disadvantaged students made satisfactry progress.	92% or 138/151 of Economically Disadvantaged 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	Number of students not Performing math tasks on a moderate and high level of complexity level Teachers not instructing at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity) Teachers not familiar with Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity)	Provide teachers with Webb's Depth of Knowledge training Require teachers to include the level of complexity either within their focus/essential question or in their lesson plan Provide explicit benchmark-focused instruction during math launch Provide safety nets for students scoring below FCAT 2.0 level 3 Differentiate instruction Require all FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s to enroll in Team Up and/or SES tutoring (F/R lunch) Provide in-school push-in tutoring for FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s	All K-5 grade teachers Math Coach Math Interventionist Leadership Team RtI Team	Review of board configuration Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 70% and above on math formatives Review the percentage of students scoring 70% and above on FCIM math mini assessments Review the number of students scoring 70% and above on their District Benchmark	Envisions assessments District Benchmark Assessment Classroom visitation log CAST District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment
2	New math curriculum	Provide teacher training on the Envision Math curriculum	All K-5 grade teachers Math Coach Math Interventionist Leadership Team RtI Team ESE Liaison Inclusion and EBD Teachers	Review of board configuration Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 70% and above on math formatives Review the percentage of students scoring 70% and above on FCIM math mini assessments Review the number of students scoring 70% and above on their District Benchmark	Envisions assessments District Benchmark Assessment Classroom visitation log CAST District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment
	Students not exposed to tasks and math standards at the highest levels of Webb's Depth of Knowledge (cognitive complexity)	Use FCIM math focus calendars to identify Sunshine State Standards most likely to be assessed on the FCAT 2.0 Use FCIM math focus calendars to focus on the	All K-5 grade teachers Math Coach Math Interventionist Leadership Team	Review of board configuration Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 70%	Envisions assessments District Benchmark Assessment Classroom visitation log

			RtI Team	and above on math formatives	CAST
3		lowest FCAT 2.0 Reporting Category		Review the percentage of students scoring 70% and above on FCIM math mini assessments	District Benchmark Assessment
					FCIM mini assessments
					Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment
				Review the number of students scoring 70% and above on their District Benchmark	

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

Mathematics Budget:

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

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	The number of 5th grade students achieving proficiency will increase 9%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
9% (5 students)	18% (11 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	Number of students not performing task with moderate and high levels of complexity	Use science leveled readers to differentiate instruction Increase student reading ability through Guided Reading Provide teachers with Webb's Depth of Knowledge training Require teachers to include the level of complexity either within their focus/essential question or in their lesson plan Provide explicit benchmark-focused instruction during the science engage	Science Lead Teacher Math/Science Coach Principal RtI Team	Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 70% and above on math formatives Review the percentage of students scoring 70% and above on FCIM science mini assessments Review the number of students scoring 70% and above on their District Benchmark	District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments CAST District Benchmark Assessment Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment
2	Students not sufficiently exposed to science standards	Use science leveled readers to differentiate instruction Use FCIM science focus calendars to focus on the lowest FCAT 2.0 Reporting Categories Provide explicit instruction during reading mini lessons Provide science safety nets for students scoring below 50% on the district science	Science Lead Teacher Math/Science Coach Principal RtI Team	Review of lesson plans Teacher observation Review the percentage of students scoring 70% and above on science formatives Review the percentage of students scoring 70% and above on FCIM science mini assessments Review the number of students scoring 60% and above on their District	District Benchmark Assessment FCIM mini assessments CAST District Benchmark Assessment Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment

| | | benchmark

Increase science instruction in grades 2nd-4th

Require all reading FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s to enroll in Team Up and/or SES tutoring (F/R lunch)to increase student reading ability to access science content | | Benchmark | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|

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

| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.

Science Goal #1b:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	NA

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:	The number of 5th grade students scoring level 4 or 5 will increase 3%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% or (0/61 students)	3% or (1/48 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
	Number of students not performing task with moderate and high levels of complexity	Use science leveled readers to differentiate instruction

Provide explicit | Science Lead Teacher

Math/Science Coach | Review of lesson plans

Teacher observation

Review the percentage of | District Benchmark Assessment

FCIM mini assessments |

1	Students not sufficiently exposed to science standards	benchmark-focused instruction during science engage lesson Use FCIM science focus calendars to focus on the lowest FCAT 2.0 Reporting Categories Provide explicit benchmark-focused instruction science engage Provide science safety nets for students scoring below 50% on the district science benchmark Require all reading FCAT 2.0 level 1 and 2s to enroll in Team Up and/or SES tutoring (F/R lunch) to increase student reading ability to access science content	Principal RtI Team	students scoring 85% and above on science formatives Review the percentage of students scoring 85% and above on FCIM science mini assessments Review the number of students scoring 75% and above on their District Benchmark	CAST District Benchmark Assessment Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	NA

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

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

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

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

Science Budget:

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	The number of 4th grade students scoring 3.0 will increase 3%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
80% or 48/61 students	83% or 50/61 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
	Number of students	Review the sunshine	All K-5 teachers	Review of board	Classroom

| | not exposed to authentic texts writing on grade level | state Standards for writing

Expose students to authentic texts

Teach students author's crafts

Have students review the FCAT 2.0 Writing rubric to score their paper | Reading Coach

Leadership Team

RtI Team | configuration

Review of lesson plans

Teacher observation

Review monthly writing assessments

Review weekly writing assignments

Review district writing assessments | visitation log

CAST

District Writing Assessment

Team-Up and SES tutoring mini assessment |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | | | | | |

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: | NA |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| NA | NA |

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						

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

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	Increase the Average Daily Attendance (ADA) rate 3% from 70585 days students were present at school compared to 77034 days students were enrolled.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
91% or 70,585/77,034 days enrolled and present	94% or 60,912/64,800 days enrolled and present
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
40% or 161/430 students absent 10+ days	37% or 151/360 students absent 10+ days
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
16% or 69/430 students tardy 10+ days	13% or 46/360 students tardy 10+ days

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	Family mobility Lack of reliable transportation Inclement weather	Recommend carpooling Identify early attendance problem patterns and schedule AIT meetings	Teachers Guidance Counselor Principal	Student sign-in log OnCourse attendance Genesis	District Attendance Report AIT meetings OnCourse

		Increase referrals to Truancy Officer	Truancy Officer		Genesis

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	Decrease the number of days students suspended out of school by 3% from 305 days to 296 days.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions

0	3
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
0/430 students	10/360 students
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
305	296
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
110	107

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	High crime area Bullying on the way to/from school Teachers not consistently implementing CHAMPs Poor student-teacher relationships	Implement Character Education Implement Second Step Anti-bullying Implementation of Foundations and CHAMPs Use Class I and Classroom Referrals Provide training to teachers on building a healthy culture Provide training to teachers in regards to establishing healthy relationships with students Refer students to the Guidance Counselor prior to wwriting discipline referrals	All teachers Guidance Counselor Principal	Decrease in the number of students sent to the office on Class II discipline referral Decrease in the number of students suspended for fighting or bullying	Student discipline School Discipline Report form Genesis

Note: the Strategy / Person / Process columns map as follows — All teachers aligns with "Implement Character Education"; Guidance Counselor aligns with "Implement Second Step"; Principal aligns with "Anti-bullying".

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	The average number of parents participating in Parent Involvement activities will increase 3%
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
6 parents	7 parents
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	SAC and PTA do not collaborate	SAC and PTA will collaborate and meet immediately after each other	Principal SAC Chairperson PTA President	Increased participation with Parent Involvement activities Better coordinated parent Involvement activities	Sin-in log for Parent Involvement activities Sign-in logs for SAC meetings Sign-in logs for PTA meetings
2	SAC and PTA meetings conflict with parent work schedules	Direct parents to the SAC and PTA meetings as they pick up their child during Team Up and SES Tutoring Schedule the SAC and PTA meetings back-to-back Experiment with shortening the SAC and PTA meetings from 60 minutes for each meeting to 30 minutes for each meeting	Principal Parent Volunteer Liaison SAC Chairperson PTA Chairperson	Increased attendance at SAC and PTA meetings	Sin-in log for Parent Involvement activities Sign-in logs for SAC meetings Sign-in logs for PTA meetings
3	Parent do not receive "person and direct" communication from teachers regarding activities Parent phone number are often incorrect or "out-of-service"	Have teachers personally contact parents by phone regarding upcoming Parent Involvement activities Text and use School Messenger (automated call service) to contact parents	All K-5 teachers Principal	Increased attendance at SAC and PTA meetings Increased participation with Parent Involvement activities Better coordinated parent Involvement activities	Sin-in log for Parent Involvement activities Sign-in logs for SAC meetings Sign-in logs for PTA meetings

---

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00

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

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:	

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

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00

Technology				
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source		Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data		$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00

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

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00

Technology

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00

Professional Development

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00

Other

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
				Grand Total: $0.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

⬚ Priority	⬚ Focus	⬚ Prevent	⬚ NA

Are you a reward school: ⬚ Yes ⬚ No

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

No Attachment

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

✓ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

Promote the benefits of students wearing uniforms and present to all stakeholders with a comprehensive democratic process for transitioning George Washington Carver #158 to school uniforms.

Conduct monthly SAC meetings to inform stakeholders of school progress toward meeting School Improvement Plan (SIP) goals.

Conduct Mid-year Stakeholders meeting on Thursday, January 31 at 4:30pm inside the Media Center.

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Duval School District
GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER ELEMENTARY
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	42%	58%	82%	9%	191	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	54%	66%			120	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?	47% (NO)	70% (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					428	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					D	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Duval School District
GEORGE WASHINGTON CARVER ELEMENTARY
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	43%	55%	96%	35%	229	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	49%	59%			108	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?	50% (YES)	63% (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					450	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested