

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

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

School Name: RUTLEDGE H. PEARSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Duval

Principal: Deborah W. Crotty

SAC Chair: Natosha Burks

Superintendent: Ed Pratt-Dannals

Date of School Board Approval: November 1, 2011

Last Modified on: 10/17/2012

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	Debroah Crotty	BA-Elementary Education/Early Childhood/Gifted Endorsement - UNF Master of Arts in Ed Leadership - UNF	6	8	2011-2012: Grade A, Reading Mastery 34%, Math Mastery 55%, Science Mastery 44% 2010-2011: Grade A, Reading Mastery 68%, Math Mastery 79%, Science Mastery 55% 2009-2010: Grade A, Reading Mastery 64%, Math Mastery 85%, Science Mastery 29%, AYP: No 2008-2009: Grade: A, Reading Mastery 67%, Math Mastery 46%, Science Mastery 46%, AYP: Yes 2007-2008: Grade: B, Reading Mastery 58%, Math Mastery 59%, Science Mastery 13%, AYP: Yes 2006-2007: Grade: F, Reading Mastery 33%, Math Mastery 33%, Science Mastery 6%, AYP: No African American and Economically did not make AYP in Reading and Math.

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)
Reading	Khahala Stamper	BA - Elementary Education UNF	6	1	2011-2012: Grade A, Reading Mastery 34%, Math Mastery 55%, Science Mastery 44%
Standards	Shirley Selsor	MA - Curriculum and Instruction - USM, BA - Elementary Ed - UNF	6	6	2011-2012: Grade A, Reading Mastery 34%, Math Mastery 55%, Science Mastery 44% 2010-2011: Grade A, Reading Mastery 68%, Math Mastery 79%, Science Mastery 55% 2009-2010: Grade A, Reading Mastery 64%, Math Mastery 85%, Science Mastery 29%, AYP: No 2008-2009: Grade: A, Reading Mastery 67%, Math Mastery 46%, Science Mastery 46%, AYP: Yes 2007-2008: Grade: B, Reading Mastery 58%, Math Mastery 59%, Science Mastery 13%, AYP: Yes 2006-2007: Grade: F, Reading Mastery 33%, Math Mastery 33%, Science Mastery 6%, AYP: No African American and Economically did not make AYP in Reading and Math.
Math	Felicia McLaughlin	BS - Psychology - FAMU, Med - Elementary Ed - UNF	11	3	2011-2012: Grade A, Reading Mastery 34%, Math Mastery 55%, Science Mastery 44% 2010-2011: Grade A, Reading Mastery 68%, Math Mastery 79%, Science Mastery 55% 2009-2010: Grade A, Reading Mastery 64%, Math Mastery 85%, Science Mastery 29%, AYP: No

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	Partnership with the university in training of interns to insure that they can implement best practices to move high risk students. Networking with colleagues, Human Resources, and other educators seeking referrals and recommendations. Creating a working climate of respect and dignity.	Principal	Beginning of year 2012-2013	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

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

0%

N/A

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
23	8.7%(2)	34.8%(8)	17.4%(4)	39.1%(9)	30.4%(7)	100.0%(23)	0.0%(0)	0.0%(0)	43.5%(10)

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
Shirley Selsor	Wayman Graham	Coach to Teacher	Daily meetings / Observations / Modeling / Analyzing Data / Differentiating Instruction
Patty Pascuito	Chelsea Flott	Coach to Teacher	Daily meetings / Observations / Modeling / Analyzing Data / Differentiating Instruction
Tiffany Bailey	Karen Fountain	Teacher to Teacher	Daily meetings / Observations / Modeling / Analyzing Data / Differentiating Instruction

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

NA

Title II

NA

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Pearson has access to services provided by Ribault Full-Service School. They provide social service referrals, clothing, school supplies, etc.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI funds will be coordinated with Title 1 funds to provide equipment, teachers, materials, and summer school for all Level 1 & 2 students.

Violence Prevention Programs

Foundations and CHAMPS Programs are fully implemented and directed by the Behavioral Interventionist.

Nutrition Programs

NA

Housing Programs

NA

Head Start

NA

Adult Education

NA

Career and Technical Education

NA

Job Training

NA

Other

Pearson' after-school program is funded by a federal grant under the direction Bridge of Northeast Florida.

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Pearson's RtI Leadership Team consists of the Principal (Deborah Crotty), RTI Facilitator (Shirley Selsor), two Academic Coaches (Felicia McLaughlin, Khahala Stamper), VE Resource Teacher (Patty Pasciuto), Behavior Interventionist (Fernando McGhee), and Guidance Counselor (Charmaine Coker-Hay), Speech Pathologist (Katresea George).

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

The Principal leads the faculty in a review of the data. The RtI Leadership Team will meet individually with grade level teams to develop the initial draft of the School Improvement Plan utilizing the template provided by the Department of Education. The draft SIP is then presented to the School Advisory Council for review and recommendations. The Leadership Team finalizes the plan.

The School Improvement Plan becomes a living document for the work of the school. The Leadership Team regularly revises and updates the plan as the needs of students change throughout the school year. The plan includes a formal review process which demonstrates how the school has used RtI to inform instruction and made mid-course adjustments as data are analyzed.

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 Principal leads the faculty in a review of the data. The RtI Leadership Team will meet individually with the grade level teams to develop the initial draft of the School Improvement Plan utilizing the template provided by the Department of Education. The draft SIP is then presented to the School Advisory Council for review and recommendations. The Leadership Team finalizes the plan.

The School Improvement Plan becomes a living document for the work of the school. The Leadership Team regularly revises and updates the plan as the needs of students change throughout the school year. The plan includes a formal review process which demonstrates how the school has used RtI to inform instruction and made mid-course adjustments as data are analyzed.

MTSS Implementation

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

Baseline Data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2009-2010 (FCAT), Writing Prompt, District Benchmarks, DRA.
Midyear Data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test - Released Test from DOE (FCAT), Writing Prompt, District Benchmarks and PMA's, DRA.
End of Year: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2010-2011 (FCAT), Writing Prompt, District Benchmarks and PMA's, DRA.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

District training will highlight and confirm the RTI process for the staff. The three Academic Coaches and Behavior Interventionist will model, observe and meet with teachers weekly during their resource times. In these sessions, data will be broken down and analyzed to help teachers become more proficient with the RTI process. Professional Development will focus on the Gradual Release Model and the role that scaffolded instruction plays in processing complex text. Resources for professional development will include Text Complexity by Douglas Fisher, Nancy Frey, and Diane Lapp and Pathways to Common Core by Lucy Calkins.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Coaches, Behavior Interventionist, Principal, ESE teachers, Guidance Counselor, and District Support Team assist teachers with the planning and implementation of each student's interventions.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Pearson's RTI Leadership Team consists of the Principal (Deborah Crotty), RTI Facilitator (Shirley Selsor), two Academic Coaches (Felicia McLaughlin, Khahala Stamper), VE Resource Teacher (Patty Pasciuto), Behavior Interventionist (Fernando McGhee), and Guidance Counselor (Charmaine Coker-Hay).

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

The Principal serves as the first line of communication in the LLT process. The Reading Coaches will interface with the district to prepare for and roll out Common Core Standards. The Literacy Leadership Team will train teachers in breaking down data, creating prescriptive plans for remediation, and managing resources for the differentiated instruction. The VE Resource Teacher will help coordinate prescriptive plans with IEP's when necessary. She will also serve as the resource for accommodations and modifications for all students. The Guidance Counselor and Behavior Interventionist will address nonacademic matters that affect performance and impact literacy development. The Literacy Leadership Team will meet monthly or as necessary to facilitate the process.

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

Unpacking the Common Core Standards. Continue to develop analytical thinking at the synthesis level through a school-wide emphasis on written response to literature.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 9/27/2012)

*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.

Pearson has an in house Pre-K program funded by Title 1. The pre-K teacher serves on the Kindergarten Learning Community. Using the data from ECHOS, FLKRS, and F.A.I.R., strengths and weaknesses of both programs are identified and adjusted to student needs.

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	The Reading Goal for 2011 is for 68% (77) of the Pearson Student population to score at proficiency level 3 on the FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
31% (30)	68% (77)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1 Focus is affected by Attendance, Classroom Discipline, and Short Attention Span	1.1 Address academic and non- academic factors that impact student learning.	1.1 Principal, Teachers, and RTI Team	1.1 Students performance is analyzed using the five legged model that includes: attitude, perception, knowledge, experience, and metacognitive.	1.1 A Whole Child Notebook is kept on each child to gather data and problem solve.
2	1.2 Student ability to comprehend complex text.	1.2 Explicit instruction of metacognitive thinking skills in lesson plans.	1.2 Principal and Coaches	1.2 Higher order thinking is evident in the student's responses to complex text.	1.2 Evaluating students' responses to literature
3	1.3 High percentage of students reading below grade level.	1.3 Accelerate students to grade level through remediation that is intensive and differentiated.	1.3 Principal and Reading Coaches	1.3 Using data from DRA results, instruction is differentiated	1.3 DRA results turned into administration for review 4 times per year.
4					

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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:	23% (21) of the Pearson Student population will score at the proficiency level 4 and 5.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
9% (13)	23% (21)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1 Students inexperience of rigor questions.	2.1 Increase rigor through analytic writing to insure comprehension of complexity text.	2.1 Principal, Coaches, Teachers	2.1 On-going analysis of student work	2.1 Rubric that measures written response to Reading.
2	2.2 Teacher proficiency at consistently engaging students in challenging activities	2.2 Plan differentiated instruction using evidence-based instruction/interventions within 90-minute reading block. Enrichment/Challenged Activities incorporated in order to engage students at a rigorous level.	2.2 Principal, Coaches, Teachers	2.2 On-going analysis of work produced independently at centers.	2.2 Rubric that measures written response to Reading.

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:	The Reading Goal for 2013 is for 100% (3) of Pearson student population to score at or above achievement level 7 in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (3)	100% (3)

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:	82% (118) of the Pearson Student population will make gains in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
80% (112)	82% (118)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3.1 Teacher proficiency at planning and intervention consistently engaging students in appropriate level activities.	Plan supplemental instruction/intervention for students not responding to core instruction. Focus of instruction is determined by review of FAIR data and will include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice.	Principal, Coaches, Teachers, RtI Team	On-going analysis of student work through focus walks, observation, and product of student work.	Teacher and Student data/conference log.

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:	100%(3) of the Pearson students population will make reading gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (3)	100%(3)

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	Teacher's ability to keep students engaged at a high level throughout the academic day.	To align learning schedule with access points using accommodations and modifications as defined in students' IEP's.	Teacher, VE Resource	On going RTi process is monitored and IEP goals.	IEP goals

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:	73% (66) of the Pearson Bottom Quartile Student population will make gains in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
60% (72)	73% (66)

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	Student engagement Parental Support Participation in TEAM-UP Teacher proficiency at consistently engaging students in appropriate level activities.	Plan targeted intervention for students not responding to core plus supplemental instruction using problem-solving process. Interventions will be matched to individual student needs, be evidence-based, and provided in addition to core.	Principal, Coaches, Teachers, RtI Team	Student progress is assessed using FAIR ongoing progress monitoring every 20 days. On-going analysis of student work through focus walks, observation, and product of student work	FAIR Ongoing Progress monitoring when appropriate will be used to determine progress from Benchmark 1 towards Benchmark 2 and from Benchmark 2 towards Benchmark 3. Teacher and student data/conference log.

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target						
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Reading Goal # 5A :				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	79% (95) of Pearson student population will make AYP.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Black: 59% (73)	Black: 79% (95)

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	Black: Student engagement Parental Support Participation in TEAM-UP Teacher new to subject areas Teacher proficiency at consistently engaging students in appropriate level activities.	Plan targeted intervention for students not responding to core plus supplemental instruction using problem-solving process. Interventions will be matched to individual student needs, be evidence-based, and provided in addition to core.	Principal, Coaches, Teachers, RtI Team	Student progress is assessed using FAIR ongoing progress monitoring every 20 days. On-going analysis of student work through focus walks, observation, and product of student work.	FAIR Ongoing Progress monitoring when appropriate will be used to determine progress from Benchmark 1 towards Benchmark 2 and from Benchmark 2 towards Benchmark 2. Teacher and Student data/conference log.
---	---	---	--	--	---

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:	All subgroups made AYP
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100%	100%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5B1	5B1	5B1	5B1	5B1

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:	All subgroups made AYP
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100%	100%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5C1	5C1	5C1	5C1	5C1

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:		All subgroups made AYP			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
100%		100%			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5D1	5D1	5D1	5D1	5D1

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						

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:	Identified need in the area of Geometry and measurement across the grade levels.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
54% (72)	65%(89)

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	Attendance Classroom Discipline Short Attention Span	Utilize the FCIM to identify students in the Core Curriculum needing intervention and enrichment to engage students.	Principal Math Coach Teachers	Review student grouping charts frequently and ensure groups are redesigned to target the need of students based on assessment.	Progress of all students on assessment.
2	Scheduling extended time for math interventions	Plan supplemental instruction/intervention for students not responding to core instruction. Focus of instruction is determined by review of common assessment data and will include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice. Supplemental instruction is provided in addition to core instruction to ensure intervention and enrichment to students at their level.	Principal Math Coach RtI Team	Grade level and RtI team will monitor results of common assessments data according to FCIM.	FCIM calendar measuring NGSSS benchmarks for proficiency.

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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:	17% (13) of the Pearson Student population will score at proficiency Level 4 or 5.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28% (29)	17% (13)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teacher proficiency at consistently engaging students in challenging activities.	Determine core instructional needs by reviewing common assessment data for all students. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence-based instruction/interventions within the mathematics curriculum to challenge and engage students on their level.	Principal Math Coach	Grade level and RtI team will monitor results of common assessments data according to FCIM.	Common assessments tied to Next Generation Math Standards administered weekly to check for understanding.

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:	The Math Goal for 2013 is for 100% (3) of Pearson student population to score at or above achievement level 7 or more in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (3)	100% (3)

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	Emotional Stability at time of assessment.	Use of extrinsic motivation as well as maintaining close relationship with family to support emotional	VE Resource	Set goals with student in order to decrease the frequency of unwanted behavior.	Charting the frequency of episodes.

stability.

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:	81% (98) of the Pearson Student population will make gains in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71% (88)	81% (98)

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	Teacher proficiency at consistently engaging students in appropriate level activities.	Increase the use of manipulatives and hands-on activities to reinforce mathematic concepts in order to engage students in appropriate level.	Principal Math Coach RtI Team	Math Coach will assist teachers in the alignment of centers and stations, and administration will ensure activities are implemented.	Progress of students on assessments.
2	Teacher proficiency at aligning explicit instruction to meet needs determined by data.	Plan targeted intervention for students not responding to core instruction. Plan supplemental instruction using problem-solving process. Interventions will be matched to individual student needs, be evidence-based, and aligned with core instruction.	Principal Math Coach RtI Team	Grade level and RtI team will review results of common assessments data to determine progress toward benchmark.	Common assessments tied to Next Generations Math Standards administered.

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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:	80% (95) of the Pearson Student population will make gains in math
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
76% (90)	80% (95)

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	Opportunities systematically solve problems through a step by step process	A systematic and comprehensive review of all math skills daily. Students work collaboratively and independently at math stations. Respond in writing reflecting on their problem solving. process.	Principal Math Coach RTI Team	Teacher reviews the written responses completed by students at the stations in order to monitor progress of problem solving ability.	Students written responses to the math task.

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 #					
	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:	All subgroups made AYP
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Black:	Black:

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	5A.1	5A.1	5A.1	5A.1	5A.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 subgroup:

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

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	5B.1	5B.1	5B.1	5B.1	5B.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 subgroup:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	All subgroups made AYP
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Black:	Black:

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	5C 1	5C 1	5C 1	5C 1	5C 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 subgroup:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	All subgroups made AYP
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Black:	Black:

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
--	---------------------	----------	---	---	-----------------

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5D 1	5D 1	5D 1	5D 1	5D 1

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 Science Goal for 2013 is 55% (17) of the Pearson Student population to score at proficiency Level 3 on the FCAT.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41% (16)	55% (17)

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	Attendance Classroom Discipline Short Attention Span	All students will engage with the new Interactive Science curriculum.	Principal Science Coach Teacher	Observing students working in collaborative groups to explore science content.	Focus walks and lesson plans review.
2	Teacher new to science curriculum.	Teachers investigate and adapt science materials for use in multiple settings across the curriculum.	Principal Science Coach Reading Coach Teachers.	Student interaction with materials, such as interactive media activities.	Focus walks to observe science themes being used across curriculum.

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:	N/A
--	-----

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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 Science Goal for 2013 is for 5% (2) of the Pearson Student population to score at proficiency Level 4 on the FCAT.
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
4% (2)	5% (2)

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	Student proficiency in reading is below level of FCAT test.	Content area reading will be a focus in Science & Reading instruction.	Principal Science Coach Reading Coaches Interventionist	Grade level and Support staff team will review results of common assessments data to determine progress toward benchmark.	Common assessments tied to Florida Science Standards administered according to FCIM.

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:	The Science goal for 2013 is for 100% (1) of the Pearson student population to score at Level 7 or above in science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (1)	100% (1)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student proficiency in reading is below level of FCAT test.	Content area reading will be a focus in Science & Reading instruction.	Principal Science Coach Reading Coaches Interventionist	Grade level and Support staff team will review results of common assessments data to determine progress toward benchmark.	Common assessments tied to Florida Science Standards administered according to FCIM.

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 Writing Goal for 2013 is 88% (40) of the Pearson Student population to score at proficiency Level 4 on the FCAT.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
17% (4)			88% (40)		
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	Student writing samples do not reflect student ability to elaborate on plot and description.	Professional development for teachers in modeling descriptive writing techniques using touchtone text.	Principal Reading Coach Teachers	Writing prompts are frequently monitored for growth in the four areas of writing by administration, Coaches and Teachers.	Progress between the Pretest Prompt and Mid-Year Prompt.

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

N/A		N/A		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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:	The Attendance Goal for 2013 is 100% (251) of the Pearson Student population not to exceed 10 or more absences.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
94% (236)	100% (251)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
46% (123)	0% (0)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
16% (43)	0% (0)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Transportation	Parent/School Communication	Behavior Interventionist Principal Guidance Counselor	Home Visits Phone conferences	Behavioral Interventionist and classroom teacher keep a communication log.
2	Responsibility of parent	Provide increasing amounts of opportunities for parents to interact with teachers on various topics.	Principal Classroom teachers SAC Team	Number of parents that show up for conference days, SAC team, Team UP events etc.	Sign In Sheet

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:	The Suspension Goal for 2013 is 1% (2) of the Pearson Student population
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
0% (0)	0% (0)
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
0% (0)	0% (0)
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
1% (2)	0% (0)
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
1% (2)	0% (0)
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Parental Involvement Appropriate Intervention Measures	Improve Community relations between home and school	Behavior Interventionist Principal Guidance Counselor	Decrease number of suspensions	Referrals

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: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	The Parent Involvement Goal for 2011 is 50% (125) of the Pearson Parent/Student population
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
20% (51)	50% (125)

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	Parental Support Transportation Socio-Economic	Encourage families to participate in Family Building Better Readers. Offer monthly REading Night (Literacy Nights)	Principal Reading Coach Parent Liaison TEAM-UP Manager	Collect participation data and survey families	Parent attendance Sign-in Sheets
2	Parental Support Transportation Socio-Economic	Quarterly Parent/Teacher Report Card Conferences	Principal Instructional Coach	Administration will review parent attendance logs	Parent attendance Sign-in Sheets
3	Parental Support Transportation Socio-Economic	Leap Frog Games	Principal Instructional Coach	Administration monitors logs	Teacher monitors parental check-out and use of resources

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)

Saftey Goals Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1. Saftey Goals Goal Saftey Goals Goal #1:			To increase the participation of volunteer support.		
2012 Current level:			2013 Expected level:		
20%			50%		
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	Actively recruit volunteers	1. Volunteer liasion 2. Follow up with interested individuals 3. Appreciation activities held for individuals	Principal Volunteer Liasion	Full participation of Volunteers	Volunteer log

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

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

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

Budget:

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

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

End of Saftey Goals Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
Daily Planners for every student	\$1,193.01

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

1. Quarterly review of School Budget
2. Quarterly review of SIP
3. On-going update of facility in conjunction with Sherwood Forest Community Center

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Duval School District RUTLEDGE H. PEARSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	68%	79%	61%	55%	263	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	76%	64%			140	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	73% (YES)	73% (YES)			146	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					549	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Duval School District RUTLEDGE H. PEARSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	64%	85%	93%	29%	271	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%	79%			128	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	50% (YES)	80% (YES)			130	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					529	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested