FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: H. L. JOHNSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Palm Beach

Principal: Sharon B. Hench

SAC Chair: April Kercheville

Superintendent: E. Wayne Gent

Date of School Board Approval: December 2012

Last Modified on: 10/22/2012

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)
					FCAT 2011 - 2012 Grade A, points earned 601 Reading High Standards: 76% Reading Learning Gains: 70% Reading Lowest % Learning Gains: 59% Math High Standards: 79% Math Learning Gains: 76% Math Lowest 25% Learning Gains: 73% Science High Standards: 82% Writing High Standards: 86% FCAT 2010-2011 Grade A, points earned 668 Reading High Standards: % 93 Reading Learning Gains: % 73 Reading Lowest % Learning Gains: % 73 Math High Standards: % 94 Math Learning Gains: % 76 Math Lowest 25% Learning Gains: % 74 Science High Standards: % 90 Writing High Standards: % 95 AYP: % 85

Position	Name	Degrees/Certifications	Years at Current School	Years as Admin	Performance Record
Principal	Sharon B. Hench	B.A. Ed. – Elementary Education; M. Ed.– Elementary/Early Childhood Education; M. Ed.– Educational Administration/ Supervision Certifications: School Principal (all levels); Early Childhood Education (Nursery-Kindergarten); Elementary Education (1-6); and National Principal Mentoring (NAESP)	10	30	SWD, ED, and Black did not meet AYP in Reading and Math FCAT 2009-2010 Grade A, points earned 605 Reading High Standards: 90% Reading Learning Gains: 76% Reading Lowest 25% Learning Gains: 64% Math High Standards: 88% Math Learning Gains: 64% Math Lowest 25% Learning Gains: 55% Science High Standards: 79% Writing High Standards: 89% AYP: 90% SWD did not meet AYP in Reading and Math; Economically Disadvantaged and Black did not meet AYP in Math 2008-2009: Grade A, points earned 671 Reading High Standards: 93% Reading Learning Gains: 79% Reading Lowest 25% Learning Gains: 78% Math High Standards: 91% Math Learning Gains: 77% Math Lowest 25% Learning Gains: 74% Science High Standards: 82% Writing High Standards: 97% AYP: 100% FCAT 2007-08 Grade A, points earned 656 Reading High Standards: 90% Reading Learning Gains: 76% Reading Lowest 25% Learning Gains: 61% Math High Standards: 89% Math Learning Gains: 84% Math Lowest 25% Learning Gains: 86% Science High Standards: 78% Writing High Standards: 92% AYP: 100% FCAT 2006-07 Grade A, points earned 632 Reading High Standards: 91% Reading Learning Gains: 79% Reading Lowest 25% Learning Gains: 73% Math High Standards: 85% Math Learning Gains: 73% Math Lowest 25% Learning Gains: 59% Science High Standards: 79% Writing High Standards: 93% AYP: 100%
Assis Principal	Cyndie L. Wolf	Degrees: B.S.-Education; B.F.A.-Architecture & Fine Arts; M.Ed-Educational Leadership Certifications: School Principal (all levels), Educational Leadership (all levels), General Science (Grades 5-9), Art (K-12), Montessori Educational Administration,	3	6	FCAT 2011 - 2012 Grade A, points earned 601 Reading High Standards: 76% Reading Learning Gains: 70% Reading Lowest % Learning Gains: 59% Math High Standards: 79% Math Learning Gains: 76% Math Lowest 25% Learning Gains: 73% Science High Standards: 82% Writing High Standards: 86% FCAT 2010-2011 Grade A, points earned 668 Reading High Standards: % 93 Reading Learning Gains: % 73 Reading Lowest % Learning Gains: % 73 Math High Standards: % 94 Math Learning Gains: % 76 Math Lowest 25% Learning Gains: % 74 Science High Standards: % 90 Writing High Standards: % 95 AYP: % 85 SWD, ED, and Black did not meet AYP in Reading and Math Data listed below is from Ms. Wolf's tenure at Jeaga Middle School: FCAT 2009-2010 Grade A, points earned 537 Reading High Standards: 60% Reading Learning Gains: 64% Reading Lowest 25% Learning Gains: 69% Math High Standards: 67% Math Learning Gains: 75% Math Lowest 25% Learning Gains: 71% Science High Standards: 44% Writing High Standards: 87% AYP: 69% White and Hispanci made AYP in Math

| | | ESOL, Professional Crisis Management | | | 2008-2009: Grade A, points earned 570
Reading High Standards: 61%
Reading Learning Gains: 70%
Reading Lowest 25% Learning Gains: 84%
Math High Standards: 64%
Math Learning Gains: 75%
Math Lowest 25% Learning Gains: 76%
Science High Standards: 46%
Writing High Standards: 94%
AYP: 69%
Black, ED, ELL, SWD did not make AYP in Reading. White, Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in Math.

FCAT 2007-08 Grade A, points earned 533
Reading High Standards: 59%
Reading Learning Gains: 65%
Reading Lowest 25% Learning Gains: 69%
Math High Standards: 64%
Math Learning Gains: 74%
Math Lowest 25% Learning Gains: 69%
Science High Standards: 42%
Writing High Standards: 91%
AYP: 82%
Black, ED, ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in Reading. ELL and SWD did not make AYP in 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)
n/a	n/a	n/a			n/a

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	Scheduled meetings with Principal	Principal	On-going	
2	Scheduled meetings with leadership team	Principal	On-going	
3	Assign a "Buddy" teacher to new teacher	Principal	On-going	
4	Assign a "Mentor" teacher to new teacher	Principal	On-going	
5	Provide support through grade level and/or learning team meetings	Team Leaders	On-going	
6	Provide support through professional development	Professional Development Contact	On-going	
7	Solicit teacher candidate referrals from colleagues (administrators/teachers)	Principal	On-going	

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
9 Staff Members	All staff are currently enrolled in the appropriate coursework.

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
71	7.0%(5)	15.5%(11)	33.8%(24)	43.7%(31)	28.2%(20)	100.0%(71)	2.8%(2)	1.4%(1)	64.8%(46)

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
Stacy Conner	April Kercheville	Kercheville is in Educator's Support Program and Conner is a Clinical Educator Certified Mentor.	Activities will follow district Educator Support Program requirements.
Jeanette Birney	Melissa Vincent	Vincent is in Educator's Support Program and Birney is a Clinical Educator Certified Mentor.	Activities will follow district Educator Support Program requirements.
Jeanette Birney	Michelle Brock	Brock is in Educator's Support Program and Birney is a Clinical Educator Certified Mentor.	Activities will follow district Educator Support Program requirements.
Sandra Trujillo	Anthony Mollica	Mollica is in Educator's Support Program and Trujillo is a Clinical Educator Certified Mentor.	Activities will follow district Educator Support Program requirements.
Melissa Garey	Tiffany Prosser	Prosser will be supported through the ESP program. Garey is a Clinical Educator Certified Mentor.	Activities will follow district Educator Support Program requirements.
Liz Torres	Dorie Cornwell	Cornwell will be supported through the ESP program. Torres is a Clinical	Activities will follow district Educator Support Program.

	Educator Certified Mentor.	

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Single School Culture and Appreciation for Multicultural Diversity.

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

Required Instruction Listed in 1003.42(2) F.S., as applicable to appropriate grade levels.

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

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The school-based RtI Leadership Team is comprised of the following members: principal, assistant principal, ESE contact, school psychologist, classroom teacher,inclusion teacher, and guidance counselor.

The principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making to ensure:
• a sound, effective academic program is in place
• a process to address and monitor subsequent needs is created
• the School Based Team (SBT) is implementing RtI processes
• assessment of RtI skills of school staff is conducted
• fidelity of implementation of intervention support is documented
• adequate professional development to support RtI implementation is provided
• effective communication with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities occurs

Two of the teachers will spend one hour per day on RtI. This individual assists in the design and implementation of progress monitoring, collect and analyze data, contribute to the development of intervention plans, implement Tier 3 interventions, and offer professional development and technical assistance.

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

The school-based RtI Leadership Team will meet regularly to review universal screening data, diagnostic data, and progress monitoring data. Based on this information, the team will identify the professional development activities needed to create effective learning environments. After determining that effective Tier 1- Core Instruction is in place, the team will identify students who are not meeting identified academic targets. The identified students will be referred to the school-based RtI Leadership Team.

The SBT will use the Problem Solving Model* to conduct all meetings. Based on data and discussion, the team will identify students who are in need of additional academic and/or behavioral support (supplemental or intensive). An intervention plan will be developed (PBCSD Form 2284) which identifies a student's specific areas of deficiencies and appropriate research-based interventions to address these deficiencies. The team will ensure the necessary resources are available and the intervention is implemented with fidelity. Each case will be assigned a case liaison to support the interventionist (e.g., teacher, inclusion teacher, guidance counselor) and report back on all data collected for further discussion at future meetings.

* Problem Solving Model

The four steps of the Problem Solving Model are:

• Problem Identification entails identifying the problem and the desired behavior for the student.
• Problem Analysis involves analyzing why the problem is occurring by collecting data to determine possible causes of the identified problem.
• Intervention Design & Implementation involves selecting or developing evidence-based interventions based upon data previously collected. These interventions are then implemented.
• Evaluating is also termed Response-to-Intervention. In this step, the effectiveness of a student's or group of students' response to the implemented intervention is evaluated and measured.

The problem solving process is self-correcting, if necessary, recycles in order to achieve the best outcomes for all students. This process is strongly supported by both IDEA and NCLB. Specifically, both legislative actions support all students achieving benchmarks regardless of their status in general or special education.

*Problem Solving & Response to Intervention Project 2008

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?

Members of the school-based RtI Leadership Team participated in the development of the School Improvement Plan.

Information considered included:
- FCAT 2.0 scores and the lowest 30%
- strengths and weaknesses of intensive programs
- mentoring, tutoring, and other services

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:
- Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)2.0
- Curriculum Based Measurement
- Palm Beach County Fall Diagnostics
- Palm Beach Writes
- K-4 Literacy Assessment System
- Diagnostic Assessment for Reading (DAR)
- Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN)
- Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)
- Discipline Referrals
- Retentions
- Absences/Tardies

Midyear data:
- Diagnostic Assessment for Reading (DAR)
- Palm Beach County Winter Diagnostics
- Palm Beach Writes
- Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN)
- K-4 Literacy Assessment System

End of year data:
- Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)2.0
- FCAT Writes

Frequency of required Data Analysis and Action Planning Days:
Once within a cycle of instruction (refer to appropriate focus calendar)

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional development will be offered to RtI/iii/Inclusion Team members by the inclusion teachers during SY13. Professional development on the RtI process is scheduled for October 17, 2012 during the Faculty Meeting.

The inclusion teacher will provide in-service to the faculty on an ongoing basis. These in-service opportunities will include, but are not limited to, the following:
- Problem Solving Model
- consensus building
- Positive Behavioral Intervention and Support (PBIS)
- data-based decision-making to drive instruction
- progress monitoring
- selection and availability of research-based interventions
- tools utilized to identify specific discrepancies in reading.

Individual professional development will be provided to classroom teachers, as needed.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Cathy Seevers - Kindergarten Teacher
Tammy Nordlinger - First Grade Teacher
Pat Horner - Second Grade Teacher
Pamela Cinilia - Third Grade Teacher
Tracey Silver - Fourth Grade Teacher
Hope Brown - Fifth Grade Teacher
Melissa Vincent - ESE/E/BD Teacher
Patrice Fletcher - ESE/Inclusion Teacher
Kathy Chiacchio - SAI Teacher
Cyndie Wolf - Assistant Principal
Sharon Hench - Principal

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

The LLT meets monthly to analyze and discuss school-wide reading data, identify concerns/trends/patterns, and develop an action plan to include strategies for development and improvement. Team members are assigned specific responsibilities and tasks to aid in the implementation of the action plan. This includes the dissemination of information to their grade level team and gathering feedback from them to determine the effectiveness of the plan.

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

The LLT will assist teachers in using Learning Village to match interests based on differentiated lessons that are student centered and provide multiple approaches to content, process, and product. Update training on Running Reading Records I and II for experienced staff members. The Fountas and Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention Program will be used with struggling readers schoolwide. All students will use the Ticket to Read web-based program.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the <u>High School Feedback Report</u>

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:		
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:		In grades 3-5, 24% of students will score at Level 3 in Reading on FCAT 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:
22% (97)		24%

		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 making the connection between the Running Reading Record (RRR) data and the Fountas and Pinnell Continuum of Literacy Learning.	Use the Fountas and Pinnell Continuum of Literacy Learning to ensure demonstration of students' higher levels of thinking. Provide interventions based on student's individual needs, as determined in the K-4 Literacy Assessment, Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI), Diagnostic Assessment of Reading (DAR), Running Reading Record (RRR), and analysis of content categories.	Leadership Team	CWT	EDW reports, Individual RRR booklets
2	Lack of funding for after-school or Saturday tutorial and/or enrichment.	Use of web-based Ticket to Read for school and home use. Implement weekend packets November through April.	Leadership Team	Monitoring of student usage.	SAI Teacher
3	Use of NGSSS and FCAT 2.0 Reading Test Item Specifications and Kindergarten- 2nd Common Core Standards.	Implement a daily skills focus in grades K-5 (Learning Village). Use texts/passages within classrooms that mirror the FCAT 2.0 passage type and length to build capacity and endurance.	Leadership Team	Lesson plans will be reviewed and CWT will be conducted.	Diagnostic Tests, CORE K-12, Lesson Plans, Ticket to Read
4	Analyzing and using data from diagnostics, CORE K-12, and EDW reports.	Implement data chats: Administration:Teacher, Teacher:Student, and Teacher:Parent.	Administration and Teachers	Administration will review data feedback forms.	Data Chat forms

5	Lack of consistency in using higher order questions during instruction.	Consistently include higher order questions in lesson plans and instruction. Implement with fidelity. Incorporate project based learning and student presentations.	Leadership Team	Leadership Team will perform CWT and will review lesson plans.	CWT checklist

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:	No goal required. Less than 15 students took the FAA.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (7)	No goal required.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><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 colspan="5" align="center">No Data Submitted</td></tr>
</table>

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	In grades 3-5, the percentage of students achieving a level 4 or 5 in reading will increase from 54% to 56% on the 2013 FCAT 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
54% (241)	56%

<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>Teachers not making the connection between the Running Reading Record (RRR) data and the Fountas and Pinnell Continuum of Literacy Learning.</td><td>Use the Fountas and Pinnell Continuum of Literacy Learning to ensure demonstration of students' higher levels of thinking.

Provide interventions based on student's individual needs, as determined in K-4 Literacy Assessment,</td><td>Leadership Team</td><td>CWT</td><td>EDW reports, Individual RRR booklets</td></tr>
</table>

		Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI), Diagnostic Assessment of Reading (DAR), Running Reading Record (RRR), and analysis of content categories.			
2	Use of NGSSS and FCAT 2.0 Reading Test Item Specifications. Kindergarten -2nd Common Core Standards.	Implement a daily skills focus in grades K-5 (Learning Village). Use texts/passages within classrooms that mirror the FCAT 2.0 passage type and length to build capacity and endurance. Keeping records of the standards mastered and not mastered to ensure coverage prior to state and end-of-year assessments.	Leadership Team	Lesson plans will be reivewed and CWT will be conducted.	Lesson plans
3	Analyzing and using data from diagnostics, CORE K-12, and EDW reports.	Implement data chats: Administration:Teacher, Teacher:Student, and Teacher:Parent. Analyzing the diagnostic data to identify which objectives have already been mastered; Maintain mastery of previously learned skills through enrichment activities.	Administration and Teachers	Administration will review data feedback forms.	Data Chat forms
4	Lack of consistency in using higher order questions during instruction.	Consistently include higher order questions in lesson plans and instruction. Implement use of higher order questions with fidelity. Incorporate project based learning and student created presentations. Offer challenging and enriching alternative learning activities for the time made available within the instructional program by compacting standards.	Leadership Team	Leadership Team will perform CWT and will review lesson plans.	CWT checklist will be used by Leadership Team to determine if processes are being used.

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:	No goal required. Less than 15 students took the FAA.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
43% (6)	No goal required.

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:	Students making learning gains in Reading will increase from 66% to 68% on the 2013 FCAT 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
66%	68%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
---	---	---	---	---	---
1	Lack of parental support or buy in with school-wide non-negotiable rules.	Open house to provide overview of reading curriculum, Ticket to Read and how to navigate Learning Tools.	Leadership Team and ITSA	Leadership Team will review parent feedback forms.	Parent feedback forms
2	Due diligence of teachers to use FCIM.	Implement FCIM.	Leadership Team and Learning Team Facilitators	Leadership Team will monitor data at LTMs.	EDW reports, LTM notes
3	Teachers not making the connection between the Running Reading Record (RRR) data and the Fountas and Pinnell Continuum of Literacy Learning.	Use the Fountas and Pinnell Continuum of Literacy Learning to ensure demonstration of students' higher levels of thinking. Provide interventions based on student's individual needs, as determined in K-4 Literacy Assessment, Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI), Diagnostic Assessment of Reading (DAR), Running Reading Record (RRR), and analysis of content categories.	Leadership Team	CWTs	EDW reports, Individual RRR booklets
4	Lack of funding for after-school or Saturday tutorial and/or enrichment.	Implement weekend packets November through April. Use of web-based Ticket to Read for home and school use.	Leadership Team	Monitoring of student usage.	SAI Teacher.
	Use of NGSSS and FCAT 2.0 Reading Test Item Specifications and Kindergarten - 2nd	Implement a daily skills focus in grades K-5 (Learning Village).	Leadership Team	Lesson plans will be reviewed and CWT will be conducted.	Diagnostic Tests, CORE K-12, Lesson Plans, Ticket to Read

5	Common Core Standards.	Use texts/passages within classrooms that mirror the FCAT 2.0 passage type and length to build capacity and endurance.			
6	Analyzing and using data from diagnostics, CORE K-12, and EDW reports.	Implement data chats: Administration:Teacher, Teacher:Student, and Teacher:Parent.	Administration and Teachers	Administration will review data feedback forms.	Data Chat forms

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:	No goal required. Less than 15 students took the FAA.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29% (4)	No goal required.

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

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:	In grades 4-5, 57% of students in the lowest 25% will demonstrate learning gains in Reading on the 2013 FCAT 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
55% (42)	57%

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teachers not making the connection between the Running Reading Record (RRR) data and the Fountas and Pinnell Continuum of Literacy Learning.	Use the Fountas and Pinnell Continuum of Literacy Learning to ensure demonstration of students' higher levels of thinking. Provide interventions based on student's individual needs, as determined in K-4	Leadership Team	Literacy walkthroughs	EDW reports, Individual RRR booklets

		Literacy Assessment, Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI), Diagnostic Assessment of Reading (DAR), Running Reading Record (RRR), and analysis of content categories.			
2	Lack of funding for after-school or Saturday tutorial and/or enrichment.	Implement weekend packets November through April. Use of web-based Ticket to Read for home and school use.	Leadership Team	Monitor student ussage.	SAI Teacher
3	Use of NGSSS and FCAT 2.0 Reading Test Item Specifications and Kindergarten -2nd Common Core Standards.	Implement a daily skills focus in grades K-5 (Learning Village). Use texts/passages within classrooms that mirror the FCAT 2.0 passage type and length to build capacity and endurance.	Leadership Team	Lesson plans will be reviewed and CWT will be conducted.	Diagnostic Tests, CORE K-12, Lesson Plans, Ticket to Read
4	Analyzing and using data from diagnostics, CORE K-12, and EDW reports.	Implement data chats: Administration:Teacher, Teacher:Student, and Teacher:Parent.	Administration and Teachers	Administration will review data feedback forms.	Data Chat forms
5	Lack of identification of students for small group instruction based on student's individual needs.	Assure implementation of FCIM through ongoing data analysis.	Leadership Team	Data and student groupings will be reviewed at weekly LTMs.	EDW, classroom data, and LTM notes

---

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 : In six years HL Johnson Elementary will reduce the achievement gap by 50% to show 88% proficient.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	78	80	82	84	86	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	In grades 3-5, the percentage of students in subgroups Black, White, and SWD not making Adequate Yearly Progrress in Reading will decrease to meet the identified AMO targets when assessed on the 2013 FCAT 2.0. All subgroups will meet the 2013 reading targets.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Black: 41% White: 20% Hispanic: 23% Asian: 4% SWD: 59% EC DIS: 38%	Black: 33% White: 16% Hispanic: 22% Asian: 3% SWD: 51% EC DIS: 34%

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 making the connection between the Running Reading Record (RRR) data and the Fountas and Pinnell Continuum of Literacy Learning.	Provide interventions based on student's individual needs, as determined in K-4 Literacy Assessment, Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI), Diagnostic Assessment of Reading (DAR), Running Reading Record (RRR), and analysis of content categories.	Leadership Team	Literacy walkthroughs	EDW reports, Individual RRR booklets
	2	Lack of funding for after-school or Saturday tutorial.	Implement weekend packets November through April. Use of web-based Ticket to Read for home and school use.	Leadership Team	Monitor student usage.	SAI Teacher
	3	Use of NGSSS and FCAT 2.0 Reading Test Item Specifications and Kindergarten Common Core Standards.	Implement a daily skills focus in grades K-5 (Learning Village). Use texts/passages within classrooms that mirror the FCAT 2.0 passage type and length to build capacity and endurance.	Leadership Team	Lesson plans will be reviewed and CWT will be conducted.	Diagnostic Tests, CORE K-12, Lesson Plans, Ticket to Read
	4	Analyzing and using data from diagnostics,CORE K-12, and EDW reports.	Implement data chats: Administration:Teacher, Teacher:Student, and Teacher:Parent.	Administration and Teachers	Administration will review data feedback forms.	Data Chat forms
	5	Lack of consistency in using higher order questions during instruction.	Consistently include higher order questions in lesson plans and instruction. Implement with fidelity. Incorporate project based learning and student presentations.	Leadership Team	Leadership Team will perform CWT and will review lesson plans.	CWT checklist
	6	Lack of identification of students for small group instruction based on student's individual needs.	Assure implementation of FCIM through ongoing data analysis.	Leadership Team	Data and student groupings will be reviewed a weekly LTMs.	EDW, classroom data, and LTM notes.
	7	FDOE Accountability Rule changes.	Maintain strategic academic focus; fidelity of FCIM.	Leadership Team	LTM data feedback and action plans.	FCAT 2.0.
	8	Consistently low performing students not responding to current adopted resources.	Use of Leveled Literacy Intervention Program. Students will be taught for 45 minutes each day in groups of 3 students.	Leadership Team	Data analysis.	EDW reports, RRR booklets, SRI scores.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	n/a
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

	n/a			n/a	

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	In grades 3-5, the percentage of Students With Disabilities not making Adequately Yearly Progress in Reading will decrease from 59% to 51% when assessed on the 2013 FCAT 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
59%	51%

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 mobility rate in E/BD student population.	Be aware of school history as it relates to number of schools attended.	Data Processor, ESE contact, Administration and Teachers	Review of cummulative folder and data available on-line.	Conference/Staffing Record
2	High numbers of low-performing/over age students in the E/BD student population due to lack of early identification and placement.	As over age children enroll we need to begin the School Based Team (SBT) process. Students new to H. L. Johnson Elementary School cumulative folders and ESE files need to be reviewed immediately and if approropriate begin SBT process, or IEP review.	Data Processor, ESE contact, Inclusion Teacher and ESE teachers	Review notes from SBT and E/BD weekly Staff meetings.	Notes from weekly E/BD meeting and SBT/CST meetings
3	Teachers not making the connection between the Running Reading Record (RRR) data and the Fountas and Pinnell Continuum of Literacy Learning.	Provide interventions based on student's individual needs, as determined in K-4 Literacy Assessment, Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI), Diagnostic Assessment of Reading (DAR), Running Reading Record (RRR), and analysis of content categories.	Leadership Team	CWT	EDW reports, Individual RRR booklets
4	Lack of funding for after-school or Saturday tutorial.	Implement weekend packets November through April. Use of web-based Ticket to Read for home and school use.	Leadership Team	Monitor student usage.	SAI Teacher
	Use of NGSSS and FCAT 2.0 Reading Test Item Specifications and	Implement a daily skills focus in grades K-5 (Learning Village).	Leadership Team	Lesson plans will be reviewed and CWT will be conducted.	Diagnostic Tests, CORE K-12, Lesson Plans, Ticket to

5	Kindergarten Common Core Standards.	Use texts/passages within classrooms that mirror the FCAT 2.0 passage type and length to build capacity and endurance.			Read
6	Analyzing and using data from diagnostics, CORE K-12, and EDW reports.	Implement data chats: Administration:Teacher, Teacher:Student, and Teacher:Parent.	Administration and Teachers	Administration will review data feedback forms.	Data Chat forms
7	Consistently low performing students not responding to current adopted resources.	Use of Leveled Literacy Intervention Program. Students will be taught for 45 minutes each day in groups of 3 students.	Leadership Team	Data Analysis	EDW reports, RRR Booklets, SRI scores.

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	In grades 3-5, the percentage of ED students not making Adequate Yearly Progress in Reading will decrease from 38% to 34% when assessed on the 2013 FCAT 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
38%	34%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Use of NGSSS and FCAT 2.0 Reading Test Item Specifications and Kindergarten Common Core Standards.	Implement a daily skills focus in grades K-5 (Learning Village). Use texts/passages within classrooms that mirror the FCAT 2.0 passage type and length to build capacity and endurance.	Leadership Team	Lesson plans will be reviewed and CWT will be conducted.	Diagnostic Tests, CORE K-12, Lesson Plans, Ticket to Read
2	Analyzing and using data from diagnostics.	Implement data chats: Administration:Teacher, Teacher:Student, and Teacher:Parent.	Administration and Teachers	Administration will review data feedback forms.	CORE K-12, and EDW reports. Data Chat forms
3	Lack of identification of students for small group instruction based on student's individual needs.	Assure implementation of FCIM through ongoing data analysis.	Leadership Team	Data and student groupings will be reviewed at weekly LTMs.	EDW, classroom data, and LTM notes
4	Lack of consistency in using higher order questions during instruction.	Consistently include higher order questions in lesson plans and instruction. Implement with fidelity. Incorporate project based learning and student presentations.	Leadership Team	Leadership Team will perform CWT and will review lesson plans.	CWT checklist
	Teachers not making the connection between the Running Reading Record (RRR) data and the Fountas and Pinnell	Use the Fountas and Pinnell Continuum of Literacy Learning to ensure demonstration of students' higher levels of	Leadership Team	CWTs	EDW reports, Individual RRR booklets

5	Continuum of Literacy Learning.	thinking. Provide interventions based on student's individual needs, as determined in the K-4 Literacy Assessment, Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI), Diagnostic Assessment of Reading (DAR), Running Reading Record (RRR), and analysis of content categories.			
6	Consistently low performing students not responding to current adopted resources.	Use of Leveled Literacy Intervention Program. Students will be taught for 45 minutes each day in groups of 3 students.	Leadership Team	Data Analysis	EDW reports, RRR booklets, SRI scores

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
iii/RtI	Grades K-5	Administration, Inclusion Teacher, ESE Contact	Teachers	on-going	Discuss data at LTM PD Component Sign-in Sheet	Teachers
Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM),School Grade	Grades K-5	Administration	Teachers Stakeholders	on-going	Data Chat Feedback Forms	Administration
NGSSS and Common Core	Teachers K-5	Principal	Teachers K-5	On-going	Principal Teacher Data Chats	Lesson plans
Running Reading Record Leve2	K-4	Dept of Curriculum and Learning Support	K-4 Teachers	October 2012	Complete PL assignments	Participants
Differentiated Instruction	K-5	District Staff	Subject Teachers	on-going	CWT	Leadership Team
Daily 5	Teacher K-5	PD team	K-5 Teachers	October 2012	Sign-in sheet	Administration
Common Core Standards Training	K-5	State Trainers	Principal/VE-RtI Facilitator	Summer 2012	Provide support for staff. Monitoring of data.	Leadership Team/Team Leaders

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI)	Fountas and Pinnell	Internal Funds and Rollover School Recognition Funds	$15,000.00

			Subtotal: $15,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Skills Practice	Ticket to Read	PTO	$3,000.00
			Subtotal: $3,000.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Running Reading Records I and II	Substitutes	Budget	$1,500.00
LLI Training	Substitutes	Budget	$750.00
Common Core Standards Training	Registration Fees	Internal Accounts	$75.00
			Subtotal: $2,325.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $20,325.00

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:	No goal required. FY12, 14 students tested.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
41% (7)	

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:	No goal required. FY12, 14 students tested.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	
35% (6)	

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:	No goal required. FY12, 14 students tested.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:	
35% (6)	

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	In grades 3-5, the percentage of students scoring Level 3 in Mathematics will increase from 25% to 27% on the 2013 FCAT 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
25% (113)	27%

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	Use of NGSSS and FCAT 2.0 Math Test Item Specifications with fidelity and Kindergarten - 2nd Common Core Standards.	Use of V Math Live, FCAT Explorer, Think Central, manipulatives, data analysis, and Problem of the Day in alignment with targeted benchmark weaknesses.	Leadership Team, Classroom teachers	Leadership team will monitor during CWT, Go Math Assessments, Learning Team Meetings (LTM), Math Leadership Team.	District diagnostic tests, EDW reports, lesson plans, Go Math! Assessments, CORE K-12,V Math Live

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:	No goal required. Less than 15 students took the FAA.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
57% (8)	No goal required.

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:	In grades 3-5 the percentage of students achieving at or above Level 4 in Mathematics will increase from 54% to 56% on the 2013 FCAT 2.0.

	2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
	54% (240)		56%		

	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	Consistently including higher-order questions in lesson plans and lesson plan implementation with fidelity.	Incorporate instructional strategies in classroom tasks and assessments that mirror the format and rigor of FCAT 2.0. Have students self-analyze their work to determine strengths/weaknesses and to develop strategies for improvement. Use H.O.T. (High Order Thinking) questions in Go Math series with students to increase familiarity and comprehension skills. Incorporate enrichment activities.	Leadership Team, Classroom teachers	Focused CWT by the Leadership Team will be used to monitor incorporation of strategies	Diagnostic tests, EDW reports, lesson plans, Go Math Assessments, CORE K-12, V Math Live
2	Use of NGSSS and FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test Item Specifications with fidelity and Kindergarten - 2nd Common Core Standards.	Utilize V Math Live, FCAT Explorer, Think Central, manipulatives, data analysis, and Problem of the Day in alignment with targeted benchmark weaknesses. Guided Math groups to increase use of manipulatives, hands on activities, and computer programs to reinforce mathematical concepts.	Leadership Team, Classroom teachers	Leadership team will monitor during CWT, Go Math! Assessments, Learning Team Meetings (LTM), Math Focus Group	District diagnostic tests, EDW reports, lesson plans, Go Math! Assessments, CORE K-12, VMathLive

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:	No goal required. Less that 15 students took the FAA.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
14% (2)	No goal required.
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:	In grades 4-5 the percentage of students making learning gains in Mathematics will increase from 72% to 74% on the 2013 FCAT 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
72% (215)	74%

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	Due diligence of teachers to use FCIM.	Implement FCIM. Ensure that differentiated instructional practices are being provided. Use of student data chats to help students set targets.	Leadership Team, Classroom teachers	Leadership team will monitor during CWT.	Diagnostic tests, EDW reports, lesson plans, Go Math Assessments, CORE K-12, V Math Live
2	Use of NGSSS and FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test Item Specifications with fidelity and Kindergarten Common Core Standards.	Utilize V Math Live, FCAT Explorer, Think Central, manipulatives, data analysis, and Problem of the Day in alignment with targeted benchmark weaknesses. Guided Math groups to increase use of manipulatives, hands on activities, and computer programs to reinforce mathematical concepts.	Leadership Team, Classroom teachers	Leadership team will monitor during CWT, Go Math! Assessments, Learning Team Meetings (LTM), Math Focus Group	District diagnostic tests, EDW reports, lesson plans, Go Math! Assessments, CORE K-12, V Math Live

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:	No goal required. Less than 15 students took the FAA.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
21% (3)	No goal required.

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:	In grades 3-5, the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics will increase from 67% to 69% on the 2013 FCAT 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67% (39)	69%

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	Use of NGSSS and FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test Item Specifications with fidelity and Kindergarten-2 Common Core Standards.	Utilize V Math Live, FCAT Explorer, Think Central, manipulatives, data analysis, and Problem of the Day in alignment with targeted benchmark weaknesses. Guided Math groups to increase use of manipulatives, hands on activities, and computer programs to reinforce mathematical concepts.	Leadership Team, Classroom teachers	Leadership team will monitor during CWT, Go Math! Assessments, Learning Team Meetings (LTM), Math Focus Group	District diagnostic tests, EDW reports, lesson plans, Go Math! Assessments, CORE K-12, V Math Live
2	Due diligence of teachers to use FCIM.	Implement FCIM.	Leadership Team, Classroom teachers	Leadership team will monitor during CWT.	Diagnostic tests, EDW reports, lesson plans, Go Math! Assessments, CORE K-12, V Math Live

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

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

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	78	80	82	84	86	

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

	5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	In grades 3-5 the percentage of the students in Black, White, Hispanic, and Economically Disadvantaged not making Adequate Yearly Progress in Mathematics will decrease to meet the identified AMO targets when assessed on the 2013 FCAT 2.0. All subgroups will meet 2013 targets.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 16% Black: 43% Hispanic: 22% Asian: 0% SWD: 49% EC DIS: 36%	White: 12% Black: 32% Hispanic: 17% Asian: 0% SWD: 49% EC DIS: 29%

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	Full implementation and use of NGSSS and FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test Item Specifications with fidelity and Kindergarten Common Core Standards.	Utilize V Math Live, FCAT Explorer, Think Central, manipulatives, data analysis, and Problem of the Day in alignment with targeted benchmark weaknesses. Guided Math groups to increase use of manipulatives, hands on activities, and computer programs to reinforce mathematical concepts.	Leadership Team, Classroom teachers	Leadership team will monitor during CWT, Go Math! Assessments, Learning Team Meetings (LTM), Math Focus Group	District diagnostic tests, EDW reports, lesson plans, Go Math! Assessments, CORE K-12, V Math Live
2	Lack of parental involvement and support for homework and school-wide non-negotiable rules.	Hold parent training sessions to provide an curriculum overview, teach parents to navigate Learning Tools and VMath Live.	Classroom teachers	Leadership team will monitor during CWT, lesson plans, on-going progress monitoring	Classroom Log, Diagnostic tests, EDW reports, CORE K-12
3	Lack of funding for after-school or Saturday tutorial.	Implement weekend packets November through April. Use of VMath Live.	Leadership Team	Math Leadership Team will monitor student usage.	Usage reports

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	No goal required. Only one student tested.

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	In grades 3-5 the percentage of the Students With Disabilities not making Adequate Yearly Progress in Mathematics will remain steady based on FLDOE identified AMO targets when assessed on the 2013 FCAT 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
49%	49%

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	Use of NGSSS and FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test Item Specificationsand Kindergarten Common Core Standards.	Use V Math Live, FCAT Explorer, Think Central, manipulatives, data analysis, and Problem of the Day in alignment with targeted benchmark weaknesses. Guided Math groups to increase use of manipulatives, hands on activities, and computer programs to reinforce mathematical concepts.	Leadership Team, Classroom teachers	Leadership team will monitor during CWT, Go Math! Assessments, Learning Team Meetings (LTM), Math Focus Group	District diagnostic tests, EDW reports, lesson plans, Go Math! Assessments, CORE K-12, V MathL ive
2	Analyzing and using data from diagnostics, CORE K-12, and EDW reports.	Implement data chats: Administration:Teacher, Teacher:Student, and Teacher:Parent. Incorporate tasks and assessments that mirror the format and rigor of FCAT 2.0.	Administration and Teachers	Administration will review data feedback forms.	Data Chat forms

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:	In grades 3-5 the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students not making Adequately Yearly Progress in Mathematics will decrease from 36% to 29% when assessed on the 2013 FCAT 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
36%	29%

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
	Use of NGSSS and FCAT	Use V Math Live, FCAT	Leadership Team,	Leadership team will	District diagnostic

1	2.0 Mathematics Test Item Specifications and Kindergarten Common Core Standards.	Explorer, Think Central, manipulatives, data analysis, and Problem of the Day in alignment with targeted benchmark weaknesses. Guided Math groups to increase use of manipulatives, hands on activities, and computer programs to reinforce mathematical concepts.	Classroom teachers	monitor during CWT, Go Math! Assessments, Learning Team Meetings (LTM), Math Focus Group	tests, EDW reports, lesson plans, Go Math! Assessments, CORE K-12, VMathLive
2	Analyzing and using data from diagnostics, CORE K-12, and EDW reports.	Implement data chats: Administration:Teacher, Teacher:Student, and Teacher:Parent. Incorporate tasks and assessments that mirror the format and rigor of FCAT 2.0. Ensure that differentiated instructional practices are being used. Provide students with descriptive feedback.	Administration and Teachers	Administration will review data feedback forms.	Data Chat forms

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
Think Central	K-5	HMH Staff	Subject teachers	On-going	Administration	Leadership Team
Math Elementary Contact Meeting	K-5	District staff	Math Contact	On-going	Leadership Team will conduct CWT	Leadership Team
Differentiated Instruction	K-5	District staff	School-wide	On-going	CWT	Leadership Team

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
VMath Live	Technology based Math support.	PTO	$3,000.00
			Subtotal: $3,000.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

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

Other

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $3,000.00

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:	In Grade 5, the percentage of students achieving Level 3 proficiency in Science will increase from 40% to 42% on the 2013 FCAT 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
40% (57)	42%

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	Implementation of NGSSS and FCAT Test Item Specifications and Kindergarten- 2nd Common Core Standards.	Provide students with grade specific Science vocabulary for mastery. Use of hands-on activities, experiments, mini-labs, and investigative approaches.	Teachers and Administration	Teachers will monitor completion and use of Science journals. CWT	Science Journal and Lesson Plans
2	Inconsistency in understanding of Nature of Science across all grade levels.	Mandatory participation in schoolwide Math/Science Fair.	Science Leadership Team	Teachers will monitor data.	Comprehension Checks, Diagnostic data and FCAT

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:	No goal required. Less than 15 students took the FAA.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
20% (1)	No goal required.

		Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy			
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:	In Grade 5, the percentage of students achieving at or above Levels 4 will increase from 42% to 44% on the 2013 FCAT 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
42% (59)	44%

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	Limited Differentiation of the Science curriculum.	Students will use Science journals to include vocabulary and responses to FCAT 2.0 style practice questions. Students will participate in science investigations.	Teachers, Science Leadership Team, Administration	Science Leadership Team CWT	District Diagnostic Tests, EDW reports.

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:	No goal required. Less than 15 students took the FAA.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
80% (4)	No goal required.

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
Elementary Science Contact Meetings	Grades K-5	District Specialists	Science Contact	on-going	CWTs	Science Leadership Team
HMH Science Focus Series	Grades K-5	HMH Representatives	Selected Teachers	on-going	LTMs and CWTs	Science Leadership Team

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			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 percentage of students in Grade 4 scoring 3.0 or higher on the Writing 2013 FCAT 2.0 will increase from 88% to 90%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

88% (141)	90%

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 are not consistently conferencing with students regarding their writing.	Instruct students how to use the scoring rubric for self-assessment. Conduct conferences with individual students to provide constructive feedback.	Leadership Team	CWT Review lesson plans Review EDW Data	CWT Lesson Plans EDW Reports Palm Beach Writes
2	Teachers are not spending adequate time on each stage of the writing process.	Familiarize students with all elements of the writing process. Provide lessons and allow adequate practice time for each stage of writing. Implement Lesson Study Process	Leadership Team Literacy Leadership Team	CWT Review lesson plans Review EDW Data	CWT Lesson Plans EDW Reports Palm Beach Writes
3	Inconsistent integration of writing strategies.	Review lesson components from Learning Village, Write from the Beginning, Writers' Workshop, Razzle Dazzle, SMILE and/or Four Square.	Leadership Team Literacy Leadership Team	CWT Review lesson plans	CWT Lesson Plans EDW Reports Palm Beach Writes

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:	No goal required. Less than 15 students take the FAA.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33% (1)	No goal required.

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
Learning Village, Write from the Beginning, Writers' Workshop, Razzle Dazzle, SMILE and/or Four Square	Grade K-5	Thinking Maps Representative (Parent) Writing Committee District Personnel	Writing Teachers	Ongoing	Review of Lesson Plans CWT	Leadership Team Writing Committee
Elementary Writing Contact Meetings	Grades K-5	Department of Curriculum and Learning Support	Writing Contact	On going	Monitor LTMs CWT	Leadership Team Literacy Leadership Team
Thinking Maps Training	Grades K-5	Thinking Maps Trainers				

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:	Attendance rate will move from 80% to 90%, the number of students with excessive absences will drop by 10%, and excessive tardies by 3%.

2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
80% (720)	90% (810)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
20% (197)	10% (91)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
13% (127)	10% (91)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Flu epidemic	Attendance Clerk and Teachers will call parent/guardian of students with extended absences. Head Custodian will monitor compliance of cleaning standards.	Attendance Clerk, Teachers, Head Custodian	Leadership Team will monitor attendance rates, excessive absences and excessive tardies.	Attendance data

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
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 number of out-of-school suspensions and the number of students with out-of-school suspensions will decrease by 10%.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
N/A	N/A
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
N/A	N/A
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
32	29
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
16	14

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of support for behavioral expectations.	Continue full implementation of PBIS.	Leadership Team, PBIS Team	PBIS will monitor suspension data.	Suspension data

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
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.*	To assist with student achievement,we will improve our awareness and marketing strategies to increase the number of parents participating in our Open House/Curriculum Workshops by 10%.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
33%	37%

	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	Parents are unaware of workshops and/or timing of workshops is inconvenient.	Market workshops using marquee, Edline, flyers, and agenda planners. Provide opportunities at different times of day.	Leadership Team, Grade Level Teams, SAC	Review parent sign-in sheets. Parent feedback.	Parent sign-in sheets.

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

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

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

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

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
Reading	Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI)	Fountas and Pinnell	Internal Funds and Rollover School Recognition Funds	$15,000.00
				Subtotal: $15,000.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Skills Practice	Ticket to Read	PTO	$3,000.00
Mathematics	VMath Live	Technology based Math support.	PTO	$3,000.00
				Subtotal: $6,000.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Running Reading Records I and II	Substitutes	Budget	$1,500.00
Reading	LLI Training	Substitutes	Budget	$750.00
Reading	Common Core Standards Training	Registration Fees	Internal Accounts	$75.00
				Subtotal: $2,325.00
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: $23,325.00

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 (Uploaded on 10/8/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

✔ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
Purchase toner and ink cartridges.	$5,000.00

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

The SAC will serve in an advisory capacity.

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Palm Beach School District H. L. JOHNSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	93%	94%	95%	90%	372	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	73%	76%			149	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)	74% (YES)			147	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					668	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Palm Beach School District H. L. JOHNSON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	90%	88%	89%	79%	346	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?	64% (YES)	55% (YES)			119	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					605	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested