

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: LORETTO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Duval

Principal: Christopher Begley

SAC Chair: Sharleen Ferris

Superintendent: Ed Pratt-Dannals

Date of School Board Approval: November 1, 2011

Last Modified on: 10/16/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Cheistopher Begley	Educational Leadership; Primary; Elementary Education	5	15	Masters Degree in Education; 28 years of teaching experience; 2012 – A. 2011 – A met AYP Increased our school achievement by 32 points to 650 as measured by the State Accountability Plan (FCAT Results 2011). Met our Reading goal of 3 or above at 94%; exceeded our Math goal of 3 or above at 95%; exceeded our Writing goal of 4.0 or above at 85%; exceeded our Science goal of 3 or above at 81%; exceeded our bottom quartile gains in reading goal at 72%; and exceeded our bottom quartile gains in math at 79%; 2010 – A did not meet AYP; 2009 – A met AYP; 2008 – A; met AYP
		Level II certification; Educational			Masters Degree in Education; Level II certification; 27 years of teaching experience; 2012 – A. 2011 – A met AYP Increased our school achievement by 32 points to 650 as measured by the State Accountability Plan (FCAT Results 2011). Met our Reading goal of 3 or above at 94%; exceeded our Math goal of 3 or above at 95%; exceeded our Writing goal

Assis Principal	Lani Derby	Leadership; Elementary; Early Childhood; ESOL	5	5	of 4.0 or above at 85%; exceeded our Science goal of 3 or above at 81%; exceeded our bottom quartile gains in reading goal at 72%; and exceeded our bottom quartile gains in math at 79%; 2010 – A did not meet AYP; 2009 – A met AYP; 2008 – A; met AYP; 2007 - A – met AYP; 2006 – C – did not meet AYP; 2005 – A; met AYP; 2004 – A; 2003 – A; 2002 – C; 2001 – D; 2000 – D; 1999 – D; 1998 – D
Assis Principal	LaQuitrice Mosely	Master of Arts Degree in Educational Administration; Bacheolor of Arts in Education; Certifications: Educational Leadership K-12; Elementary Education 1-6; Gifted Endorsement	1	4	2010-2011 Assistant Principal Northwestern Middle School Northwestern Middle Assistant Principal 2009-2010 Northwestern Middle School (2008/2009) 67% of Bottom quartile students made gains in Reading. Highlands Elem. (2006-2008) School grade from C to B; significant gains in Reading; High percentage of students scoring at proficiency in Writing Rufus E. Payne Elem. (2002-2006) School grade increased from F to C, and from D to B; significant gains in Reading; high percentage of students scoring at proficiency in Reading; high percentage of students scoring at proficiency in Writing.

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)
Instructional Coach	Kim Miller	Elementary 1-6; Gifted	9	4	2012 – A. 2011 – A met AYP Increased our school achievement by 32 points to 650 as measured by the State Accountability Plan (FCAT Results 2011). Met our Reading goal of 3 or above at 94%; exceeded our Math goal of 3 or above at 95%; exceeded our Writing goal of 4.0 or above at 85%; exceeded our Science goal of 3 or above at 81%; exceeded our bottom quartile gains in reading goal at 72%; and exceeded our bottom quartile gains in math at 79%; 2010 – A did not meet AYP; 2009 – A met AYP; 2008 – A; met AYP; 2007 - A – met AYP; 2006 – A – met AYP; 2005 – A; met AYP; 2004 – A; 2003 – A; Proficiency 89%; Math Proficiency 84%; Writing Proficiency 85%; Gains Reading 71%; Gains Math 68%; Bottom Quartile Reading 62% Bottom Quartile Math 70%;

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
	1. Regular meetings of new teachers with Administration 2. Partnering new teachers with veteran staff (mentors) Mentors and coach work extensively to support the new to Loretto teachers both in formal and informal ways. The grade level mentors support the new teachers from day one including walking them through the day to day routines and assisting them at their Orientation.			

1	<p>3. Beginning teachers fulfill the requirements of the Teacher Induction Program (MINT). Great effort is put forth to make sure every teacher feels a part of this learning community.</p> <p>4. Lead teachers are named to diversify leadership roles and give others a chance to lead. Teacher Meetings are planned and lead by the Lead Teachers.</p> <p>5. All teachers are provided with extensive professional development opportunities at the school and on the clock.</p> <p>6. Named teachers participate on Leadership</p> <p>7. Teachers have access to an Instructional Coach. The coach assists in helping the teacher plan instruction, models demonstration lessons, observes and offers feedback to teachers, and provides opportunities for the teacher to watch instruction in other classrooms.</p>	<p>Principal Principal Principal Principal Principal/Instructional Coach Principal Principal/Instructional Coach</p>	<p>Ongoing Ongoing ongoing ongoing ongoing ongoing</p>
---	---	--	--

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
1 (1%)	Grade Level Meetings; New Teacher Support; MINT; Infusing state standards into the county's curriculum; Demonstration lessons and debriefs; planning content lessons together

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
78	1.3%(1)	11.5%(9)	39.7%(31)	48.7%(38)	38.5%(30)	98.7%(77)	6.4%(5)	10.3%(8)	67.9%(53)

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
Emily Messink	Kelly Brown	s. Brown is a first year teacher. Ms. Messink is our Site Coach and has demonstrated effective classroom strategies and monitoring of the CSS classrooms.	Grade Level Meetings; New Teacher Support; MINT; Infusing state standards into the county's curriculum; Demonstration lessons and debriefs; planning content lessons together

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Identify the school-based MTSS Leadership Team.

Principal: Christopher Begley – provides a common vision for the use of data based decision making, ensures that the school based team is implementing RtI, conducts assessments of RtI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities.

Assistant Principal: Lani Derby – assists with providing the common vision for the use of data based decision making, ensures that the school based team is implementing RtI, conducts assessments of RtI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities. Provides data analysis. Provides information about school wide and class wide behavior curriculum and instruction; participates in behavioral data collection; provides professional development principles of Foundations to faculty and staff; and collaborates with staff to implement behavioral interventions.

Assistant Principal – LaQuatrice Mosely – RtI coordinator. Provides guidance on K-5 reading plan; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistances to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning; supports the implementation of all tier intervention plans.

Instructional Coach: Kimberly Miller – Develops, leads and evaluates school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children considered “at risk”; assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.

Guidance Counselors: Anita Allen and Donna Musselwhite – provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students. In addition to providing interventions, continues to link child serving and community agencies to the schools and families to support the child’s academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.

Technology Instructor: Rich Welsler – develops or brokers technology necessary to manage and display data; provides professional development and technical support to teachers and staff regarding data management and display.

General Education Teachers (RtI VLC – Vertical Learning Community): Rita Ellis and Millie Warren – K; Wendy Herrmann and Megan Grimes – 1st ; Anne Jones – 2nd; Robin Soud and Gina Riley - 3rd; Michelle Manning– 4th; Kristie Holley – 5th ; Kelly Brown – CSS (representatives from every grade level) – provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, delivers tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement tier 2 interventions and integrates tier 1 materials/instruction with tier 2/3 activities.

ESE Teachers – Lou Whitaker and Connie Steffen – participates in student data collection; assists in determination for further assessment; integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 instruction; and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching, facilitation, and consultation.

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

Team meets once a week to engage in the following activities: review universal screening data and link to instructional decisions; review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development and resources. The team will also collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skills. The team will also facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation.

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

The RtI VLC Team met with the School Advisory Council (SAC) and principal to help develop the SIP. The team provided data on tier 1, 2, and 3 targets; academic and social/emotional areas that needed to be addressed; helped set clear expectations for instruction (rigor, relevance and relationship); facilitated the development of a systemic approach to teaching and aligned processes and procedures.

MTSS Implementation

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

Baseline: district benchmarks; summatives; FAIR; teacher made assessments; PMRN; DRA2; FCAT
Progress Monitoring: FAIR, running records; teacher made assessments;
Midyear: FAIR; DRA's; district benchmarks; teacher made assessments
Diagnostic: formatives; teacher made assessments
End of Year – summatives; FAIR; FCAT; portfolios; DRA's

Frequency of Data Days – twice a month for data analysis

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Continue professional development in small and large groups; Rtl vertical learning community with representation from every grade level to help support the instruction

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Continue professional development with Vertical Learning Communities and Grade Levels Meetings to provide structure in making data driven decisions to drive instruction. Provide more support in looking at student work and working in learning communities.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

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

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

Principal: Christopher Begley – provides a common vision for the use of data based decision making, ensures that the school based team is implementing Literacy instruction, conducts assessments of literacy skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support literacy implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based literacy plans and activities.

Assistant Principal: Lani Derby – assists with providing the common vision for the use of data based decision making, ensures that the school based team is implementing literacy, conducts assessments of literacy skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support literacy implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based literacy plans and activities. Provides data analysis.

Assistant Principal – LaQuatrice Mosely - Provides guidance on K-5 reading plan; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistances to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning; supports the implementation of all tier intervention plans.

Instructional Coach: Kimberly Miller – Develops, leads and evaluates school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children considered “at risk”; assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.

General Education Teachers (Reading VLC): Susie Toomer and Brenda Bateh – K; Nancy Andrysko and Lisa Johnson – 1st; LeAnn Vondrasek, Sharon Rosenblum and Evelyn Scott – 2nd; Joan Vogt and Anne Chapple – 3rd; Linda Smigaj and Dawn Bickerstaff– 4th; Sarah Baierl and Lorraine Hannah – 5th ; (representatives from every grade level) – provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, delivers tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement tier 2 interventions and integrates tier 1 materials/instruction with tier 2/3 activities.

ESE Teachers – Rita Patrick and Megan Dworschak – participates in student data collection; assists in determination for further assessment; integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 instruction; and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching, facilitation, and consultation.

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

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

Team meets once a week to engage in the following activities: review universal screening data and link to instructional decisions; review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development and resources. The team will also collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skills. The team will also facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation.

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

Improving literacy instruction. Increasing number of students reading at or above grade level. Reading Celebrations

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	Based on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test, 35% (210) of the students will score a 3
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
30% (177)	35% (210)

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	1a.1. Implementation of Florida's Next Generation Sunshine State Standards	1.a.1. Instructing students in understanding how to meet the expectations of each benchmark for each of the Next Generation Sunshine State Reading standards.	1a.1. Principal, Assistant Principals, Instructional Coach and Classroom Teachers	1a.1. Alignment of curriculum and instruction to cover each reading standard	1.a.1. Classroom observations, lesson plans, assessment results, collegial discussions
2	1.a.2 Changes to FCAT 2.0 and new cut scores	1.a.2. Providing students with examples of test experiences that mirror the changes in FCAT	1.a.2. Principal, Assistant Principals, Instructional Coach and Classroom Teachers	1.a.2. Alignment of curriculum, instruction and assessment to reflect changes to FCAT 2.0 and reporting categories	1a.2. assessment data and FCAT results
3	1.a.3 Implementation of common core standards in K-2	1.a.3. instructing K-2 students in understanding how to meet the expectations of each standard in the common core	1.a.3 Administration and classroom teachers	1.a.3. Alignment of K-2 curriculum and assessment to standards	1.a.3. formative and summative assessment results; FAIR results
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:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	Based on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test, more than 60% (348) of our students will score a 4 or 5 in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
59% (356)	60%(348)

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	2a.1.. Changes to FCAT 2.0 item complexities	2a.1.Increasing the number of moderate and high complexity questions and activities for students in daily workshop expectations and on assessments.	2a.1. Principal, APs, Instructional Coach, and classroom teachers	2a.1 Analyzing school based assessments and performance tasks	2a.1. FCAT Results
2					

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	Based on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test, more than 75% (435) of our students will make learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
72%(418)	75% (435)

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	3a.1. Fidelity to curriculum; funding for tutoring; student attendance	3a.1. Remediation will be offered for those scoring below grade level, lowest quartile and/or recommended by the teacher through guided reading, differentiated instruction and after school tutoring.	3a.1. Administration and classroom teachers	3a.1. documentation of tutoring; monitoring attendance; review of test data and lesson plans	3a.1. FCAT Results
2	3a.2.changes to range of words and average word count per FCAT passage	3a.2. Increasing student reading stamina by providing concentrated independent reading time daily	3a.2.Administration	3a.2.Analyzing the cold reading assessments to determine correlation to new grade level expectations regarding length of texts; increased student reading stamina during the work period	3a.2.DRA results, cold reading assessments, FCAT results
3	3a.3.Time	3a.3. Providing students with individual and group instruction	3a.3.administration	3a..3. progress monitoring checks	3a.3.assessment results
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:

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

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	Based on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test, more than 69% (43) of our lowest quartile students will make learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
65%. (40)	69% (43)

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	4a.1. Identification of students to put on a PMP	4a.1. Implement FAIR and other technology as an assessment resource to teachers to guide reading instruction and help provide instruction for struggling readers.	4a.1. Instructional Coach; Principal; Assistant Principals; Computer teacher; classroom teachers	4a.1. Documentation of results	4a.1. FAIR results; FCAT Explorer results; AR results; STAR results, PMP's
2	4a.2. Documented low performance on Vocabulary (FCAT 2012)	4a.2. Implement Isabel Beck's strategies for improving vocabulary instruction	4a.2. classroom teachers	4a.2. quality instruction aligned with standards and assessment	4a.2. FCAT, formative assessments, FAIR, DRA2, informal checks through classroom discussion
3	4a.3 Time, Resources, money	4a.3. Implement before and after school tutoring as well as individual and small group instruction for identified students	4a.3. administration, tutor, classroom teachers, extended day	4a.3. progress monitoring checks	4a.3. FAIR and FCAT results
4					

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

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

5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	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:

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:	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:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:			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

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
Language Arts – Improving Vocabulary and Reading Stamina	Reading	Susie Toomer and Joan Vogt	Representatives from each grade level	2nd early release day of each month	Monitoring benchmark and FCAT results	Susie Toomer and Joan Vogt
Rtl for Reading Strategies for tier 2 and tier 3 students	Rtl	LaQuatrice Mosely and Anita Allen	Representatives from each grade level	2nd early release day of each month	Monitoring benchmark and FCAT results	LaQuatrice Mosely and Anita Allen

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Comprehension Strategies Kit to teach students how to construct meaning from text using critical thinking strategies that leads to higher level comprehension	Fiction and Nonfiction Comprehension Kit	Internal accounts	\$4,079.94
To provide remediation in Extended Day for our lowest quartile students	"After The Bell" Complete Program	Internal accounts	\$2,250.00
			Subtotal: \$6,329.94
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: \$6,329.94

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.		Based on the 2013 CELLA results, 47% (14) will score proficient on the listening/speaking portion			
CELLA Goal # 1:					
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
46% (13)					
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Non English speakers that don't attend ESOL immersion programs	1.1. Instructing students in understanding how to meet the expectations of each benchmark for each of the Next Generation Sunshine State Reading standards.	1.1. Principal, Assistant Principals, Instructional Coach and Classroom Teachers	1.1. Alignment of curriculum and instruction to cover each reading standard	1.1. Classroom observations, lesson plans, assessment results, collegial discussions

2	1.2 Implementation of common core standards in K-2	1.2.instructing K-2 students in understanding how to meet the expectations of each standard in the common core	1.2 Administration and classroom teachers	1.2 Alignment of K-2 curriculum and assessment to standards	1.2.formative and summative assessment results; FAIR results
---	--	--	---	---	--

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:	Based on the 2013 FCAT Math Test, 35% (210) of the students will score a 3
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27%% (163)	35% (210)

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	1a.1.Implementation of Florida's Next Generation Sunshine State Standards	1.a1. Instructing students in understanding how to meet the expectations of each benchmark for each of the Next Generation Sunshine State Math standards.	1a.1. Principal, Assistant Principals, Instructional Coach and Classroom Teachers	1a.1. Alignment of curriculum and instruction to cover each math standard	1.a1. Classroom observations, lesson plans, assessment results, collegial discussions
2					
3	1.a 2 Changes to FCAT 2.0 and new cut scores	1.a2. Providing students with examples of test experiences that mirror the changes in FCAT	1.a2. Principal, Assistant Principals, Instructional Coach and Classroom Teachers	1.a2. Alignment of curriculum, instruction and assessment to reflect changes to FCAT 2.0 and reporting categories	1a.2. FCAT Results
4	1.a.3 Implementation of common core standards in K-2	1.a.3.instructing K-2 students in understanding how to meet the expectations of each standard in the common core	1.a.3 Administration and classroom teachers	1.a.3. Alignment of K-2 curriculum and assessment to standards	1a.3.formative and summative assessment results; FAIR results

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

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

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	Based on the 2013 FCAT Math Test, 60% (360) of the students will score above proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
59% (354)	60% (360)

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	2a.1.. Changes to FCAT 2.0 item complexities	2a.1.Increasing the number of moderate and high complexity questions and activities for students in daily workshop expectations and on assessments.	2a.1. Principal, Aps, Instructional Coach, and classroom teachers	2a.1 Analyzing school based assessments and performance tasks	2a.1. FCAT Results

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

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

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

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	Based on the 2013 FCAT Math Test, 72% (418) of the students will make learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
69% (400)	72% (418)

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	3a.1. Fidelity to curriculum; funding for tutoring; student attendance	3a.1. Remediation will be offered for those scoring below grade level, lowest quartile and/or recommended by the teacher through guided practice, differentiated instruction and after school tutoring.	3a.1. Administration and classroom teachers	3a.1. documentation of tutoring; monitoring attendance; review of test data and lesson plans	3a.1. FCAT Results
2	3a.2. Quality of questions asked	3a.2. Differentiating instruction during explore time. Discussion of strategies utilized.	3a.2. Administration	3a.2. Monitoring of Lesson plans and Data notebooks	3a.2. Benchmark and FCAT results
3	3a.3. Time	3a.3. Providing students with individual and group instruction	3a.3. administration	3a.3. progress monitoring checks	3a.3. assessment results

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	Based on the 2013 FCAT Math Test, 69% (53) of our lowest quartile will make learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
66% (51)	69% (53)

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	4a.1. Fidelity to curriculum; funding for tutoring; student attendance	4a.1. Remediation will be offered for those scoring below grade level, lowest quartile and/or recommended by the teacher through guided practice, differentiated instruction and after school tutoring.	4a.1. Administration and classroom teachers	4a.1. documentation of tutoring; monitoring attendance; review of test data and lesson plans	4a.1. FCAT Results
2	4a.2. Quality of questions asked	4a.2. Differentiating instruction during explore time. Discussion of strategies utilized.	4a.2. Administration	4a.2. Monitoring of Lesson plans and Data notebooks	4a.2. Benchmark and FCAT results
3	4a.3 Time, Resources, money	4a.3. Implement before and after school tutoring as well as individual and small group instruction for identified students	4a.3. administration, tutor, classroom teachers, extended day	4a.3. progress monitoring checks	4a.3. FCAT results

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:		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:

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:		n/a			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
n/a		n/a			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:		We did not meet AYP in this area			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
35% (29)		80% (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
	5C.1. Time; attendance; limited personnel;	5C.1. Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions will be	5C.1. Administration;	5C.1. lesson plans; focus walks; conference logs;	5C.1. disaggregated

1	scheduling	provided by the ESE Resource teacher assigned to that grade level. ESE and general education teachers will meet weekly to plan and implement best practices. ESE and general education teachers will maintain documentation on each student. Instructional strategies and best practices will be utilized to meet each learner's needs.	classroom teachers; ESE Resource teachers	Data Notebooks; ESE notebooks; team meeting notes	data; FCAT data
---	------------	--	---	---	-----------------

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.		n/a			
Mathematics Goal #5E:					
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

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
Math – Improving Math automaticity and literacy	Math	Ann Grieb and Alethea Tarabishi	Representatives from each grade level	2nd early release day of each month	Monitoring benchmark and FCAT results	Ann Grieb and Alethea Tarabishi
RtI for Math Strategies for tier 2 and tier 3 students	RtI	LaQuatrice Mosely and Anita Allen	Representatives from each grade level	2nd early release day of each month	Monitoring benchmark and FCAT results	LaQuatrice Mosely and Anita Allen

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
To provide remediation to our lowest quartile students in extended day	FASTT Math	Internal accounts	\$1,250.00
			Subtotal: \$1,250.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Tutoring program for lowest quartile students during extended day	IXL – math tutorial for practice and enrichment	Internal accounts	\$3,850.00
			Subtotal: \$3,850.00
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: \$5,100.00

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.		Based on the 2013 FCAT Science Test, 40% (80) of the 5th grade students will score a 3			
Science Goal #1a:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
39% (78)		40% (80)			
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	1a.1. Use an Inquiry based approach to cover all science benchmarks	1a.1. instruct students in understanding how to meet the expectations of each benchmark for each of the science standards	1a.1. Administration and classroom teachers	1a.1. Attendance;	1a.1. FCAT results
	1a.2. Fidelity to	1a.2. The district	1a.2.	1a.2. documentation of	1a.2.

2	curriculum; identification of students that need a PMP	benchmark assessment will be administered to all 5th grade students twice during the school year and the data will be disaggregated to address weaknesses	Administration and teachers	results	disaggregation of data Benchmark results; FCAT results
3	1a.3. Fidelity to curriculum; time; monitoring	1a.3. Science Workshop will be implemented in grades K-5.	1a.3. Administration and teachers	1a.3. focus walks; lesson plans; classroom visits	1a.3. Lesson Plans and observation

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:		Based on the 2013 FCAT Science Test, 28% (53) of our fifth grade students will score above proficiency in science.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
26% (52)		28% (53)			
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	2a.1. Deep questioning by teachers and test question complexity	2a.1. increase the number of moderate and high complexity questions and activities for students in daily workshop expectations and on assessments	2a.1. administration and teachers	2a.1. lesson plans; classroom visits; focus walks; test item analysis, and self reflection on questions asked during instruction and students ability to answer high level	2a.1. disaggregation of data; and FCAT results

				complexity test items
--	--	--	--	-----------------------

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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
Science FCAT 2.0	Science	Sue Esser and Sandra Fountain	Representatives from all grade levels	2nd Early Release Day each month	Improve instruction in the areas of science and literacy	Sue Esser and Sandra Fountain
RtI and Science tier 2 and tier 3 strategies	RtI	LaQuatrice Mosely and Anita Allen	Representatives from each grade level	2nd early release day of each month	Improving instruction in the focused area	LaQuatrice Mosely and Anita Allen

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:	Based on the 2013 FCAT Writing Test, 83% (171) of the students in 4th grade will score a 4.0 or better.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
92% (190)	83% (171)

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	1a.1. Students do not know what writing is good enough	1a.1. Classroom teachers will display a standards board with samples of student writing. The standards board will include teacher commentary.	1a.1. Administration and classroom teachers	1a.1. monitoring forms and focus walks; lesson plans	1a.1. focus walks and observation
2	1a.2. Keeping track of student's writing that shows growth over time	1a.2. Classroom teachers will develop a writing portfolio for each student. Each student portfolio will show evidence of growth over time in all district required genres.	1a.2. Administration and classroom teachers	1a.2. portfolios	1a.2. portfolios
3	1a.3. Not understanding the FCAT writes rubric for student performance, including spelling, language and mechanics	1a.3. Students will self assess their writing using the FCAT Writes rubric, looking especially at the spelling, language and mechanics. Teachers will use WriteScore to have an outside source score student's writing and to give a class	1a.3. Administration and classroom teachers	1a.3 student performance on the rubric	1a.3. lesson plans and observation; FCAT results; portfolios

analysis.

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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
Writing and growth over time	Writing	Joan Vogt and Susie Toomer	Representatives from each grade level	2nd early release day of each month	Monitoring district writing prompts and FCAT results	Joan Vogt and Susie Toomer
RtI and writing	RtI	LaQuatrice Mosely and Anita Allen	Representatives from each grade level	2nd early release day of each month	Monitoring district writing prompts and FCAT results	LaQuatrice Mosely and Anita Allen

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Write Score – formative assessment program that scores student essays to make data driven decisions	Writing program that will take pieces of student's writing and score them and give a class analysis as to the next steps.	Internal accounts	\$1,628.55
			Subtotal: \$1,628.55
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: \$1,628.55

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:		To reduce the number of students having 21 or more absences			
2012 Current Attendance Rate:		2013 Expected Attendance Rate:			
96% (1152)		97% (1164)			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)			
22% (268)		21% (252)			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)			
12% (142)		11% (132)			
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 Communication; follow through; parents	1.1 Classroom teachers will monitor attendance to communicate with parents the attendance policy and take the necessary steps to refer attendance issues.	1.1 Attendance Intervention Team	1.1 Monitor; Incentives for good attendance	1.1 Attendance rate
2	1.2. Parents do not see correlation between attendance and student achievement	1.2. Increase communication by utilizing reminders on the school website and school newsletter	1.2. Administration	1.2. Monitor; incentives for good attendance	1.2. Attendance rate

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
Attendance Intervention Team	Attendance	LaQuatrice Mosely, Anita Allen and Vickie Franks	LaQuatrice Mosely, Anita Allen and Vickie Franks	Meet as needed	Monitor attendance	LaQuatrice Mosely, Anita Allen and Vickie Franks

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:	We had a total of 59 suspensions for the 2012 school year
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
2	0
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School

0	0
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
59	45
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
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	1.1. Code of Conduct Requirements; use of Positive Behavior Systems	1.1. School-wide implementation of CHAMPs will take place; continued monitoring of where and when referrals are being written and by whom; implementation of social skill lessons for children with impulsive behaviors, teachers implement second step program, behavior contracts, incentive programs	1.1. Administration; Foundations VLC	1.1. Monitor number of referrals and documentation in Genesis	1.1. Monitor; reduce number of suspensions
2	1.2. Time management; effective implementation	1.2. Implement classroom meetings or social skills groups in the classrooms	1.2. Administration and classroom teachers	1.2. Monitor lesson plans; focus walks	1.2. Reduction of referrals written
3	1.3. Training time	1.3. Have all faculty attend Behavior Tools I	1.3. Administration	1.3. Increase of effectiveness of teachers handling misbehaviors in class	1.3. Reduction of referrals written

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:		To provide positive experiences for parents			
<i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>					
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:		2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:			
95%		96%			
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 Effective use of technology; communication	1.1. Through the use of technology – email blasts, as well as class and school websites and the Facebook page, keep our parents informed of all school events for them to choose what to be involved in.	1.1 Administration and classroom teachers	1.1 Feedback, monitoring, observations	1.1. Climate Survey question #15

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

Additional Goal(s)

Establish safe, secure and respectful schools 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. Establish safe, secure and respectful schools Goal			Establish safe, secure and respectful schools		
Establish safe, secure and respectful schools Goal #1:					
2012 Current level:			2013 Expected level:		
90% (55) of students feel safe at school (climate survey #1)			91% (56) of students will feel safe at school (climate survey #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	1.1. Implementation; communication;	1.1. Implement CHAMPS school wide	1.1. Administration; Foundations VLC	1.1. monitoring and observation	1.1. Foundations survey

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
Rtl Behavior and addressing tier 2 and tier 3 behavior issues	Rtl	LaQuatrice Mosely and Anita Allen	Representatives from each grade level	2nd early release day of each month	Monitoring referral and suspension data	LaQuatrice Mosely and Anita Allen
Foundations and addressing tier 2 and tier 3 behavior issues	Behavior	Keith Kusmirek	Representatives from each grade level	as needed	Monitoring referral and suspension data	Keith Kusmirek

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 Establish safe, secure and respectful schools Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Comprehension Strategies Kit to teach students how to construct meaning from text using critical thinking strategies that leads to higher level comprehension	Fiction and Nonfiction Comprehension Kit	Internal accounts	\$4,079.94
Reading	To provide remediation in Extended Day for our lowest quartile students	"After The Bell" Complete Program	Internal accounts	\$2,250.00
Mathematics	To provide remediation to our lowest quartile students in extended day	FASTT Math	Internal accounts	\$1,250.00
Writing	Write Score – formative assessment program that scores student essays to make data driven decisions	Writing program that will take pieces of student's writing and score them and give a class analysis as to the next steps.	Internal accounts	\$1,628.55
				Subtotal: \$9,208.49
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Mathematics	Tutoring program for lowest quartile students during extended day	IXL – math tutorial for practice and enrichment	Internal accounts	\$3,850.00
				Subtotal: \$3,850.00
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: \$13,058.49

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 (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 computerized Ellison machine	\$2,000.00

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

Consult with principal to determine progress to meet SIP goals.
Participate in planning and monitoring of the school building and grounds
Initiating activities or programs that generate greater cooperation between the community and the school
Recommending various support services for the school
Reviewing the impact of property development and zoning changes in the vicinity of the school as they relate to safety, welfare and educational opportunities of the students
Assist in the preparation and evaluation of the SIP required by Florida statutes, and annually reviewing, amending or continuing such school improvement plan
Assist in the development of educational goals and objectives
Assist in the preparation of the accreditation report
Performing other functions as requested by the principal

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 LORETTO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	94%	95%	85%	81%	355	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	72%	72%			144	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?	72% (YES)	79% (YES)			151	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					650	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Duval School District LORETTO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	93%	90%	92%	71%	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	72%	69%			141	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?	65% (YES)	66% (YES)			131	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					618	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested