FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: GARDEN CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Duval

Principal: Aszloyn Wakefield

SAC Chair: Sakia Robertson

Superintendent: Ed Pratt-Dannals

Date of School Board Approval: November 5, 2012

Last Modified on: 11/6/2012

Pam Stewart, Commissioner
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	Aszloyn Wakefield	B.A.- Elementary Education (1-6), M.S- Elementary Education , Ed.S.- Education Leadership	2	9	Principal – Garden City – School Grade B Grades 3-5 scored 43% proficient in Reading, 45% proficient in Math, 47% proficient in Writing, and 32% proficient in Science Assistant Principal-Louis Sheffield Elem.– 2005- 2011. School grade- A AYP NOT Met 2010-2011 and 2009-2010 FCAT High Achieving Reading 88% ,Math 86%, Writing 84%, Science 67% Learning Gains Reading 69%, Math 63%, Bottom Quartile Gains Reading 64% Math 73% Assistant Principal Richard L. Brown 2004/5- B- AYP Not met AYP MET 2005-2009

					Assistant Principal
Assis Principal	Kathy Tarkington	Elementary Education (1-6) Education Leadership	28	7	Assistant Principal/Garden City Elem. – 2006 to present School grades: C, A, A C and C AYP NOT not met in 2005-2006, 2006-2007, 2009-2010, and 2010-2011 In 2011 – Grades 3-5 scored 43% proficient in Reading, 45% proficient in Math, 47% proficient in Writing, and 32% proficient in Science
Principal					

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)
NONE					

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1. Recruitment/Interviewing of highly qualified teachers currently employed in DCPS seeking transfers	Aszloyn Wakefield, Principal	Ongoing as needed	
2	2. Recruitment of new applicants via DCPS HR Services	Aszloyn Wakefield, Principal	As scheduled by HR Ongoing as needed	
3	3. Participation with local colleges/univeristies pre-service teachers	Kathy Tarkington, AP	As scheduled by UNF	
4	4. Teachers new to Garden City are assigned a mentor based on grade level or certification area	Grade Level Chairpersons	Ongoing	
5	5.			

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
NONE	

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
30	3.3%(1)	23.3%(7)	36.7%(11)	36.7%(11)	16.7%(5)	53.3%(16)	10.0%(3)	3.3%(1)	36.7%(11)

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
Kenya Small	Cortina Floyd	CET certified; common grade level	Particiapate in Grade Level planning Observe in mentor's (and other's)classroom (noticing good instruction and management practices.) Focus Walks Before and after school support as needed.

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.

Aszloyn Wakefield (Principal), Kathy Tarkington (Assistant Principal),
Colleen Walsh (Kindergarten), Sandra Sheffield (Grade 1 Teacher), Kaleigh Deckert (Grade 2 Teacher), Vicky Joseph (Grade 3 Teacher), Robyn Cooper (Grade 4 Teacher), Dana Young (Grade 5 Literacy Teacher), Catherine Dawson (Grade 5 Math/Science Teacher), Marva Miller (ESE), Linda Mizelle (Guidance), Susan Hatcher (Psychologist)

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 Leadership Team engages in four primary activities
1. Attends all district level RtI training;
2. Provides in-service and assistance to school faculty and staff related to RtI implementation and practices;
3. Reviews student performance data to identify school-wide and grade level problems and concerns; and assist in developing strategies
4. Facilitate and support teachers as their students move through the RtI process (Tier II and Tier II, CPST, etc)
The RtI Leadership team meets on a regular basis to focus on school based academic and behavioral questions such as:
1. What do we expect the students to learn?
2. How do we know they have or have not learned what was expected?
3. What will we do when they do or do not learn?
4. What evidence do we have to support our responses to these questions?

The RtI Leadership Team will meet with grade level teams and other school based teams to determine needs of particular students and develop interventions as needed.

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

The RtI Leadership Team takes an active role in using the problem solving strategy to analyze data, identify the cause of the problem, and suggest possible interventions and strategies that might be used to address issues of academics and behavior. The SIP includes a formal review process which demonstrates how the school has used RtI to inform instruction and make mid-course adjustments as data is analyzed.

MTSS Implementation

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

The RtI Team will use data from multiple sources. They will use the data from FCAT, FAIR, district assessments, DRA2, as well as from Tier II and Tier II sources (Soar to Success, Envisions RtI, etc), and curriculum based measures to provide information about academic performance.

The Team will also use data from absentee reports, referrals, and suspensions to provide information related to behavior issues.

Progress monitoring will continue through the use of PMRN and Pearson Inform.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The RtI Leadership Team will support the staff by providing continuous learning. This learning will be facilitated by using training materials provided by the district. Learning will also occur through the sharing among co-workers, presentations at school-based workshops and internet-based webinars.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Aszloyn Wakefield, Principal
Sandra Sheffield- Kindergarten Teacher
Amy Lynch -Grade 1 Teachers
Venetia Alexander -Grade 2 Teacher
Darellee Naccarato, Callie Broughton Grade 3 Teachers
Nina Bliss- Grade 4 Teachers
Keelia Britt, Grade 5 Teacher

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

The Literacy PLC is a combined team consisting of members of our Reading and Writing PLCs committees. This team will develop strategies to support both the district reading and writing goals as well as our own school reading and writing goals. During the monthly meetings, team members will review reading and writing data (Benchmark, FCAT, and FAIR) and plan strategic activities that will enable, enhance and motivate students to achieve high success in reading and writing and to help teachers provide more meaningful lessons and activities. Realizing the importance of literacy in the home, the team will also develop ways to strengthen the home-school connection and further involve parents as learning partners.

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

1.Increase the rigor in Reading and Writing instruction by deepening teacher understanding of
the standards and expectation as well as the cognitive levels of complexity.
2.Implementing Guided Reading with fidelity
3.Develop practices for effectively teaching spelling and vocabulary.

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:	In 2013, 30% (87) of 287 students will achieve proficiency (FCAT Level 3 in Reading)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
25% (72) of (286).	30 %(87) of 287

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. Parents not taking advantage of remediation beyond school hours.	1a.1. Students will be enrolled in extended learning opportunities, Tier II & III groups, safety nets, during school tutoring, and Destination Success to address their deficiencies in reading. RtI Tiers II and III strategies will be relevant and rigorously applied.	1a.1. Classroom Teacher RtI Team Assistant Principal PLC Reading Team	1a.1. Monitoring the effectiveness safety-nets RtI Data Monitoring Assessments Data	1a.1. SES bi-weekly progress reports Bi-weekly FCIMS Reading Assessments FAIR Assessments 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Standards component Teacher Reading Assessments
2	1a.2. Lack of student engagement and motivation to read.	1a.2. Implement reading recognition in the classroom. School-wide reward celebration for students achieving quarter reading benchmark. Grade-level/school-wide reading goals will be set.	1a.2. PLC Reading Team Teachers	1a.2. Observation by teachers Listing of students achieving quarter reading benchmarks	1a.2. Teacher data notebook 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Standards component
3	Students lack foundational reading skills	Implement Reader's Workshop to include differentiated instruction, Guided Reading groups, conferencing, and reading journals	Classroom teachers	Weekly Progress Monitoring of Assessments, Conferencing, Running Records	Developed Common Assessments, Benchmarks, PMAs DRAs FCAT 2012
4	30% of tested students are at least one year overage	Increase minutes per day that students read (reading in the content areas- and 30 minutes per year that the student is overage) Guided Reading Daily	Teachers	Running Records	Developed Common Assessments, Benchmarks, PMAs FCAT 2.0 2012

		Use technology tools such as:Destination Success			
5	Lack of intrinsic motivation to read	Quarterly reading recognition activities End of the year reading celebration	Reading PLC	Observations by teachers Listing of students achieving quarter reading benchmarks	2011 FCAT Reading Standards component 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 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:	Level 4 and 5 in Reading In 2013 23% (34) of 287 students will achieve above proficiency on FCAT
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
17% (49) of 286	17% (49) of 286

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. Lack of high cognitive complexity questions	2a.1. Professional development on Webb's Depth of Knowledge and strategies to formulate high cognitive complexity questions Embed high cognitive complexity questions in instruction	2a.1. Principal Assistant Principal PLC Reading Team	2a.1. Observation using Webb's Depth of Knowledge observation checklist Review teacher lesson plans Feedback from students	2a.1. 2013 FCAT Reading Standards component results Classroom walk-through tool
	Teacher understanding of FCAT 2.0, changes in the	Embed high cognitive complexity questions in	Classroom Teachers	FCAT 2.0 Test specs	Formatives. PMAs

2	Test specification, and levels of cognitive complexity	instruction Implement weekly book clubs as an enrichment Utilize FCAT 2.0 Test specs in lesson planning	Administration	Instruction & Assessments aligned with standards withthe appropriate level of complexity Review of lesson plans Feedback from students	FCAT 2.0
3	Time management	Stduents will participate in literature circles and/ or small group discussion to share and apply reading strategies	Classroom teachers	Student's ability to respond critically (journal writing, responses, etc)	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:

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:	In 2013, 70% (123) of students will make learning gains in Reading
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
65% (98)	70% (123)

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 vocabulary	Vocabulary instruction in all content areas Authentic use of word	Principal Teachers	Monitoring of vocabulary assessment results Use of vocabulary when	Formatives PMAs FCAT 2.0

		walls Increased reading time		explaining concepts and skills	
2	Poor reasoning skills – inability to pick out relevant information	Guided Reading with fidelity Skill specific small group and individualized instruction	Classroom Teachers	Monitor reading journals Lesson plans with prescriptive instruction	DRA2 Benchmark Assessments FCAT 2.0
3	Time mangament	Daily implementation of FCIM mini-focus leesons and weekly assessment.	Administration	Observation of instruction Review of lesson plans	FCIM Assessment Benhcmark Assessments FCAT 2.0

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:	In 2013, 81% of students in the lowest quartile will make learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
79%	81%

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. Limited background experiences and/or knowledge	4a.1. Read aloud of different genres Provide opportunities for students to read books	4a.1. Classroom teachers Principal Assistant Principal	4a.1. Observations Review of lesson plans	4a.1. Teacher data notebook 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Standards component

		from varied genres Students use texts to support their ideas, responses, and opinions			FAIR
2	4a.2. Lack of motivation	4a.2. Assign mentors to identified students Motivational talks with identified students	4a.2. Teachers Volunteer students from Highlands Middle School Administration Guidance Counselor	4a.2. Feedback from mentors and students	4a.2. 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Standards component FAIR
3	4a.3 Poor problem solving and comprehension skills	4a.3. Implement Kagan strategies to strengthen these skills	4a.3. Classroom teachers	4a.3. Observations Review of lesson plans	4a.3. 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Standards component FAIR
4	Limited background experiences and/or knowledge	Utilize technology, internet, and virtual field trips to build background knowledge	Classroom Teachers	Observations Review of lesson plans	FCAT 2.0 assessment results
5	Poor reasoning and problem solving skills	Guided Reading and cooperative learning groups targeting higher level thinking	Classroom Teachers	Observations	FCAT 2.0 assessment results
6	Lack of intrinsic motivation	Assign mentors to identified students	Administrators	Feedback from students and mentors	FCAT 2.0 assessment 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%.	Reading Goal # 5A : In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	43%	53%	58%	63%	67%	

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 2013 only 54% of black students, 33% white students and 59% of Hispanic students will not make satisfactory progress in Reading..
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
not making satisfactory progress Black – 59% White – 38% Hispanic – 64%	In 2013 only 54% of black students, 33% white students and 59% of Hispanic students will not make satisfactory progress in Reading

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	Black: Limited Vocabulary	Purposeful vocabulary instruction in all content areas Authentic use of word walls Increased reading opportunities Utilize technology, internet, and virtual field trips to build background knowledge	Literacy Leadership Team Reading PLC	Review of lesson plans including differentiated plans and RtI strategies	FCAT 2.0 assessment results
2	Inability to effectively use data to plan instruction	PLC/grade level plan instructionally to target learning needs and work cooperatively to teach specific skill lessons daily	Classrooom teachers RtI Team	Monitor RtI plans	Common Assessments Benchmarks FCAT 2.0
3					

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
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 subgroup:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	
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

1	5D.1. Teachers including differentiated instruction in their lesson plan for the Literacy block.	5D.1. Provide immediate intervention for students showing need of remediation for a specific skill or strategy taught	5D.1. Administration	5D.1. Classroom monitoring forms will reflect scores in each area and lesson plans will document intervention strategies for students who are struggling.	5D.1. Monitoring forms, focus walks, Oncourse

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:	Reading Goal #5E: In 2013, 30% (45) of 153 Economically Disadvantaged students in grades 3-5 will make satisfactory progress in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
24% (70)	30% (45)

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 and students having a thorough understanding of the data and using the data to guide instruction.	Analyze data from ongoing progress monitoring, FAIR, FCAT and District Benchmark assessments to create FCIM calendars. Generate and utilize class monitoring forms and data notebooks. Provide immediate intervention for students showing need of remediation for a specific skill or strategy taught. Interventions will include tutoring, small group instruction, extended time, and re-teaching..	Administration	Classroom focus walks, lesson plans, Oncourse	Lesson plans, classroom observations, monitoring forms
2	Difficulty in building relationships	Through conferencing and interviews teachers will develop and maintain a rapport of trust and safety	Classroom Teachers	Informal observations of student-teacher interactions	Teacher-made assessments Anecdotal notes
3	Effectively using data to plan instruction	PLC/ Grade level teams strategiaclly plan to target the needs and work cooperatively to teach specific skill lessons	Classroom Teachers Reading PLC RtI	RtI plans	Formatives Benchmark PMAs Common Assessments FCAT 2.0

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
Florida Continuous Improvement Model	All	Adminstration	Techers	On-going	Instructional Focus Calendars	Administration
FCAT Explorer	Grades 3-5	Administration	Teachers 3-5	On- going	FCAT Explorer Reports	Administration
Destination Success	All	Administration	Teachers	On-going	Destination Success Reports	Administration
Text Complexity/Questioning	All	Administration	Techers	On-going	Focus Walks; observations	Administration

Reading Budget:

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

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	In 2013 50% (5) of 10 students tested will score proficient on 2012 CELLA/LAS Links.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:

40% (2)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. 1.1. The student is unable to use English to learn required concepts at or above grade level. Students lack of pre-requisite skills which impact preparedness to achieve at or above grade level	1.1. Skill specific and individualized instruction Continuous communication with parents regarding lessons being taught. Teacher utilizes ESOL strategies with ELL students. Teacher labeled classroom with vocabulary words. Provide ELL students with language dictionary. ELL students will be allowed to present information orally.	1.1. Classroom Teachers ELA Teacher	Weekly Progress Monitoring of Assessments, Conferencing, Running Records Continuous communication with parent concerning student progress or lack thereof. Oral assessment rubric	CELLA or LAS Links test scores Teacher/Parent Input Classroom Grades
2	PLC/G1.2. Inability to effectively use data to plan instruction	PLC/Grade Level planning to instructionally target learning needs and work collaboratively to teach specific skill lessons daily.	Classroom Teachers RtI Team	Review of lesson plans including differentiated plans and RtI strategies	CELLA or LAS Links test scores Teacher input Classroom Grades

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:	In 2013, 50% (5) of 10 students tested will score proficient on 2012 CELLA/LAS Links.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

40% (2)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

1	2.1. Limited English vocabulary. Student's inability to retain information learned. .	2.1. Guided Reading with fidelity. Skill specific and individualized instruction Students will use the Destination success and star fall websites to help improve reading. Provide reading materials in variety of languages. Students are provided with a language dictionary to help with vocabulary.	2.1. ELA Teacher Classroom Teachers	2.1.Weekly Progress Monitoring of Assessments, Conferencing, Running Records	2.1 Cella or LAS Links test scores Teacher Input Classroom Grades FCAT Reading scores
2	2.2Inability to effectively use data to plan instruction	2.2 PLC/Grade Level planning to instructionally target learning needs and work collaboratively to teach specific skill lessons daily	2.2. classroom teachers RtI team	2.2 Review of lesson plans including differentiated plans and RtI strategies	2.2. CELLA or LAS Links test scores Teacher Input Classroom Grades
3	2.3 Students lack of test taking strategies	2.3. Ongoing instruction to demonstrate mastery on materials covered Repetition of Materials taught	2.3. Classroom Teachers	2.3. Ongoing assessments Increased student participation	CELLA or LAS Links test scores Teacher Input Classroom Grades

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
1	2.1. Limited English vocabulary Vocabulary deficiencies	2.1.Skill specific and individualized instruction Ongoing instruction to demonstrate mastery on materials covered Repetition of Materials Exposure to different types of literature, include hands on experiences	2.1. ELA teachers	2.1.Weekly Progress monitoring of Assessments, Conferencing, Running Records Ongoing Assessments Increased student participation	CELLA or LAS Links test scores Teacher Input Classroom Grades 4th grade Florida Writes 2.0 scores

		Create PMP to target student needs Students are pulled to work in small groups with resource teachers			
2	2.2.Correct use of conventions in daily writing	2.2.Embedd grammar/conventions into daily writing/skills block	2.2. Classroom teachers	2.2. Writing Journals/Student Portfolios Review of Lesson Plans	2.2. CELLA or LAS Links test scores Teacher Input Classroom Grades

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	In 2013 34% (90) of 287 students will score at least Level 3 in Mathematics
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27% (78)of 286	34% (90) of 287

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack prerequisite skills and have weak problem solving skills	Implement the math workshop model to include differentiated instruction, guided math groups, conferencing, and math journals Math Fact Frenzy- student compete with their peers to improve knowledge of basic math facts	Classroom Teachers Math PLC	Weekly Progress Monitoring of Assessments and conferncing	Formatives PMAs FCAT
2	Weak math vocabulary and problem solving skills	Development of math centers at various levels of complexity Implementation of FCIM Teachers will use math vocabulary during instruction and will require students to use math vocabulary when responding and journaling	Classroom Teachers Administration Math PLC	Observations, Conferencing, Lesson plans reflecting differentiated groups and activities	Weekly Assessments FCAT
3	Parents/guardians unfamiliar with current skills and strategies	Academic focused parent involvement activities Provide parents with information about Math resources and tool, FCAT Explorer, Destination Success and Pearson Online	Administration Math PLC	Monitoring of online activities Increase parental support	Surveys Increase in homework being turned in

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:	Mathematics Goal #2A: In 2013, 20% (56) of 287 students will achieve above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in Mathematics
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
15% (44) of 286	20% (56) of 287

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. Teacher knowledge of effectively differentiating instruction	2a.1. Analyzing data and planning for instruction as grade level teams. Math PLC members meet to analyze student work, discuss and develop strategies for all learners	2a.1. Classroom teachers Grade level teams Math PLC	2a.1. Students' ability to explain or demonstrate their understanding in journals. Gains made on various monitoring tools.	2a.1 Benchmark assessments District Monitoring tools FCAT.
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 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:	In 2013, 77%(116) of students will make learning gains in math
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
74% (112)	77% (116)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack basic problem solving skills	Daily implementation of FCIM Focus lessons with weekly assessments	Administration	Weekly Assessments Math journals	FCIM assessments
2	Teacher ability to expect high performance from students who are presently below level	Guided Math activities targeting higher order thinking to improve problem solving skills Use writing to explain math responses to develop comprehension of newly acquired skills	Classroom Teachers Math PLC	Monitor Math journals Lesson plans with prescriptive instruction to target higher thinking	Common Assessments District Monitoring tools
3					

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:	In 2013, 77% of students in the lowest quartile will make gains in Mathematics
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
73%	77%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teacher ability to expect high performance from students who are presently below level	Small group, teacher-led guided practice to reinforce skills and strategies Safety Nets RtI Strategies	Classroom Teachers Math PLC RtI Team	Diagnostic Assessments Frequent Analyzing data Progress monitoring	District Monitoring tools
2	Students lack knowledge of basic facts and skills in reading and math	Envisions Language in Math materials On-line resources: Gizmo, FCAT Explorer, Pearson Success Intensive Safety Nets	Classroom Teachers Administration	Diagnostic Assessments Frequent Analyzing data Progress monitoring	FCIM Assessments District monitoring tools
3	Students lack test taking strategies Students have difficulty communicating mathematical ideas	Ongoing instruction on test taking strategies FCAT Explorer Writing in Math Kagan Strategies	Classroom Teachers	Observations Review of Lesson Plans Math Journals	FCAT

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 : In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	40%	46%	51%	57%	62%	

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 2013 only 55% of black students, 24% of white students, and 45% of Hispanic students will not n make satisfactory progress in math
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012 59% (black students, 29% white students, 50% Hispanic students did not make satisfactory progress in Math.	Only 55% black 24% white 45% Hispanic students will not make satisfactory progress

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of prerequisite skills	Implementation of FCIM Differentiated Math groups (intensive-reinforcement activities) Implementation RtI (Tier II and Tier III intervention strategies)	Classroom Teachers	Monitor weekly FCIM lesson plans and assessments	FCIM assessments FCAT
2	Using data to effectively plan instruction	PLC and grade level teams plan to strategically teach specific skills lessons daily	Classroom teachers RtI Teacher	Monitor RtI plans Observations of lessons	Formatives Benchmark Common Assessments FCAT 2.0
3					

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
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 subgroup:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	N/A Only 7 SWD students in grades 3-5

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	5D.1. Students lack prerequisite skills which impact preparedness to achieve grade level benchmarks/standards	5D.1. Differentiated Instruction RtI strategies Guided Math Groups Utilize math games and manipulatives to reinforce skills and strategies	5D.1. Differentiated Instruction RtI strategies Guided Math Groups Utilize math games and manipulatives to reinforce skills and strategies	5D.1. Review of lesson plans including differentiated plans and RtI strategies	5D.1. Formatives Benchmark Assessments FCAT 2.0

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:	In 2013, 33% (49) of 153 Economically Disadvantaged students will demonstrate proficiency in Math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28% (81)	33% (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	Students lack pre-requisite skills which impact preparedness to achieve grade level benchmarks/standards	Differentiated Instruction RtI Strategies Guided Math Groups Utilize math games and manipulatives to reinforce skills and strategies	Classroom teachers	Review of lesson plans including differentiated plans and RtI strategies	Formatives Benchmark Assessments FCAT 2.0
2	Limited problem solving strategies	Incorporate problem solving strategies/tools as part of daily math instruction	Administration, Classroom teachers	Review of lesson plans Classroom observations	Formatives Benchmark Assments FCAT 2.0
3					

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
Common Core Lesson Plans	K- 5	Administration	School-wide	9/19/12 Early Release	Classroom artifacts, Lesson Plans	Administration
Math Content for Ele Teacher of Algebra	K-5	Schultz Center	Ms. Rollins	9/18 10/2, 16, 30, 11/13	Classroom artifacts, share at future PLC meeting	District Trainers
Guided Math	K - 5	PLC co chairs	Math PLC	At Monthly meetings	Classroom Artifacts	PLC co chairs
Foundations of Elementary K-2 Group 1	K-2	Schultz Center	Ms. Bennett	9/11,25 10/9,23 11/6,20	Classroom artifacts, share at future PLC meeting	District Trainers
Foundations of Elementary 3-5 Group 1	3 - 5	Schultz Center	K. Deckert	9/11,25 10/9,23 11/6,20	Classroom artifacts, share at future PLC meeting	District Trainers

Mathematics Budget:

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

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	In 2013, 36% (29) of students will score a level 3 in Science
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

31% (29)	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
1	Students have limited understanding of scientific vocabulary	The Science team will meet to plan how to best embed vocabulary into the science curriculum Maintain Science Journals	Science PLC Classroom Teachers	Classroom Observations Lesson Plans Review Analysis of progress during weekly grade level meetings (meeting minutes) Science Team Meeting Minutes	Science FCAT Common Assessments
2	Retention of information learned from prior year.	Implement the Science Curriculum, with fidelity, uisng the 5E model, and Essential Explorations (K-5) Maintain Science Journals Vertical articulation of standards and expectations	Science PLC Classroom Teachers	Classroom Observations Lesson Plans Review Analysis of progress during weekly grade level meetings (meeting minutes), and Science PLC meeting notes	Science FCAT Common Assessments
3					

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:	In 2013 6% (5) of (88) student will score a level 4 or 5 in science
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
1% (1) of 96	6% (5) of 88

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teacher difficulty asking high cognitive complexity questions	Provide teachers questioning strategy techniques through Science CLC Integrate language arts strategies – reading and writing – in science instruction	Classroom Teachers Science Team Science Lead Teachers	Classroom Observations Sciene journals Lesson Plans Review (including high complexity questions)	Essential Explorations Science FCAT
2	Effective scheduling of activites	Teachers will observe Peer teachers and District Coach will model effective management of strategeis and time	ClasroomTeachers Science PLC District Coach	Observations Student Engagement	Science 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:	
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
Use of the 5-E's	Grades K-5	District Science Coach	School-wide	Early Release Day	Classroom Observation Lesson Plan Review	Administrators District Science Coach
Demonstrations Science Lessons	Grades 3-5	District Science Coach	Grades 3-5	As scheduled by grade levels/district coach	Classroom Observations	Administrators District Science Coach
Unpacking the Science Benchmarks	Grades K-5	District Science Coach	School –wide	Early Release Day	Classroom observations Lesson Plan Review	Administrators District Science Coach

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:	In 2013, 90% (90) of 100 students will score at least a level 3 in writing
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
85% (78)	90% (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	1A.1. Limited Vocabulary	1A.1. Utilize Elements of Reading Vocabulary Kit, Juicy Words on word wall, expose students to more literature Wednesday Writes	1A.1. Administration, Classroom teachers; tutors	1A.1. Increased vocabulary in writing. Teacher/ Student Conferencing	1A.1. Monthly writing assessments
2	1A.2. Lack of Grammar Skills	1A.2. Daily DOL Practice that implements a focus on grammar and sentence structure	1A.2. Administration, Classroom teachers; tutors	1a.2. Increased grammar skills in writing Teacher/Student Conferencing	1a.2. Monthly writing assessments Six Points Writing Rubric
3	Correct use of conventions in daily writing Poor use of oral language; writing matches speaking	Create a focus calendar by grade level for conventions/grammar Embedd grammar/conventions into daily writing/skills block Maintain focus on conferencing and increase focus on editing daily writing	Writing PLC Classroom Teachers	Focus Calendar Lesson Plans Conference Logs	FCAT 2.0 assessment results
4	1A.3. Limited exposure to higher level writing	1a.3. Model and expose students to papers that would score a 5 or 6 on FCAT Writes	1A.3. 3rd and 4th grade teachers	1a.2. Increased grammar skills in writing Teacher/Student Conferencing	1a.2. Monthly writing assessments Six Points Writing Rubric

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
No Data Submitted						

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	To reduce the number of students that are excessively absent and chronically tardy by 10%
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
95%	98%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)

33% of 580	28%of 580
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
27% of 580	22% of 580

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 parent understanding, support and/or concern	Inform parents of the Compulsory Attendance Laws – Florida Statues 1003.2, 1003.24 and 1003.27 Communicate with parents when excessive non-attendance problems occur in a timely manner Create/develop extracurricular activities and opportunities to motivate students to want to come to school	Administrators	Reports from DCPS Attendance Office Percentage of students meeting criteria for rewards	DCPS Student Absences/Tardies Report

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:	In 2013 the goal is that there will be no more than 48 times that a student received in school suspension for a code of conduct offense.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
53	48
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
31	25
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
26	23
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
17	13

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Students who use inappropriate behavior as a coping mechanism for deficient academic abilities and personal problems.	Ensure that struggling students and students with on -going behavior concerns are involved in safety nets, mentoring and counseling	.Administrators Teachers Guidance Counselor RtI-B team	Monitoring of Code of Conduct offenses	DCPS Incident Rate Targets Data

		Celebrate, recognize, and reward appropriate behavior			
2	. Common understanding and expectation of behavior management strategies	. School wide implementation of CHAMPS	Foundations Team Administrators Teachers	.Monthly and quarterly tracking of number and type of referral data Classroom Observations	1.2. Collect and analyze data
3					

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.*	In 2013, parental involvement will increase to 49% of 520 students whose parents are actively involved in school activities, programs,an meetings.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
44%	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	Work schedules and/or other scheduled activities of parents	Provide timely notification of parent involvement activities to afford parents time to plan to attend	Teachers Administrators Academic Curriculum Teams	Memos, flyers, weekly school-wide newsletter	Attendance sign-in records
2					
3	Lack of understanding and/or concern	Inform parents of FCAT content and format; provide strategies and materials that can be used to assist their children. Provide childcare, door prizes, refreshments as incentives for attending/ participation in parent involvement activities Maintain ongoing and frequent communication between school and home	Teachers Administrators PLC Teams	Monthly school-wide newsletters, weekly grade level newsletters, memos, flyers	Attendance sign-in records
4					
5	Lack of an organized PTA board representing the school	Re-organize a PTA board, elect officers, hold monthly meetings, etc.	Principal	The PTA board being a functioning team with regular meeting and increased PTA membership	Monthly meeting agendas Increased PTA membership

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

Safety Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Safety Goal Safety Goal #1:	The number of student accident incidents occurring on the playground will decrease by 50%.
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
36 student accidents occurred on the playground during the 2010-2011 school year.	18 or fewer student accidents will occur on the playground during the 2012 - 2013 school year.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	NONE	Foundations Team will set grade level times for recess and define zones to eliminate over-crowding in any one paricular zone.	Foundations Team Assistant Principal	Frequent monitoring of playground activity	Reduction in the number of accident reports (from playground

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

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

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

Budget:

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

Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

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

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

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

End of Safety Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

○ 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 10/16/2012)

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
We are still discussing ideas.	$4,167.36

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

Our SAC is focusing on improving Reading K-5. We are exploring ways and hearing from vendors in order to make decisions on how we will best spend our funds.

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
GARDEN CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	63%	60%	67%	34%	224	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	62%	54%			116	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)	67% (YES)			132	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					472	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Duval School District
GARDEN CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	62%	61%	88%	27%	238	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	60%	56%			116	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	57% (YES)	57% (YES)			114	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					468	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested