

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

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

School Name: PINE FOREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Duval

Principal: Tamara Bush-Williams

SAC Chair: Jennifer Ancelin

Superintendent: Ed Pratt-Dannals

Date of School Board Approval: November 5, 2012

Last Modified on: 1/2/2013

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

| Position | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | # of Years at Current School | # of Years as an Administrator | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year) |
|-----------|-----------------|---|------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|
| Principal | Tamara Williams | B.S. Elementary Education, 2001 M. Ed Educational Leadership, 2005 | 2 | 4 | Elementary was deemed an "A" school by the Florida DOE. The school earned a total of 564 points. 86% were proficient in reading, 84% in math, 80% in writing, and 63% in science. Our black students earned AYP in math. 97% Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP. |

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 | # of Years as an Instructional | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and |
|--------------|------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|---|
|--------------|------|-----------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|---|

| | | | School | Coach | AMO progress along with the associated school year) |
|----------|---------------|---|--------|-------|---|
| Literacy | Sarah Momberg | Degree: B.S. in Elementary Education (Grades 1-6) | 17 | 10 | --7 years in an "A" school --AYP made 5 out of 8 years --FCAT gains made in most content areas over the past 14 years --Parent support and involvement has increased significantly in 4 years --PTA named "PTA Unit of the Year" by County Council PTA --Named School of Excellence in 2008 by Magnet Schools of America --Named School of Distinction in 2009 and 2010 by Magnet Schools of America School Grades: 2005-2006:A; 2006-2007:A; 2007-2008: A, 2008-2009: A, 2009-2010: A 2010-2011:B; 2011-2012:A AYP: 2005 Yes; 2006 No; 2007 Yes; 2008 No; 2009 Yes; 2010 No; 2011 No |

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

| | Description of Strategy | Person Responsible | Projected Completion Date | Not Applicable (If not, please explain why) |
|---|---|---|---------------------------|---|
| 1 | Professional development opportunities every 4-6 weeks (Working on the Work – "WOW's") with Instructional Coach and/or various professional | Principal, Instructional Coach | June 2013 | |
| 2 | Weekly participation in Professional Learning Communities with grade levels to plan instruction and analyze student work. | Principal | June 2013 | |
| 3 | Define, establish and support professional learning communities within building (Leadership Team, Lead Teacher Teams, Grade Level Teams) | Principal | June 2013 | |
| 4 | Allow time for vertical and horizontal collaboration | Principal | June 2013 | |
| 5 | Professional development aligned with student data and teachers' Individual Professional Development Plans | Principal, Instructional Coach, District offerings of staff to assist with school-based professional development activities | June 2013 | |
| 6 | Instructional coach models instructional strategies and parallel teaches with teachers to provide in-depth, one-on-one professional development in the classroom. | Principal, Instructional Coach | June 2013 | |

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

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

Staff Demographics

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

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

| Total Number of Instructional Staff | % of First-Year Teachers | % of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience | % of Teachers with Advanced Degrees | % Highly Effective Teachers | % Reading Endorsed Teachers | % National Board Certified Teachers | % ESOL Endorsed Teachers |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 36 | 2.8%(1) | 19.4%(7) | 44.4%(16) | 25.0%(9) | 13.9%(5) | 97.2%(35) | 0.0%(0) | 2.8%(1) | 58.3%(21) |

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 |
|-----------------|-----------------|--|---|
| Terri Wester | Carl Vorwerk | Mr. Vorwerk is a first year teacher. Mr. Vorwerk was strategically paired with Ms. Wester because she is a successful veteran arts teacher. Ms. Wester will provide assistance with lesson planning, familiarization with curriculum, behavior management strategies, time management within the arts. management strategies, time management within the arts. | Daily and/or weekly meetings to review past and current lesson plans. --Provide individualized on-going assistance on lesson planning, all aspects classroom management --Monitor weekly, that lesson plans are current and aligned with learning schedules and curricula; appropriate classroom management strategies; and utilization of appropriate supports and differentiated instructional strategies |
| Kim Baumgardner | Nicole Simmons | Ms. Simmons is a first year teacher. Mrs. Baumgardner is a successful 2nd grade teacher who will be very instrumental assisting Mrs. Simmons as a novice teachers. Ms. Baumgardner will provide assistance with lesson planning, familiarization with curriculum, behavior management strategies, time management within the arts. | Daily and/or weekly meetings to review past and current lesson plans. --Provide individualized on-going assistance on lesson planning, all aspects classroom management --Monitor weekly, that lesson plans are current and aligned with learning schedules and curricula; appropriate classroom management strategies; and utilization of appropriate supports and differentiated instructional strategies |
| | | Ms. Menchan | |

| | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|---|---|
| Johnna Mattiace | Arnetta Menchan | is a teacher who is returning to Duval County. Ms. Mattiace will provide assistance with lesson planning, familiarization with curriculum, behavior management strategies, time management within the arts. | Daily and/or weekly meetings to review past and current lesson plans. --Provide individualized on-going assistance on lesson planning, all aspects classroom management --Monitor weekly, that lesson plans are current and aligned with learning schedules and curricula; appropriate classroom management strategies; and utilization of appropriate supports and differentiated instructional strategies |
| Debbie Rankin | Rose Francis | Mrs. Francis is a first year teacher. Ms. Rankin will provide assistance with lesson planning, familiarization with curriculum, behavior management strategies, time management within the arts. | Daily and/or weekly meetings to review past and current lesson plans.- Provide individualized on-going assistance on lesson planning, all aspects classroom management --Monitor weekly, that lesson plans are current and aligned with learning schedules and curricula; appropriate classroom management strategies; and utilization of appropriate supports and differentiated instructional strategies |

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.

Principal: Tamara Williams
 Instructional Coach: Sarah Momberg
 Guidance Counselor: Nancy Bent
 ESE Teacher: Sheila Blackburn
 Kindergarten: Mattiace
 First Grade: Behrens
 Second Grade: Baumgardner
 Third Grade: Stephens
 Fourth Grade: Cotton
 Fifth Grade: Johnson

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 meets biweekly to focus on:

- Defining criteria for student achievement across the content areas.
- Analyzing on-going assessment data sources.
- Monitoring and analyzing data from monthly Progress Monitoring Notebooks.
- Strategizing classroom and/or school interventions and strategies for those students who do not meet achievement criteria.
- Examining relevant evidence of achievement, such as assessment data from DRA2, FAIR, MyTest, FCAT, Progress Monitoring Assessments, FLKRS, ECHO, Running Records, District Benchmark assessments

The team engages 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 determines what professional development and resources are necessary for better meeting the needs of students. The team collaborates regularly, engages in problem solving, shares effective practices, evaluates effectiveness of intervention implementation, makes decisions as to necessary adjustments in interventions, and practices new processes and skills necessary to monitor and adjust Tier II and Tier III Interventions. The team facilitates the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about RTI implementation.

In addition to the oversight work of the RTI Team, other building leadership and instructional teams (such as professional

learning communities, small learning communities, grade level teams, and/or content area teams) carries the work forward with individual and smaller groups of students. This academic and behavioral work includes the following, beginning with Tier 1 (core/universal instruction) and continuing through Tier 2 (supplemental instruction/intervention):

- Identifying and analyzing systematic patterns of student needs
- Identifying appropriate evidence-based differentiation and intervention strategies
- Implementing and overseeing progress monitoring
- Analyzing progress monitoring data
- Problem solving
- Determining next steps

For the most intensive interventions at Tier 3 in the 2011-12 school year, the current RTI Leadership structure and the RTI Facilitator will be used collaboratively with the building instructional teams (Target Team, PLC's, grade level teams, and/or content area teams) to provide classroom support for students.

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 Building RTI Leadership Team leads the faculty in a review of the data and, with input from building instructional teams and PLC's, assists in developing the initial draft of the School Improvement Plan utilizing the template provided by the Department of Education. The draft SIP is then presented to the School Advisory Council for review and recommendations. The Building RTI Leadership Team finalizes the plan.

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

MTSS Implementation

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

Baseline Data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Diagnostic Reading Assessment-2 (DRA-2), District Interim Benchmark Assessments as appropriate, Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT 2.0), Retention Rates, Absence and Tardy Rates, Discipline data; district timed writing assessments; Progress Monitoring Assessments, Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessments (CELLA), cumulative data used in Continuous Learning Cycles (CLCs' data)

Midyear: FAIR, DRA-2, District Interim Benchmark Assessments as appropriate, PMRN, Progress Monitoring Assessments, and CLCs' data

End of Year: FAIR, FCAT, DRA-2, FCAT Writes, CLCs' data

Ongoing Progress Monitoring: PMRN, Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM), FAIR (ongoing formative assessments), and CLCs' data

Frequency of data review: On-going by grade level and lead teacher teams throughout each week; monthly comprehensive review by the RTI and Leadership Teams via Progress Monitoring Notebooks submitted by each teacher

Data will be managed by Pearson Inform. Monthly Progress Monitoring Notebooks turned in by each teacher also structures strategic management of data and conversations taking place between teachers, parents, and administration.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The school-based MTSS/ RTI Inclusion Facilitator will continue to provide in-service to the faculty on designated professional development days (i.e. pre-planning, early dismissal, planning days, and faculty meetings).

MTSS/RTI Professional Development includes more than scheduled workshops. In addition to traditional RTI training during pre-planning, early dismissal, and faculty meetings, RTI learning is job-embedded and occurs during the following:

- Problem solving
- Professional learning communities
- Classroom observations
- Collaborative planning
- Analyses of student work
- Book study
- Lesson study

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The Guidance Counselor will meet biweekly with the MTSS/RTI Team to provide them with support and current best practices to ensure that teachers are implementing RTI successfully.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Principal: Tamara Williams
Instructional Coach: Robin Momberg
Guidance Counselor: Nancy Bent
ESE Teacher: Sheila Blackburn
Kindergarten: Roxanne Fredrickson
First Grade: Susan Capitano
Second Grade: Kim Drawdy
Third Grade: Mike Slowik
Fourth Grade: Debra Moore
Fifth Grade: Patricia Baker

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

The LLT meets weekly (Tuesday mornings). The roles and functions include data analyses across grade levels to identify strengths and needs; strategize on instructional and support systems necessary to address instructional needs; identify methods for accountability for student achievement; identify methods to ensure that consistent implementation of instructional and support systems are in place; problem solve barriers to instructional or organizational systems necessary to address student needs; ensure that instruction is aligned with district goals and with school goals and mission. This team also provides assistance in assessing faculty professional development needs and to develop plans on effective implementation of targeted reading goals within our surrounding community. Instructional rigor in our reading curriculum and its instructional delivery is a primary goal.

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

- Identify ongoing professional development needs for teachers to ensure that moderate to higher cognitive complexity levels are being addressed with fidelity throughout instruction
 - Ensure that 90 minutes of uninterrupted instruction is taking place daily in each classroom
 - Assist in the process of aligning test specifications with literacy standards in grades K-5
 - Ensure that the 30 minute of RTI Interventions are occurring across grade levels each morning from 8:35 until 9:05
- Include reading targets and action steps to improve performance for all AYP groups and grade levels (e.g. CLC, Lesson Study, and PLC's)

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: | 34% (88) of students will achieve proficiency on the FCAT in Reading. This is a 4% increase from the previous year. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 30% (77) | 34% (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 | 1.1. Teacher use of higher complexity level questioning with fidelity. | 1.1. Teachers will participate in a professional development book study "Rigor is not a Four Letter Word" to develop higher level questioning. Teachers will refer to learning schedules, curricula and web based resources to identify moderate and higher level complexity for instructions and questions. | 1.1. -Teachers -Principal -Instructional coach -Leadership Team | 1.1. -Vertical and horizontal PLC's will collaborate weekly in planning, sharing, developing, and assessing the effectiveness of higher cognitive complexity activities. -Principal will monitor implementation of informal/formal focus walks, lesson plan development, grade level meeting notes, and book study. | 1.1. -Continuous Learning Cycle -Lesson Study -Lesson plan reviews -Classroom Walk-throughs -CAST -Focus Walks |
| 2 | 1.2. -Teachers lacking the necessary skills to properly address students with diagnosed processing deficiencies. | 1.2. Professional development opportunities for ESE Inclusion teachers and ESE teachers. ESE students evenly distributed between inclusion classrooms. Collaboration between district ESE support staff and school ESE support staff. Collaboration between ESE teachers and inclusion teachers on data analysis, lesson planning, and assessments. | 1.2. -Teachers -Principal -ESE teachers -ESE inclusion teachers - Guidance Counselor | 1.2. -Graph and track data to determine appropriateness of RTI interventions and ESE accommodations. - Tracking students' achievement of IEP goals. -ESE teachers tracking student progress through monthly progress monitoring notebook. | 1.2. -Progress Monitoring Notebooks - Student grades -RTI graphs -Student work -Student portfolios |
| | 1.3. The use of data driven instruction and interventions | 1.3. Teachers will participate in professional development to track | 1.3. -Teachers -Principal -Instructional | 1.3. -Vertical and horizontal PLC's will collaborate weekly in planning, | 1.3. -Book Study -Lesson plan reviews |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| 3 | <p>student data</p> <p>Teachers will refer to learning schedules, curricula and web based resources to identify data needed for instruction.</p> <p>Teachers will increase the use of technology</p> | <p>coach</p> <p>-Leadership Team</p> | <p>sharing, developing, and assessing the effectiveness of higher cognitive complexity activities.</p> <p>-Principal will monitor implementation of informal/formal focus walks, lesson plan development, grade level meeting notes, and book study.</p> | <p>-Classroom Walkthroughs</p> <p>-CAST</p> <p>-Focus Walks</p> <p>-Benchmark Tracker</p> |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|--|---|

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: | 61% (158) of students will achieve above proficiency on the FCAT in Reading. This is a 4% increase from the previous year. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 56%(143) | 61% (158) |

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 | <p>2a.1.</p> <p>-Teacher use of higher complexity level questioning with fidelity.</p> <p>-Teachers need professional development on how to address unique instructional needs of students.</p> | <p>2a.1.</p> <p>Teachers will participate in a professional development book study "Rigor is not a Four Letter Word" to develop higher level questioning.</p> <p>Teachers will refer to learning schedules, curricula and web based resources to identify moderate and higher level complexity for instructions and questions.</p> <p>District and/or Cluster Literacy Coaches to provide professional development in the instructional needs of students.</p> | <p>2a.1.</p> <p>-Teachers</p> <p>-Principal</p> <p>-Instructional coach</p> <p>-Leadership Team</p> <p>-District and/or Cluster Literacy Coaches</p> | <p>2a.1.</p> <p>-Vertical and horizontal PLC's will collaborate weekly in planning, sharing, developing, and assessing the effectiveness of higher cognitive complexity activities.</p> <p>-Principal will monitor implementation of informal/formal focus walks, lesson plan development, grade level meeting notes, CLC's, and lesson studies.</p> <p>-Documentation of students growth and progress with higher level reading comprehension skills</p> <p>District and/or Cluster Literacy Coaches will assist principal and Leadership Team in monitoring appropriate instructional practices</p> | <p>2a.1.</p> <p>-Continuous Learning Cycle</p> <p>-Book Study</p> <p>-Lesson plan reviews</p> <p>-Classroom Walk-throughs</p> <p>-CAST</p> <p>-Focus Walks</p> <p>-Reading Benchmark Assessment</p> |
| | <p>2a.2.</p> <p>-Increased number of ESE students applying for and being accepted to our school</p> | <p>2a.2.</p> <p>Professional development opportunities for ESE Inclusion teachers and ESE teachers.</p> <p>ESE students evenly distributed between</p> | <p>2a.2.</p> <p>-Teachers</p> <p>-Principal</p> <p>-Guidance Counselor</p> <p>-ESE teachers</p> <p>-ESE inclusion teachers</p> | <p>2a.2.</p> <p>-Graph and track data to determine appropriateness of RTI interventions and ESE accommodations.</p> <p>- Tracking students'</p> | <p>2a.2.</p> <p>-Progress Monitoring Notebooks</p> <p>- Student grades</p> <p>-RTI graphs</p> <p>-Student work</p> <p>-Student portfolios</p> |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 2 | | inclusion classrooms. Collaboration between district ESE support staff and school ESE support staff. Collaboration between ESE teachers and inclusion teachers on data analysis, lesson planning, and assessments. | | achievement of IEP goals. -ESE teachers tracking student progress through monthly progress monitoring notebook. | |
| 3 | 2a.3. Provide professional development and time to analyze data. | 2a.3. Review Strand data from district Reading Benchmark Assessment, FAIR testing, and previous FCAT 2.0 data to plan for instruction. Teachers will participate in professional development to analyze data of students. | 2a.3. - Teachers - Principal - Instructional coach - Leadership Team/RtI Team - Literacy Lead Teachers | 2a.3. - Review data and compare with previous assessment data sets from District Benchmarks, FCAT 2.0, and FAIR - Determine student needs and appropriate core instructional delivery. - Vertical and horizontal PLC's will collaborate weekly in planning, sharing, developing, and assessing the effectiveness of higher cognitive complexity activities. - Principal will monitor implementation of informal/formal focus walks, lesson plan development, grade level meeting notes, CLC's, and lesson studies. Refer students to Tier 2 interventions when appropriate through standard protocol or problem solving. | 2a.3. - Reading Benchmark Assessment Data, FCAT data, FAIR data - AIDE and/or Pearson Inform data (FCAT reading) Continuous Learning Cycle - Lesson Study - Lesson plan reviews - Classroom Walkthroughs - Teacher Assessment System - Focus Walks |

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: | 57% (140) of students will achieve a proficiency level of 4 or 5 on the FCAT in Reading. This is a 4% increase from the previous year. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 53%(133) | 57%(140) |

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 |
|--|---|---|--|--|---|
| | 2.1. - Teacher use of higher complexity level questioning with fidelity. | 2.1. Teachers will participate in the Continuous Learning Cycle to develop | 2.1. - Teachers - Principal - Instructional | 2.1. - Vertical and horizontal PLC's will collaborate weekly in planning, | 2.1. - Continuous Learning Cycle - Lesson Study |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| 1 | | <p>higher level questioning as a grade level.</p> <p>Teachers will refer to learning schedules, curricula and web based resources to identify moderate and higher level complexity for instructions and questions.</p> <p>-Literature Circles -Book Clubs</p> | <p>coach</p> <p>-Leadership Team -District and/or Cluster Literacy Coaches</p> | <p>sharing, developing, and assessing the effectiveness of higher cognitive complexity activities.</p> <p>-Principal will monitor implementation of informal/formal focus walks, lesson plan development, grade level meeting notes, CLC's, and lesson studies.</p> <p>-Documentation of students growth and progress with higher level reading comprehension skills</p> <p>District and/or Cluster Literacy Coaches will assist principal and Leadership Team in monitoring appropriate instructional practices</p> | <p>-Lesson plan reviews -Classroom Walk-throughs -CAST -Focus Walks -Reading Benchmark Assessment</p> |
| 2 | <p>2.2 Provide professional development and time to analyze data.</p> | <p>2.2 Review Strand data from district Reading Benchmark Assessment, FAIR testing, and previous FCAT data to plan for instruction.</p> <p>Teachers will participate in the Continuous Learning Cycle to analyze data of students.</p> | <p>2.2</p> <p>-Teachers -Principal -Instructional coach -Leadership Team/RtI Team -Literacy Lead Teachers</p> | <p>2.2</p> <p>-Review data and compare with previous assessment data sets from District Benchmarks, FCAT, and FAIR</p> <p>-Determine student needs and appropriate core instructional delivery.</p> <p>-Vertical and horizontal PLC's will collaborate weekly in planning, sharing, developing, and assessing the effectiveness of higher cognitive complexity activities.</p> <p>-Principal will monitor implementation of informal/formal focus walks, lesson plan development, grade level meeting notes, CLC's, and lesson studies.</p> <p>Refer students to Tier 2 interventions when appropriate through standard protocol or problem solving.</p> | <p>2.2</p> <p>-Reading Benchmark Assessment Data, FCAT data, FAIR data -Pearson Inform data (FCAT reading) Continuous Learning Cycle -Lesson Study -Lesson plan reviews -Classroom Walkthroughs -CAST -Focus Walks</p> |

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| 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: | |
| <p>2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading.</p> <p>Reading Goal #2b:</p> | |
| 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: | 79 % (137) of students will make learning gains on the FCAT in Reading. This is a 2% increase from the previous year. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 77% (133) | 79% (137) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| 1 | 3.1. -Teacher use of higher complexity level questioning with fidelity. Teacher use of vocabulary lessons across curricula | 3.1. Teachers will participate in the Continuous Learning Cycle to develop higher level questioning as a grade level. Teachers will increase use of vocabulary lessons, and increase assessments. Teachers will refer to learning schedules, curricula and web based resources to identify moderate and higher level complexity for instructions and questions | 3.1. -Teachers -Principal -Instructional coach -Leadership Team -School Technology Coordinators | 3.1. -Vertical and horizontal PLC's will collaborate weekly in planning, sharing, developing, and assessing the effectiveness of higher cognitive complexity activities. -Principal will monitor implementation of informal/formal focus walks, lesson plan development, grade level meeting notes, PLC's, and lesson studies. | 3.1. -Continuous Learning Cycle -Lesson Study -Lesson plan reviews -Classroom Walk-throughs -CAST -Focus Walks |
| 2 | 3.2. -Teachers using best instructional practices with fidelity. Teachers using guided reading with fidelity Access to various author study text | 3.2. Implement Author Studies to engage students in authentic literacy tasks. Teachers will observe colleagues modeling workshop format. Teacher-student conferencing designed to achieve student goals based on the data received from DRA2, FAIR, and Benchmark data Leadership team will | 3.2. -Teachers -Principal -Instructional coach -Leadership Team | 3.2. -Documentation of students' growth and progress on authentic literacy tasks Principal will monitor implementation of informal/formal focus walks, lesson plan development, and grade level meeting notes. | 3.2. -Reading Benchmark Assessments -Walkthrough checklist -Teacher self-reflections or self-assessments -Classroom walkthroughs |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|---|
| | | <p>conduct walkthroughs to view evidence of workshop model.</p> <p>Principal will conduct walkthroughs to view evidence of workshop model.</p> <p>Teachers will observe peer teachers modeling guided reading across grade levels</p> | | | |
| 3 | 3.3. -The use of data driven instruction and interventions | <p>3.3. Teachers will participate in the Continuous Learning Cycle to analyze data of students.</p> <p>Teachers will refer to learning schedules, curricula and web based resources to identify data needed for instruction.</p> <p>Implement Instructional Focus Calendar (FCIM) and Readers Workshop with fidelity to improve student achievement on reading benchmarks.</p> | <p>3.3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teachers - Principal - Instructional coach - Leadership Team | <p>3.3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Create and monitor FCIM through the leadership team and grade levels - Vertical and horizontal PLC's will collaborate weekly in planning, sharing, developing, and assessing the effectiveness of higher cognitive complexity activities. - Document student growth and performance - Principal will monitor implementation of informal/formal focus walks, lesson plan development, grade level meeting notes, CLC's, and lesson studies. | <p>3.3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Continuous Learning Cycle - Lesson Study - Lesson plan reviews - Classroom Walkthroughs - CAST - Focus Walks - Quarterly data meetings with Principal - 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:

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| 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. | 83 % (37) of bottom quartile students will make gains on the FCAT in Reading. This is a 2% increase from the previous |
|---|---|

| | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Reading Goal #4: | year. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 81% (24) | 83 % (37) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|--|--|---|
| 1 | <p>4.1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -New teachers need training on administering the DRA2 Word Analysis -Teacher use of higher complexity level questioning with fidelity. <p>Teachers use of vocabulary lessons</p> | <p>4.1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Utilize Word Analysis (DRA2) Assessment tasks to determine reading deficiencies and instruction needed by students in the 25% and below quartile -Teachers will participate in the Continuous Learning Cycle and Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) to develop higher level questioning as a grade level.. -Teachers will refer to learning schedules, curricula and web based resources to identify moderate and higher level complexity for instructions and questions. <p>Teaches will increase vocabulary lessons</p> | <p>4.1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Teachers -Principal -Instructional coach -Leadership Team | <p>4.1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Vertical and horizontal PLC's will collaborate weekly in planning, sharing, developing, and assessing the effectiveness of higher cognitive complexity activities. -Principal will monitor implementation of informal/formal focus walks, lesson plan development, grade level meeting notes, CLC's, and lesson studies. | <p>4.1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Continuous Learning Cycle -Lesson Study -Lesson plan reviews -Classroom Walk-throughs -CAST -Focus Walks -Benchmark Data, FCAT data, FAIR and DRA2 data, PMA data FCAT Results |
| 2 | <p>4.2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Teachers using best instructional practices with fidelity. | <p>4.2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Teachers will observe colleagues modeling workshop format. -Leadership team will conduct walkthroughs to view evidence of workshop model. -Principal will conduct walkthroughs to view evidence of workshop model. -Provide Tier 2/Tier 3 Interventions for students not responding to core instructional practices. Supplemental instruction will include reading support services during the school day and tutoring outside the school day | <p>4.2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Teachers -Principal -Instructional coach -Leadership Team -Leadership/RTI Team -Classroom teachers -Tutoring teachers | <p>4.2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Principal will monitor implementation of informal/formal focus walks, lesson plan development, and grade level meeting notes. -Identify students -Design instruction to meet each student's needs -Assess weekly -Flexibly group students based on needs and achievement | <p>4.2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Walkthrough checklist -Teacher self-reflections or self-assessments -Classroom walkthroughs -FCAT Results -Benchmark Data results -Scheduled time for RTI Interventions -Scheduled time for RTI data analyses and planning |
| | <p>4.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The use of data driven instruction and interventions | <p>4.3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Teachers will participate in the Continuous Learning Cycle to analyze data of students. | <p>4.3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Teachers -Principal -Instructional coach | <p>4.3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Vertical and horizontal PLC's will collaborate weekly in planning, sharing, developing, and | <p>4.3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Continuous Learning Cycle -Lesson Study -Lesson plan |

| | | | | |
|---|--|------------------|---|--|
| 3 | <p>-Teachers will participate in a Lesson Course Study to determine the needs of students based on data.</p> <p>-Teachers will refer to learning schedules, curricula and web based resources to identify data needed for instruction.</p> | -Leadership Team | <p>assessing the effectiveness of higher cognitive complexity activities.</p> <p>-Principal will monitor implementation of informal/formal focus walks, lesson plan development, grade level meeting notes, CLC's, and lesson studies</p> | <p>reviews</p> <p>- Classroom Walkthroughs</p> <p>- CAST</p> <p>- Focus Walks</p> <p>- Benchmark and FCAT data</p> |
|---|--|------------------|---|--|

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 # Pine Forest AMO Reading goal is to increase proficiency from 74% to 86%. 5A : | | | | | |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | 73 | 76 | 78 | 81 | 83 | |

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: | <p>The White subgroup will increase from 81% to 88% proficiency.</p> <p>58% (48) Blacks met the satisfactory proficiency in Reading. This year our goal is to have 86% (68) Black students make satisfactory progress in reading.</p> |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Black: 58%(47) White: 81% (107) | Black: 86% (68) White: 88% (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 | 5B.1. Weak skills in reading. Lack of background knowledge and vocabulary acquisition | 5B.1. - Increase home/ school connections/Launch Night - Explicit Vocabulary and building background knowledge - Arts teachers need to expand multicultural instructional lessons - Implementation of school wide benchmarks students have not mastered Exposition Form | 5B.1. Classroom Teacher Instructional Coach ESE Teachers | 5B.1. Ongoing assessments utilized throughout the quarter from the Reading Series Ongoing Observation of student performance in guided reading groups and independent reading times | 5B.1. DRA II's F.A.I.R. Benchmark Tests Core selected reading tests FCAT 2.0 Results |
| | 5B.2. Weak skills in reading. | 5B.2. - Increase home/ school connections | 5B.2. Classroom Teacher | 5B.2. Ongoing assessments utilized throughout the | 5B.2. DRA II's |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|------------------------------------|--|---|
| 2 | Lack of background knowledge and vocabulary acquisition | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Explicit Vocabulary and building background knowledge -Arts teachers need to expand multicultural instructional lessons -Implementation of school wide benchmarks students have not mastered Exposition Form Extended Reading Time RTI | Instructional Coach VE Teachers | quarter from the Reading Series Ongoing Observation of student performance in guided reading groups and independent reading times | F.A.I.R. Series Benchmark Tests Core selected reading tests FCAT Results |
| 3 | 5B.3. Enrich background knowledge and increase complex vocabulary | 5B.3. Higher level read alouds in addition to higher order questioning and enriched vocabulary instruction | 5B.3. Principal Classroom Teachers | 5B.3. RtI/FCIM data | 5B.3. Pre and Post tests Tracking Instruments at the beginning, midpoint and end of the school year FCAT Scores |

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

| | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C: | |
| 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 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 |
| 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:

| | |
|---|---|
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E: | This past school year, 55% (45) of the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup did not make progress. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 55% (45) | 45% (23) |

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 | 5E.1. Parents unaware of how to help their children | 5E.1. Partner with the school's PTA to present quality afterschool learning activities (math, reading and writing), in which parents and children can attend | 5E.1. PTA President Classroom Teachers Team Up Coordinator Instructional Coach | 5E.1. Evaluations completed at the end of events Implementation of skills learned in the classroom setting | 5E.1. Observation in the classroom setting Completed Evaluation by the parents determining the effectiveness of the workshops presented |
| 2 | 5E.2. Enrich background knowledge and increase complex vocabulary | 5E.2. Higher level read alouds in addition to higher order questioning and enriched vocabulary instruction Team Up Tutoring | 5E.2. Principal Classroom Teachers Team Up Coordinator Team Up Tutors | 5E.2. Data tracking by Team Up RtI/FCIM data | 5E.2. Pre and Post tests Tracking Instruments at the beginning, midpoint and end of the school year FCAT 2.0 Scores |

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

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

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

| | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|--|
| Day training on data analysis/ Reading Workshop Model | K-5 | Principal/ Instructional Coach | School wide | Early Release Days | Progress Monitoring Notebooks Exposition Forms | Teachers, Principal |
| Continuous Learning Cycle | 1st and 2nd | Principal/ Instructional Coach | 1st & 2nd Grade Teaches | Selected Dates | CLC data | Teachers, Principal, Instructional Coach |
| RTI training | K-5 | Guidance Counselor | School wide | Early Release Days Monthly WOW's Grade Level common Planning | RTI graphs and charts | Teachers, Principal, Guidance Counselor |

Reading Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|--|--|---|------------------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Utilizing the Houghton Mifflin Reading Series with full implementation | District's Reading CORE | District Funded | \$0.00 |
| Utilize Soar to Success with struggling readers in grades KG – 5th | Reading component for struggling readers that are classified as Tier III students RTI Team Up grades K-5 | District Funded Team Up (Wayman Academy Budget) | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Diagnostic Test to determine a child's readability level | F.A.I.R. | State Funded | \$0.00 |
| Activities to increase readability and comprehension levels at all ages | FCRR Activities (Components of F.A.I.R.) FCAT Explorer | State/ District Funded | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Professional Development opportunities every 9 weeks WOW Wednesdays with Instructional Coach. | Appropriate materials available for all classroom instructors | District Funded | \$0.00 |
| Developing an understanding of content and reading skills through higher level questions that are differentiated for all leveled learners | Instructional Coach and District Literacy Coach | District Funded | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Students will participate in hands on enrichment activities throughout the school on various levels. Incentive for 25 Book (1,000,000 word campaign) challenge | 1 Bike per Grade Level | PTA Funded Internally Funded PTA Donations of Materials | \$800.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$800.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$800.00 |

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.

CELLA Goal #1:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.

2. Students scoring proficient in reading.

CELLA Goal #2:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

CELLA Budget:

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

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: | 42% (109) of students will achieve proficiency on the FCAT in Math. This is a 4% increase from the previous year. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 38% (97) | 42% (109) |

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 | <p>1.1. -Teachers balancing the implementation of, Math Investigations and Envisions</p> <p>-Teachers are implementing the New Generation Sunshine State Standards for math. (Common Core)</p> <p>-Teacher use of higher complexity level questioning with fidelity.</p> | <p>1.1. -Implement Core Instruction with Fidelity: Calendar Math, Envisions, Math Investigations II</p> <p>-Teachers will refer to learning schedules, curricula and web based resources to identify moderate and higher level complexity for instructions and questions through differentiated instruction.</p> | <p>1.1. -Teachers -Principal -Instructional coach -Leadership Team -Math Lead Teachers on each grade level</p> | <p>1.1. -Principal will monitor Lesson Plans with unpacked benchmarks worksheets attached</p> <p>-Professional Development on unpacking standards.</p> <p>-Monitor and observe implementation of standards based instruction and fidelity of core programs</p> <p>-Conduct focus walks, classroom observations, provide feedback to teachers on implementation of core programs. and conduct data review meetings.</p> <p>-Vertical and horizontal PLC's will collaborate weekly in planning, sharing, developing, and assessing the effectiveness of higher cognitive complexity activities.</p> <p>-Principal will monitor implementation of informal/formal focus walks, lesson plan development, grade level meeting notes, CLC's, and lesson studies.</p> | <p>1.1. -Book Study -Lesson plan reviews -Classroom Walk-throughs -CAST -Focus Walks -Math Quick Peek Focus Walks -Math Portfolios/Student Work Samples -Quarterly Data Review Meetings -Pearson Inform Data</p> |
| | <p>1.2 Teachers lack of understanding of intervention for our increasing ESE population and below proficiency students</p> | <p>1.2. -Professional development opportunities for ESE Inclusion teachers and ESE teachers. ESE students evenly</p> | <p>1.2. -Teachers -Principal -ESE teachers -ESE inclusion teachers</p> | <p>1.2 -Graph and track data to determine appropriateness of RTI interventions and ESE accommodations.</p> | <p>1.2. -Progress Monitoring Notebooks -Student grades -RTI graphs -Student work</p> |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| 2 | | <p>distributed between inclusion classrooms.</p> <p>-Collaboration between district ESE support staff and school ESE support staff.</p> <p>-Improve teacher pedagogy and methodology: Implement in-depth vocabulary development</p> <p>Implement reading strategies to increase content-knowledge teacher</p> <p>Utilize manipulative and incorporate hands-on activities to promote performance-based instruction</p> <p>Quality visual strategy charges and graphic organizers</p> | | <p>- Tracking students' achievement of IEP goals.</p> <p>-ESE teachers tracking student progress through monthly progress monitoring notebook.</p> <p>-Teachers will model and observe quality instruction.</p> | <p>- Student portfolios</p> <p>-Quick Peeks Focus Walks</p> |
| 3 | <p>1.3. - The consistent use of data driven instruction and interventions that are aligned with the district's curricula and learning schedules.</p> <p>-Benchmark data results must be received in a timely manner and report formats must be user friendly and easy to read.</p> | <p>1.3. Teachers will refer to learning schedules, curricula and web based resources to identify data needed for instruction.</p> <p>-Analyze 2012 FCAT 2.0 data, 2012 Fall Benchmark data, and Calendar Math Fall Assessment to plan and deliver differentiated instruction in the Math Workshop</p> | <p>1.3. - Teachers -Principal -Instructional coach -Leadership Team -Math Lead Teachers</p> | <p>1.3. -Vertical and horizontal PLC's will collaborate weekly in planning, sharing, developing, and assessing the effectiveness of higher cognitive complexity activities.</p> <p>-Principal will monitor implementation of informal/formal focus walks, lesson plan development, grade level meeting notes, CLC's, and lesson studies.</p> <p>-Grade level and Leadership Team analyses of data monthly via Progress Monitoring Notebooks</p> | <p>1.3 - Book Study - Lesson plan reviews - Classroom Walk-throughs - CAST - Focus Walks - Quarterly Data Review Meetings FCAT Results</p> |

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: | 50% (130) of students will achieve above proficiency on the FCAT in Math. This is a 4% increase from the previous year. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 46% (117) | 50% (130) |

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 use of higher complexity level questioning with fidelity. | 2a.1. Teachers will refer to learning schedules, curricula and web based resources to identify moderate and higher level complexity for instructions and questions. | 2a.1. -Teachers -Principal -Instructional coach -Leadership Team | 2a.1. -Vertical and horizontal PLC's will collaborate weekly in planning, sharing, developing, and assessing the effectiveness of higher cognitive complexity activities. -Principal will monitor implementation of informal/formal focus walks, lesson plan development, grade level meeting notes, CLC's, and lesson studies. -Conduct grade level observations, reviews, and meetings to ensure all requirements are being met. | 2a.1. -Book Study -Lesson plan reviews -Classroom Walk-throughs -CAST -Focus Walks -Quarterly Data Meetings |
| 2 | 2a.2. -Teachers lacking necessary skills to assist students with processing deviancies. | 2a.2. Professional development opportunities for ESE Inclusion teachers and ESE teachers. ESE students evenly distributed between inclusion classrooms. Collaboration between district ESE support staff and school ESE support staff. | 2a.2. -Teachers -Principal -ESE teachers -ESE inclusion teachers -Guidance Counselor | 2a.2. -Graph and track data to determine appropriateness of RTI interventions and ESE accommodations. - Tracking students' achievement of IEP goals. -ESE teachers tracking student progress through monthly progress monitoring notebook. | 2a.2. -Progress Monitoring Notebooks -Student grades -RtI graphs -Student work -Student portfolios |

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: | 79% (205) of students will make gains on the FCAT in Math. This is a 2% increase from the previous year. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 77% (195) | 79% (205) |

| 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 -Teachers using best instructional practices. | 3a.1 -Teachers will observe colleagues modeling workshop format. -Leadership team will conduct walkthroughs to view evidence of workshop model. -Principal will conduct walkthroughs to view evidence of workshop model. | 3a.1 -Teachers -Principal -Instructional coach -Leadership Team -Math Lead Teachers | 3a.1 -Principal will monitor implementation of informal/formal focus walks, lesson plan development, and grade level meeting notes. | 3a.1 -Walkthrough checklist -Teacher self-reflections or self-assessments -classroom walkthroughs |
| 2 | 3a.2 -The use of data driven instruction and interventions. | 3a.2 -Teachers will participate in the Continuous Learning Cycle to analyze data of students. -- Teachers will refer to learning schedules, curricula and web based resources to identify data needed for instruction. -Data from the District | 3a.2 -Teachers -Principal -Instructional coach -Leadership Team/RTI Team -Math Lead | 3a.2 -Vertical and horizontal PLC's will collaborate weekly in planning, sharing, developing, and assessing the effectiveness of higher cognitive complexity activities. -Principal will monitor implementation of informal/formal focus | 3a.2 -Book Study -Lesson plan reviews -Classroom Walk-throughs -CAST -Focus Walks -Samples of student work RTI meetings/data collection FCIM data (Florida |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| | | Benchmark assessments and will be used to plan and deliver differentiated instruction -Utilize RTI to monitor students and provide appropriate Tier II and Tier III interventions. | | walks, lesson plan development, grade level meeting notes, CLC's, and lesson studies. -RTI team will conduct training for faculty and staff and identify standard and problem solving protocol for math interventions. | Achieves) |
| 3 | 3a.3 -Teacher use of higher complexity level questioning with fidelity. -Teachers are learning to balance the new curriculum between Math Investigations 2.0 and Envisions | 3a.3 -Teachers will participate in the Continuous Learning Cycle to develop higher level questioning as a grade level. -Teachers will refer to learning schedules, curricula and web based resources to identify moderate and higher level complexity for instructions and questions. -All students in grades 3-5 will participate in Math Investigations lessons using hands-on math activities and using math tools to actively engage in problem solving daily. Lesson planning and instruction will be delivered using Math Workshop Model and will be differentiated based on students' needs. | 3a.3 -Teachers -Principal -Instructional coach -Leadership Team -Math Lead Teachers | 3a.3 -Vertical and horizontal PLC's will collaborate weekly in planning, sharing, developing, and assessing the effectiveness of higher cognitive complexity activities. -Principal will monitor implementation of informal/formal focus walks, lesson plan development, grade level meeting notes, CLC's, and lesson studies. -Math Investigations Observations (CWT) -Conduct grade level observations, reviews, and meetings to ensure all requirements are being met. Collecting data via CWT forms and Problems of the Day | 3a.3 -Book Study -Lesson plan reviews -Classroom Walk-throughs -CAST -Focus Walks -Monthly Progress Monitoring Forms Calendar Math materials -Benchmark Assessment 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 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: | 76% (35) of students will make gains on the FCAT in Math. This is a 2% increase from the previous year. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 74%(22) | 76% (35) |

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 -The use of data driven instruction and interventions Time in schedule to implement and teacher's lack of understanding of FCIM | 4a.1 Teachers will participate in the Continuous Learning Cycle to analyze data of students. Teachers will refer to learning schedules, curricula and web based resources to identify data needed for instruction. Teachers will infuse math academic vocabulary and present concept maps in mathematics during math instruction -Teachers will develop and implement FCIM focus lessons on benchmarks students have not mastered. -Teachers will differentiate instruction based on data results and students' needs. - Identified students will be invited to attend Team Up tutoring and Saturday School sessions for identified strands in need of improvement | 4a.1 -Teachers -Principal -Instructional coach -Leadership Team -Math Lead Teachers Conduct grade level observations, reviews, and meetings to ensure all requirements are being met. Collect data via CWT forms --Math Lead Teachers -Principal -Math Lead Teachers | 4a.1 -Vertical and horizontal PLC's will collaborate weekly in planning, sharing, developing, and assessing the effectiveness of higher cognitive complexity activities. -Principal will monitor implementation of informal/formal focus walks, lesson plan development, grade level meeting notes, CLC's, and lesson studies. -Provide training for teachers for assisting students with written math solutions. -Provide training to teachers on utilizing the FCIM (Florida Achieves) -Review data with teachers and students. -Identify students in need of additional instruction for after school Team Up tutoring and Saturday School | 4a.1 -Book Study -Lesson plan reviews -Classroom Walk-throughs -CAST -Focus Walks -Monthly Progress Monitoring Forms -Calendar math Assessment Data -Quarterly Data meetings with the Principal -Review of Florida Achieves Data to determine student progress -Monitor student progress in safety net programs |
| 2 | 4a.2 - Teachers using best instructional practices, like the workshop model, with fidelity. | 4a.2 Teachers will observe colleagues modeling workshop format. Leadership team will conduct walkthroughs to view evidence of workshop model. Principal will conduct walkthroughs to view evidence of workshop model. | 4a.2 - Teachers -Principal -Instructional coach -Leadership Team | 4a.2 -Principal will monitor implementation of informal/formal focus walks, lesson plan development, and grade level meeting notes. | 4a.2 - Walkthrough checklist - Teacher self-reflections or self-assessments - Classroom walkthroughs |
| | 4a.3 -Teacher use of higher complexity level questioning with fidelity. Student lack of computational fluency | 4a.3 -Teachers will participate in the Continuous Learning Cycle to develop higher level questioning as a grade level. | 4a.3 - Teachers -Principal -Instructional coach -Leadership Team | 4a.3 -Vertical and horizontal PLC's will collaborate weekly in planning, sharing, developing, and assessing the effectiveness of higher | 4a.3 -Book Study -Lesson plan reviews -Classroom Walk-throughs -CAST |

| | | | | |
|---|------------------|---|---|--------------|
| 3 | and basic skills | -Teachers will refer to learning schedules, curricula and web based resources to identify moderate and higher level complexity for instructions and questions. Use of Destination Success Math Foundations Training | cognitive complexity activities. -Principal will monitor implementation of informal/formal focus walks, lesson plan development, grade level meeting notes, CLC's, and lesson studies. | -Focus Walks |
|---|------------------|---|---|--------------|

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 # By 2013,72% of all students will make satisfactory progress in Mathematics. | | | | |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | 69% | 72% | 75% | 77% | 80% | |

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: | 51% (23) of Economically Disadvantage Students did not make satisfactory progress in Math. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| BLACK 51% (42)did not make satisfactory progress | BLACK 42%(36)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 | 5B.1. Weak skills in reading. Lack of background knowledge and vocabulary acquisition | 5B.1. -Increase home/ school connections/Launch Night -Explicit Vocabulary and building background knowledge -Arts teachers need to expand multicultural instructional lessons -Implementation of school wide benchmarks students have not mastered Exposition Form | 5B.1. Classroom Teacher Instructional Coach ESE Teachers | 5B.1. Ongoing assessments utilized throughout the quarter from the Reading Series Ongoing Observation of student performance in guided reading groups and independent reading times | 5B.1. DRA II's F.A.I.R. Benchmark Tests Core selected reading tests FCAT 2.0 Results |
| | 5b.1. Students lack of | 5b.1 -Differentiated | 5b.1 -Teachers | 5b.1 -Vertical and horizontal | 5b.1 -Student portfolio |

2

background knowledge and understanding of math vocabulary.

instruction is based on students' readiness and provides knowledge needed.

-Students will be provide intensive small group instruction.

-Adult mentors will help provide background knowledge.

-Provide professional development on the unique instructional needs of students who are black.

RTI

The school must implement Florida's Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM). The school will develop and implement a comprehensive FCIM model which includes an FCIM calendar, FCIM focus lessons (mini-lessons on tested benchmarks), curriculum pacing guide, and progress monitoring data collection/analysis schedule (FCIM implemented with subgroups not making AYP)

-Mentors
-Principal

-District trainers
-Principal
-District Instructional Math Coach

PLC's will collaborate weekly in planning, sharing, developing, and assessing the effectiveness of higher cognitive complexity activities.

-Leadership team analyzing data from progress monitoring notebooks and monitoring student progress.

-Focus Walks to analyze implementation of best instructional practices
-On-going analyses of data to ensure current instructional needs of students are being met.

-Student self-assessments
-Student journals
-Benchmark assessment data
-Monthly Progress Monitoring Forms
-Benchmark tracking form

3

5b.2.
-The consistent use of data driven instruction and interventions that are aligned with the district's curricula and learning schedules.

5b.2.
-Pearson Inform data management systems will be used to assist teachers in instructional planning and in identifying students in this subgroup.

-Recommend students to attend safety net programs (e.g. Team Up after school tutoring and Saturday School)

-Teachers will participate in the Continuous Learning Cycle, PLC's, and collaboratively planning for instruction and assessment.

-Teachers will refer to learning schedules, curricula and web based resources to identify best instructional practices.

-Teachers will be provided support via professional development and from district coaches in implementation of best instructional practices.

-Implement FCIM

5b.2.
-Teachers
-Principal
-Instructional coach
-Leadership Team
-Math Lead Teachers
-District Math Coach

5b.2.
-Present Pearson Inform data to teachers and monitor use of data.

-Monitor use of DOK/FCAT Item Specifications in instruction

-Monthly Progress Monitoring Forms will be analyzed by Leadership Team and grade levels

-Vertical and horizontal PLC's will collaborate weekly in planning, sharing, developing, and assessing the effectiveness of higher cognitive complexity activities.

-Principal will monitor implementation of informal/formal focus walks, lesson plan development, grade level meeting notes, CLC's, and lesson studies.

-District math coach will collaborate with school administration, math lead teachers, and other PLC's in assessing and

5b.2.
-Book Study
-Lesson plan reviews
-Classroom Walk-throughs
-CAST
-Focus Walks
-Evidence of appropriate math artifacts in each classroom
-Monthly Progress Monitoring Forms
-Pre-post assessments, Benchmark results, PMA results, FCAT results

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|---|
| | | | | developing instruction and appropriate use of district curricula. -Principal will review Instructional Focus Calendars and Focus Lessons | |
| 4 | 5b.3 -Teachers using best instructional practices, with fidelity. -New Generation Sunshine State Standards/Common Core | 5b.3 -Teachers will observe colleagues modeling workshop format. -Leadership team will conduct walkthroughs to view evidence of workshop model. -Principal will conduct walkthroughs to view evidence of workshop model. -Professional development on NGSSS and FCAT Item Specifications will be used to clarify skills needed to be taught per benchmark assessed on the FCAT -Teachers will unpack standards for each new curricular module and align with FCAT Item Specifications | 5b.3 -Teachers -Principal -Instructional coach -Leadership Team -District Math Coach | 5b.3 -Principal will monitor implementation of informal/formal focus walks, lesson plan development, and grade level meeting notes. -Principal will monitor that unpacking standards worksheets are attached to lesson plans | 5b.3 -Walk-through checklist -Teacher self-reflections or self-assessments -classroom walk-throughs -Evidence of appropriate math artifacts in each classroom (math journals, portfolios, strategy charts, word wall) -CAST -Lesson Plans -Quarterly Data Meetings -Benchmark data reviewed fall, winter and spring |

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: | | | | |
| 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 subgroup:

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics 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 |
| 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:

| | |
|--|---|
| E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E: | This past school year, the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup did not earn AYP in the area of Math. 27% (11) made AYP last year. This year, our goal is set at 86% (49). |
|--|---|

| | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 27% (11) | 86% (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 | <p>5E.1 - Teachers using best instructional practices, with fidelity.</p> <p>- New Generation Sunshine State Standards</p> | <p>5E.1 - Teachers will observe colleagues modeling workshop format.</p> <p>- Leadership team will conduct walkthroughs to view evidence of workshop model.</p> <p>- Principal will conduct walkthroughs to view evidence of workshop model.</p> <p>- Professional development on NGSSS and FCAT Item Specifications will be used to clarify skills needed to be taught per benchmark assessed on the FCAT</p> <p>- Students will complete benchmark assessments using the Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM)</p> <p>- Recommend students to attend safety net programs (e.g. Team Up</p> | <p>5E.1 - Teachers - Principal - Instructional coach - Leadership Team - District Math Coach</p> | <p>5E.1 - Principal will monitor implementation of informal/formal focus walks, lesson plan development, and grade level meeting notes.</p> <p>- Principal will monitor that unpacking standards worksheets are attached to lesson plans</p> | <p>5E.1 - Walk-through checklist - Teacher self-reflections or self-assessments - classroom walk-throughs - Evidence of appropriate math artifacts in each classroom (math journals, portfolios, strategy charts, word wall) - CAST - Lesson Plans - Quarterly Data Meetings - Benchmark data reviewed fall, winter and spring</p> |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|---|
| | | <p>after school tutoring and Saturday School)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Teachers will participate in the Continuous Learning Cycle, PLC's, and collaboratively planning for instruction and assessment. -Teachers will refer to learning schedules, curricula and web based resources to identify best instructional practices. -Teachers will be provided support via professional development and from district coaches in implementation of best instructional practices. | | | |
| 2 | <p>5E.2. Students lack of background knowledge and understanding of math vocabulary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Teachers lack of differentiated instruction | <p>5E.2. Differentiated instruction is based on students' readiness and provides knowledge needed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Students will be provide intensive small group instruction. -Adult mentors will help provide background knowledge | <p>5E.2. Teachers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Mentors -Principal -District trainers -Principal -District Instructional Math Coach | <p>5E.2. Vertical and horizontal PLC's will collaborate weekly in planning, sharing, developing, and assessing the effectiveness of higher cognitive complexity activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Leadership team analyzing data from progress monitoring notebooks and monitoring student progress. -Focus Walks to analyze implementation of best instructional practices -On-going analyses of data to ensure current instructional needs of students are being met. | <p>5E.2. Student portfolio</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Student self-assessments -Student journals -Benchmark assessment data -Monthly Progress Monitoring Forms -AYP tracking form |
| | <p>5E.3. The consistent use of data driven instruction and interventions that are aligned with the district's curricula and learning schedules.</p> | <p>5E.3. Pearson Inform data management systems will be used to assist teachers in instructional planning and in identifying students in this subgroup.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) will be implemented Economically Disadvantaged Subgroups -Recommend students to attend safety net programs (e.g. Team Up after school tutoring and Saturday School) -Teachers will participate in PLC's and collaboratively planning for instruction and assessment. -Teachers will refer to learning schedules, curricula and web based | <p>5E.3. Teachers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Principal -Instructional coach -Leadership Team -Math Lead Teachers -District Math Coach | <p>5E.3. Vertical and horizontal PLC's will collaborate weekly in planning, sharing, developing, and assessing the effectiveness of higher cognitive complexity activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Leadership team analyzing data from progress monitoring notebooks and monitoring student progress. -Focus Walks to analyze implementation of best instructional practices -On-going analyses of data to ensure current instructional needs of students are being met. -Present Pearson Inform data to teachers and monitor use of data. -Monitor use of DOK/FCAT Item Specifications in | <p>5E.3. Student portfolio</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Student self-assessments -Student journals -Benchmark assessment data -Monthly Progress Monitoring Forms -AYP tracking form |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|
| 3 | | <p>resources to identify best instructional practices.</p> <p>-Teachers will be provided support via professional development and from district coaches in implementation of best instructional practices.</p> | <p>instruction</p> <p>-Monthly Progress Monitoring Forms will be analyzed by Leadership Team and grade levels</p> <p>-Vertical and horizontal PLC's will collaborate weekly in planning, sharing, developing, and assessing the effectiveness of higher cognitive complexity activities.</p> <p>-Principal will monitor implementation of informal/formal focus walks, lesson plan development, grade level meeting notes, CLC's, and lesson studies.</p> <p>-District math coach will collaborate with school administration, math lead teachers, and other PLC's in assessing and developing instruction and appropriate use of district curricula.</p> <p>-Principal will review Instructional Focus Calendars and Focus Lessons</p> | |
|---|--|--|---|--|

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 Curriculum/Academic Training/Foundation of Math | K-5 | District Coaches | School Wide | According to District Workshop Schedule | Principal will observe teaching episodes reflective knowledge and skills acquired by the teachers following each professional development session. | Principal |
| NGSSS, Common Core Standards | K-5 | Principal, Instructional Coach, District Coaches | School wide | Monthly WOW's | Principal will observe teaching episodes reflective knowledge and skills acquired by the teachers following each professional development session Principal will monitor Lesson Plans for implementation with fidelity | Principal |
| RtI training | K-5 | Guidance Counselor | School wide | Early Release Days Monthly WOW's Grade Level common | RtI graphs and charts | RtI graphs and charts |

| | | | | | | |
|---|-----|--------------------------------|-------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|
| Early Release Day training on data analysis | K-5 | Principal/ Instructional Coach | School wide | Planning Early Release Days | Progress Monitoring Notebooks, | Teachers, Principal |
|---|-----|--------------------------------|-------------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------|

Mathematics Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|--|---|--------------------------|---------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Continue implementing Envisions Math Series effectively and with fidelity | EnVisions (The district's adopted math CORE) | District Funded | \$0.00 |
| Continue implementing Math Investigations Series effectively and with fidelity | Implementing all phases (Launch, Work time and Closure) within the math block for effective instruction | District Funded | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Software that is utilized for math practice for performers of all levels | FCAT Explorer (5th grade only) Destination Success (3rd and 4th) Gizmos | District Funded | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Unpacking math standards to better understand what's being taught | Principal and District Math Coach | District Funded and Fund | \$0.00 |
| Continue utilizing the state approved math CORE with fidelity | Principal, District Math Coach and Academy of Math Participants | District Funded and Fund | \$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: | 55% (47) of students will achieve proficiency on the FCAT in Science. This is a 2% increase from the previous year. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 53% (45) | 55% (47) |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | |
| | Person or Process Used to |

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Position Responsible for Monitoring | Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| 1 | 1a.1. -Teacher use of higher complexity level questioning with fidelity. | 1a.1. Teachers will refer to learning schedules, curricula and web based resources to identify moderate and higher level complexity for instructions and questions through differentiated instruction. | 1a.1. -Teachers -Principal -Instructional coach -Leadership Team | 1a.1. -Vertical and horizontal PLC's will collaborate weekly in planning, sharing, developing, and assessing the effectiveness of higher cognitive complexity activities. -Principal will monitor implementation of informal/formal focus walks, lesson plan development, grade level meeting notes, and lesson studies. | 1a.1. -Lesson Study -Lesson plan reviews -Classroom Walk-throughs -CAST -Focus Walks |
| 2 | 1a.2. -Consistent use of the 5 E's (Engage, explore, explain, extend, evaluate) with fidelity. | 1a.2. Teachers will provide hands on instructional activities aligned with the NGSSS/Common Core Standards | 1a.2. Principal Instructional Coach Science Lead Teachers | 1a.2. Core Curriculum will be implemented with fidelity and monitored by the principal utilizing informal walk-throughs. | 1a.2. -Science Journal -Progress Monitoring Notebooks -Benchmarks |
| 3 | 1a.3. - The consistent use of data driven instruction and interventions that are aligned with the district's curricula and learning schedules. | 1a.3. Grade Level collaboration | 1a.3. -Teachers -Principal -Instructional coach -Leadership Team | 1a.3. -Vertical and horizontal PLC's will collaborate weekly in planning, sharing, developing, and assessing the effectiveness of higher cognitive complexity activities. -Principal will monitor implementation of informal/formal focus walks, lesson plan development, grade level meeting notes, and lesson studies. | 1a.3. -Lesson Study -Lesson plan reviews -Classroom Walk-throughs --Focus Walks -CAST |

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: | Science Goal #2a: 12% (10) of students will achieve above proficiency on the FCAT in Reading. This is a 2% increase from the previous year. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 10% (12) | 12% (10) |

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 use of higher complexity level questioning with fidelity. -Lack of exposure to scientific thinking activities | 2a.1. Teachers will refer to learning schedules, curricula and web based resources to identify moderate and higher level complexity for instructions and questions through differentiated instruction. -Implement the 5E's Lesson planning and delivery model. -Increase hands-on activities and experiments | 2a.1. - Teachers -Principal -Instructional coach -Leadership Team | 2a.1. -Vertical and horizontal PLC's will collaborate weekly in planning, sharing, developing, and assessing the effectiveness of higher cognitive complexity activities. -Principal will monitor implementation of informal/formal focus walks, lesson plan development, grade level meeting notes, and lesson studies. -Classroom visits, student work samples, lab sheets | 2a.1. -Lesson Study -Lesson plan reviews -Classroom Walk-throughs -CAST -Focus Walks -Science Curriculum -Project rubrics and displays |
| 2 | 2a.2. -Consistent use of the 5 E's (Engage, explore, explain, extend, evaluate) with fidelity. | 2a.2. -Teachers will provide hands on instructional activities aligned with the NGSSS using the 5 E's. -Science Journals | 2a.2. Teachers -Principal -Instructional coach -Leadership Team | 2a.2. Vertical and horizontal PLC's will collaborate weekly in planning, sharing, developing, and assessing the effectiveness of higher cognitive complexity activities. -Principal will monitor implementation of informal/formal focus walks, lesson plan development, grade level meeting notes, and lesson studies. -Classroom visits, student work samples, lab sheets | 2a.2. -Lesson Study -Lesson plan reviews -Classroom Walk-throughs -CAST -Focus Walks -Science Curriculum -Project rubrics and displays |

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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|---|-----------------------------------|---|
| No Data Submitted | | | | | | |

Science Budget:

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

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: | 54% (46) of students will achieve a level 4 on the FCAT in Writing. This is a 5% increase from the previous year. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 49%(43) | 54%(46) |

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. -Teachers using best instructional practices, like the workshop model, with fidelity. The use of effective feedback during teacher/student conferences | 1a.1. Teachers will observe colleagues modeling workshop format school wide. Leadership team will conduct walkthroughs to view evidence of workshop model school wide. Principal will conduct walkthroughs to view evidence of workshop model school wide. Provide differentiated instruction based on student need in the writing process. | 1a.1 -Teachers -Principal -Instructional coach -Leadership Team | 1a.1 -Principal will monitor implementation of informal/formal focus walks, lesson plan development, and grade level meeting notes. | 1a.1 -Walk-through checklist -Teacher self-reflections or self-assessments -classroom walk-throughs -Evidence of appropriate writing artifacts in each classroom (daily writing journals, portfolios, strategy charts, word wall) |
| 2 | 1a.2 Teacher knowledge and understanding of the writing process Teacher gives student opportunity to discuss and analyze their own writing and the writing of peers | 1a.2 Teachers will observe lessons on explicitly taught strategies for editing and revising. Teachers will attend professional development on the writing process on all grade levels. Instructional Coach continues to model writing for teachers Students will write daily | 1a.2 -Teachers -Instructional coach -Principal | 1a.2 -Vertical and horizontal PLC's will collaborate weekly in planning, sharing, developing, and assessing the effectiveness of higher cognitive complexity activities. -Leadership team analyzing data from progress monitoring notebooks and monitoring student progress. -Principal will monitor daily writing journals and conduct informal/formal walk-throughs. | 1a.2 -Writing portfolio -Progress Monitoring Notebooks -Observations |
| | 1a.3 Teacher knowledge and understanding of the writing process | 1a.3 Teachers will participate in professional | 1a.3 -Teachers -Principal -Instructional | 1a.3 -Vertical and horizontal PLC's will collaborate weekly in planning, | 1a.3 -Lesson Study -Lesson plan reviews |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| 3 | <p>Teacher gives student opportunity to discuss and analyze their own writing and the writing of peers</p> <p>1.3.</p> <p>-The use of data driven instruction and interventions.</p> <p>- Creating a positive writing environment</p> | <p>development to analyze data of students.</p> <p>Teachers will use best practices and refer web based resources to identify data needed for instruction.</p> <p>- Incorporate writing into the content areas and using technology</p> <p>Teachers use anchor papers to calibrate new writing requirements</p> | <p>coach</p> <p>-Leadership Team</p> | <p>sharing, developing, and assessing the effectiveness of higher cognitive complexity activities.</p> <p>-Principal will monitor implementation of informal/formal focus walks, lesson plan development, grade level meeting notes, and lesson studies.</p> <p>-Work in the writing portfolios</p> | <p>-Classroom Walk-throughs</p> <p>-Focus Walks</p> <p>-District Writing Prompts</p> <p>-Student writing (published pieces)</p> |
|---|---|---|--------------------------------------|---|---|

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 |
|---|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| Early Release Day training on data analysis | K-5 | Principal/ Instructional Coach | School wide | Early Release Days | Progress Monitoring Notebooks | Teachers, Principal |
| Rtl Training | K-5 | Principal/ Instructional | School wide | Early Release Days | Progress Monitoring Notebooks | Teachers, Principal |

Writing Budget:

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|--|---|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Use of Write Score | 4th Grade Teachers, instructional Coach | Literacy Account | \$1,200.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$1,200.00 |
| 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 |
| Developing an Understanding of the official Florida Writes Rubric and how to assess when using | Instructional Coach and District Literacy Coach | District Funded and Fund | \$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: \$1,200.00 |

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: | Continue working closely with families to decrease the number of excessive tardies and absences |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: |
| 95% (480) | 97% (497) |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) |
| 5% (25) | 4% (21) |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) |
| 3% (15) | 2% (10) |

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. We are a dedicated arts magnet. Students | 1.1. Continue closely monitoring attendance | 1.1. Office Assistant Principal | 1.1. Daily attendance analyses | 1.1. The Daily Attendance |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|-----------------|
| 1 | are coming from all over the county. Many have to be transported by parents. Therefore, due to work schedules and child care conflicts, there may be obstacles to getting to and/or from school. | and tardies. Send out parent notices when students are approaching unacceptable levels of absences or tardies. Conduct required conferences with parents when students reach unacceptable levels of absences or tardies. Attempt to strategize solutions to reasons for absences or tardies. | | | Analysis 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 |
|---|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| Clerical staff to receive district training on attendance policies and procedures | K-5 | District Staff | Clerical Staff | As scheduled by the district | Attendance Daily Records | Principal |

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 |

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: | Maintain 0 In-School Suspensions. Reduce number of Out-of-School Suspensions |
| 2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions |
| 0 (505) | 0 (505) |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School |
| 0 (505) | 0 (505) |
| 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions |
| 3% (15) | 2% (10) |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School |
| 3% (15) | 2% (10) |

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. New students acclimating to our school and do not know our expectations for behavior. | 1.1. Utilize CHAMPS with fidelity Maintain a strong Foundations Committee who analyzes discipline data and determines school-wide strategies and policies to address discipline Continue with our sequence of disciplinary procedures prior to referrals being written Continue with our sequence of disciplinary consequences through the referral process Continue Student of the Month Ceremonies to publically recognize students making good choices. | 1.1. Teachers Principal Foundations Committee | 1.1. Monthly analyses of discipline referrals and notes sent home to parents | 1.1. SESIR Monthly Progress Monitoring Notebooks for notes sent home to parents |

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: | |
| <p>1. Parent Involvement</p> <p>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</p> <p><i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i></p> | <p>65% (325) of parents will participate in parent workshops throughout the year.</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement: | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: |
| 60% (300) | 65% (325) |

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 As a dedicated arts magnet it is difficult for parents to return to school for evening workshops. Daytime workshops are prohibitive as most of our parents work. | 1.1. Provide incentives (door prizes, homework passes) for parents to return for workshops on various aspects of parenting and ways to support their child's education. Offer parent workshops during or before schedule events (such as Family Fitness Night; school performances) | 1.1. Teachers Instructional Coach Principal | 1.1. Monthly Progress Monitoring Notebooks that tracks the achievement of those students' whose parents attend workshops | 1.1. Parent involvement tracking sheet Attendance records from each workshop |

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)

Arts 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. Arts Goal Arts Goal #1: | | Arts teachers will consistently collaborate with feeder school arts area teachers to prep 4th and 5th grade students for the audition process | | | |
| 2012 Current level: | | 2013 Expected level: | | | |
| 10% (3) | | 20% (7) | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 1.1. Arts teachers will consistently collaborate with feeder school arts area teachers to prep 4th and 5th grade students for the audition process | 1.1 Teachers collaborating monthly with teachers at Lavilla. Adequate planning time between arts resource and academic classroom teachers | 1.1 Teachers – academic and arts teachers Principals | 1.1. Art Student leveling at Lavilla of incoming 6th graders | 1.1. Audition Process |

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 Arts Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|--|---|----------------------|
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Utilizing the Houghton Mifflin Reading Series with full implementation | District's Reading CORE | District Funded | \$0.00 |
| Reading | Utilize Soar to Success with struggling readers in grades KG – 5th | Reading component for struggling readers that are classified as Tier III students RTI Team Up grades K-5 | District Funded Team Up (Wayman Academy Budget) | \$0.00 |
| Mathematics | Continue implementing Envisions Math Series effectively and with fidelity | EnVisions (The district's adopted math CORE) | District Funded | \$0.00 |
| Mathematics | Continue implementing Math Investigations Series effectively and with fidelity | Implementing all phases (Launch, Work time and Closure) within the math block for effective instruction | District Funded | \$0.00 |
| Writing | Use of Write Score | 4th Grade Teachers, instructional Coach | Literacy Account | \$1,200.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$1,200.00 |
| Technology | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Diagnostic Test to determine a child's readability level | F.A.I.R. | State Funded | \$0.00 |
| Reading | Activities to increase readability and comprehension levels at all ages | FCRR Activities (Components of F.A.I.R.) FCAT Explorer | State/ District Funded | \$0.00 |
| Mathematics | Software that is utilized for math practice for performers of all levels | FCAT Explorer (5th grade only) Destination Success (3rd and 4th) Gizmos | District Funded | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Professional Development opportunities every 9 weeks WOW Wednesdays with Instructional Coach. | Appropriate materials available for all classroom instructors | District Funded | \$0.00 |
| Reading | Developing an understanding of content and reading skills through higher level questions that are differentiated for all leveled learners | Instructional Coach and District Literacy Coach | District Funded | \$0.00 |
| Mathematics | Unpacking math standards to better understand what's being taught | Principal and District Math Coach | District Funded and Fund | \$0.00 |
| Mathematics | Continue utilizing the state approved math CORE with fidelity | Principal, District Math Coach and Academy of Math Participants | District Funded and Fund | \$0.00 |
| Writing | Developing an Understanding of the official Florida Writes Rubric and how to assess when using | Instructional Coach and District Literacy Coach | District Funded and Fund | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| | Students will participate in hands on | | | |

| | | | | |
|---------|--|------------------------|---|-------------------------|
| Reading | enrichment activities throughout the school on various levels. Incentive for 25 Book (1,000,000 word campaign) challenge | 1 Bike per Grade Level | PTA Funded Internally Funded PTA Donations of Materials | \$800.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$800.00 |
| | | | | Grand Total: \$2,000.00 |

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Priority | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Focus | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prevent | <input checked="" 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 10/19/2012)

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 |
|---|------------|
| This year the Pine Forest SAC has requested that all SAC funds be used to fund our Saturday School. Our Saturday School is designed to provide our struggling students in grades 3rd- 5th tutoring, to assist them in their academics, and on the FCAT. | \$1,200.00 |

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

The School Advisory Council solicits information which will help us better our program at Pine Forest Elementary. The information is used to generate goals and plan activities. Meetings are open to all students, teachers, parents, and community members. School Advisory plans are generated annually and presented to the community at the May PTO meeting. The role of a School Advisory Council is to assist in the preparation of the annual budget, and in the development and evaluation of the School Improvement Plan. Review of SAC committee roles and responsibilities: Pine Forest 2011-2012 SAC Activities:

1. Review of School Improvement Plan for 2012 - 2013 school year;
2. Review of Title 1 budget and how it aligns with the School Improvement Plan;
3. Review of Parent Involvement Plan;
4. School Needs Assessment

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 PINE FOREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011 | | | | | | |
|---|----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------|---|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 85% | 86% | 58% | 63% | 292 | 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 | 67% | 62% | | | 129 | 3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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? | 48% (NO) | 57% (YES) | | | 105 | 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 | | | | | 526 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | B | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |

| Duval School District PINE FOREST ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010 | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------|---|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 87% | 78% | 92% | 51% | 308 | 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 | 70% | 69% | | | 139 | 3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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? | 59% (YES) | 66% (YES) | | | 125 | 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 | | | | | 572 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | A | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |