FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: WEST RIVERSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Duval

Principal: Susan Hamner

SAC Chair: Janet Holt

Superintendent: Ed Pratt-Dannals

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/19/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Assis Principal	None	N/A			N/A
Principal	Susan Hamner	Bachelor of Science – Biology/ Chemistry Masters of Secondary Education Professional Educator's Certificate Biology/Chemistry – Middle School Endorsement Principal (All Levels) Completion of 3	2	23	2011School grade was a C. 64% of our students were proficient in reading, 64% of our students were proficient in math. 74% of our fourth graders scored a 3.5 or higher. 41% of our students were proficient in science. 60% of our students showed reading gains and 49% showed math gains. In the bottom quartile 50% showed reading gains and 63% showed math gains. In 2012 the school grade was a D. 49% of our students showed proficiency in reading. 47% of our students showed proficiency in math. 53% of our students showed reading gains and 53% of our students showed math gains. In the bottom quartile 56% showed reading gains and 36% showed math gains.

		year Principal Academy 2010			
Principal					

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide assessment performance (Percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Instructional	Kristan Haas	Bachelor's Degree in Elementary Education / Education of Mentally Handicapped	6	1	2012 (4th grade ELA) WRES Grade D, FCAT In 2012 the school grade was a D. 49% of our students showed proficiency in reading. 47% of our students showed proficiency in math. 53% of our students showed reading gains and 53% of our students showed math gains. In the bottom quartile 56% showed reading gains and 36% showed math gains.
Math	Gloria Manuel	Bachelor's Degree in Elementary Education Certification 1-6 Kindergarten (K-3), ESOL Endorsement	1	1	2012 (3rd grade Math) Richard L. Brown, Grade C, FCAT In 2012 the school grade was a C.. 34% of our students showed proficiency in reading. 41% of our students showed proficiency in math. 66% of our students showed reading gains and 67% of our students showed math gains. In the bottom quartile 68% showed reading gains and 61% showed math gains.
Reading	Lorrie Johnson	Bachelor's Degree in Elementary Education Master's Degree K-12 Reading	1	9	2012 (Instructional Coach K-5) Hyde Park Elementary, Grade C, FCAT Reading 44, Reading Gains 67%, Lowest 25% Reading Gains 70% 2011 (Instructional Coach K-5) Hyde Park Elementary, Grade C, FCAT Reading 64% 2010 (Reading Coach K-5) North Shore K-8, Grade F, FCAT Reading 40% Reading 44% 2008 (Reading Coach K-3) North Shore K-8, Grade D, FCAT Reading 41% 2007 (Reading Coach K-3) North Shore K-8, Grade F, FCAT Reading 39% 2006 (Standards Coach K-2) R.V. Daniels Elementary, not graded (K-2 School) 2005 (Standards Coach K-5) Susie Tolbert Elementary, Grade B, FCAT Reading 70%, FCAT Math 57% 2009 (Reading Coach K-3) North Shore K-8, Grade F, FCAT

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1. Regular bi-monthly grade level meeting (K-5) during resource time (40 minutes) one day per every two weeks	Principal School coaches District staff	Ongoing to June 2013	
2	2.Informal observations with an emphasis on high quality student work	Principal School coaches District staff	Ongoing to June 2013	
3	3.Bimonthly early release inservices in Reading/Math/Writing/Science/ using student work	Principal School coaches District Staff Committee member (school teachers)	Ongoing to June 2013	
4	4.Thinking Map training on the eight visual maps students can use to organize concepts/strategies.	Principal 3 school trainers	Ongoing to June 2013	

5				
6				

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).
*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
0%	NA

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
28	3.6%(1)	10.7%(3)	64.3%(18)	21.4%(6)	21.4%(6)	100.0%(28)	0.0%(0)	0.0%(0)	42.9%(12)

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
Connie Guting	Elizabeth Walton Smart	This is Beth Smart's first year back in kindergarten after three years in other grades. Ms. Guting will support her instruction in reading, writing, math, and science with fidelity as well as other issues such as classroom management, IEP creations, data collection, data analysis, and IPDP.	The mentor and mentee will meet bimonthly August to May. Meetings will center around student performance. Curricular issues and professional development will align with 2012-2013 goals.
Lee Townsend	Clare Begin	This is Ms. Begin's first full year in the 4th grade math and science. She is in the 2 year MINT program.	The mentor and mentee will meet monthly and ERD. Meetings will discuss student performance and various curricular issues.
		This is	

Lee Townsend	Jeremy Tish	Jeremy Tish's first year of teaching. Ms. Townsend teaches 3rd grade math and science. Mr. Tish teaches math and science STAR.	The mentor and mentee will meet bimonthly August to May. Meetings will center around student performance. Curricular issues and professional development will align with 2012-2013 goals.

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

N/A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Migrant services provided and coordinated by the district and our guidance counselor is our coordinator.

Title I, Part D

WRES has a drop out prevention program. The STAR program utilizes an accelerated curriculum to move the students forward to his/her appropriate grade.

Title II

N/A

Title III

Federal funds are utilized through the district to support the ESOL program by providing teaching and paraprofessional positions and needed instruction materials.

Title X- Homeless

District Homeless Social Worker provides resources.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI funds are used for tutoring in reading and math during the school day for the FCAT level 1 and 2 students and children in red on the FAIR.

Violence Prevention Programs

CHAMPS is used to teach rituals/routines and organize classroom management. The Second Step program is used to teach empathy and eliminate bullying in school. Westside Full Service programs provide needed services for our families in need.

Nutrition Programs

Currently 73% of our student enrollment is on free or reduced food program.

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

Other

N/A

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Gloria Manuel-Math Coach Bob Tano- School Psychologist
Angela Doss, WRES guidance counselor Kristan Haas- Instructional Coach
Patricia Wilson, WRES ESE teacher Lorrie Johnson- Reading Coach

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

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

The MTSS Leadership Team will meet with the School Advisory Council (SAC) and principal to help develop the SIP. The team will provide data on: Tier 1, 2, and 3 targets; academic and social/emotional areas that need to be addressed; help set clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, Relationship); facilitate the development of a systemic approach to teaching (Gradual Release, Essential Questions, Activating Strategies, Teaching Strategies, Extending, Refining, and Summarizing); and align processes and procedures.

MTSS Implementation

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

Baseline data: Insight, Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Diagnostic Reading Assessment-2 (DRA-2), District Benchmark Assessments as appropriate, Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), Pearson Inform
Midyear: FAIR, DRA-2, District Benchmark Assessments as appropriate, Insight
End of year: FAIR, FCAT, DRA2, Benchmarks
Ongoing Progress Monitoring: Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM), FAIR (ongoing formative assessments), Pearson Inform, DRA2
Frequency of data review: Weekly Grade Level Professional Learning Communities to discuss student learning and disaggregate data.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The school's Professional Development Plan must support continuous learning for all educators that results in increased The school's Professional Development Plan must support continuous learning for all educators that results in increased student achievement and includes evidence of scaffolded MTSS professional learning that is results-driven, standards-based, school-centered, and sustained over time. The School Instructional Leadership Team established protocols for on-going assessment

and adjusting of the plan to meet school needs.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

• Professional learning communities
• Classroom observations
• Collaborative planning
• Analysis of student work
• Book study
• Lesson study

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Susan Hamner, Principal
Lorrie Johnson, Reading Coach
Kristan Haas, Instructional Coach
Olga Williams
Sylvia Buchanan
Ric Hurst
Connie Guting
Lori Cohen
Tanya Scharps
Kristi St. John
Larisa Ladyzhenskay

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

The team meets the first Tuesday of every month to disaggregate student performance data. We examine the performance of AYP subgroups, grade levels, classes, and the school performance on assessments. Through this meeting we develop strategies to address particular curricular issues and use the FCIM model to teach focus lessons and then administer mini assessments to measure student learning. Team members, review current and longitudinal data to ensure the successful implementation (with fidelity) of the core reading series and the use of research based strategies for supporting students in the core curriculum.
We also examine the needs of our faculty and staff for professional development and create training opportunities at early dismissal, PLC's, CP's, and before school meetings. We coordinate our training and professional development to ensure we are moving forward toward achieving our reading targets for school grade and AYP.

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

PLC, Lesson Studies, the 30 Book kick-off event, 9 week student reading goals with celebrations and end of year celebration for reading 30 books.

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.

N/A

*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.

N/A

*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?

N/A

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?

N/A

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

N/A

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:	33%(60))of our students in grades 3/4/5 will achieve level 3 on FCAT reading
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
20% (35)	33%(60)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1a.1 Students lack ability to organize thoughts/strategies and concepts	1a.1. Use of 8 visual maps called Thinking maps to organize knowledge Common Board Configuration Interactive Word Wall	1a.1.Thinking Map trainers Principal School Coaches Classroom Teachers	1a.1.Classroom visitations Lesson Plans Student Thinking Maps posted in classrooms and selected bulletin boards Grade level meeting where teachers share student work using thinking maps FCIM Calendar FCIM Enrichment Common Board Configuration Interactive Word Wall	a.1.Classroom observations (formal and informal) Student thinking maps in classrooms Bulletin boards showcasing student thinking maps Students using thinking maps on various assessments (scrimmages/benchmarks/end of unit tests) Common Board Configuration Interactive Word Wall F.A.I.R. Assessment Data/ reports from PMRN DRA2 Class Status Reports District Benchmark Data Reports
2	1a.2.Student lack of grade level vocabulary	1a.2.Use of Thinking Maps to visualize new vocabulary Common Board Configuration Interactive Word Wall	1a.2.Thinking Map trainers Principal School Coaches Classroom teachers	1a.2.Classroom visitations Common Board Configurations Lesson Plans Student Thinking Maps posted in classrooms and selected bulletin boards Grade level meeting where teachers share student work using thinking maps. Common Board Configuration Interactive Word Wall	1a.2. Classroom observations (formal and informal) Student thinking maps used for vocabulary instruction Lesson Plans Common Board Configuration Interactive Word Wall F.A.I.R. Assessment Data/ reports from PMRN DRA2 Class Status Reports District Benchmark Data Reports
3	1a.3.Teachers need deeper understanding of the components of reading	1a.3.Train staff in such reading components as: Explicit instruction, guided reading, center activities, Increase rigor, and scaffold Instruction Common Board	1a.3.Train staff in such reading components as: Explicit instruction, guided reading, center activities, Increase rigor, and scaffold	1a.3.Classroom visitations Common Board Configuration FCIM calendar Guided Reading lesson plans Center activities in classroom FCIM Calendar	1a.3.Classroom observations (formal and informal) Lesson Plans (literacy block template) Guided Reading lesson plans Antidotal notes on students at least 3x's per week Common Board Configuration Interactive Word Wall FCIM Assessments

		Configuration Interactive Word Wall New Literacy block in daily schedule New literacy block lesson plan template Deeper analysis of FAIR data for student grouping	Instruction Common Board 1a.3.Reading coach Instructional coach District reading coach RED coach	FCIM Enrichment Common Board Configuration Interactive Word Wall New literacy block in daily schedule	F.A.I.R. Assessment Data/ reports from PMRN DRA2 Class Status Reports District Benchmark Data Reports

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	29%(53) of the students in grades 3/4/5 will achieve a level 4 or higher on the FCAT
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
19%(32)	29%(53)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2a.1.Students lack the ability to organize: thoughts, strategies and concepts.	2a.2Use of 8 visual maps called Thinking Maps to organize knowledge Interactive Word Wall Common Board Configuration	2a.2Thinking Map Trainers Principal School Coaches Classroom teachers	2a.1.Classroom visitations Lesson Plans Student thinking maps posted in classrooms and selected bulletin boards Grade level meeting where teachers share student thinking maps Interactive Word Wall Common Board Configuration FCIM Calendar FCIM Enrichment	2a.1.Classroom observations (formal and informal) Student thinking maps in classrooms Student thinking maps on selected thinking map bulletin boards Students use of thinking maps on various

					assessments (scrimmages, benchmarks and end of unit exams) F.A.I.R. Assessment Data/ reports from PMRN DRA2 Class Status Reports District Benchmark Data Reports
2	2a.2.Increase grade level vocabulary	2a.2.Use of thinking maps to visualize new vocabulary Interactive Word Wall Common Board Configuration	2a.2.Thinking map trainers Principal School Coaches Classroom teachers	2a.2.Classroom visitations Common Board Configurations Lesson Plans Interactive Word Wall	2a.2. Classroom observations (formal and informal) Student thinking maps used for vocabulary instruction Lesson Plans F.A.I.R. Assessment Data/ reports from PMRN DRA2 Class Status Reports District Benchmark Data Reports
3	2a.3 Teachers need deeper understanding of the components of reading	2a.3 Train staff in such reading components as: Explicit instruction, guided reading, center activities, Increase rigor, and scaffold Instruction Common Board Configuration Interactive Word Wall New Literacy block in daily schedule New literacy block lesson plan template Deeper analysis of FAIR data for student grouping	2a.3.Reading coach Instructional coach District reading coach RED coach	2a.3 Classroom visitations Common Board Configuration FCIM calendar Guided Reading lesson plans Center activities in classroom FCIM Calendar FCIM Enrichment	2a.3 Classroom observations (formal and informal) Lesson Plans(new literacy template) Guided Reading lesson plans Antidotal notes on students at least 3x's per week F.A.I.R. Assessment Data/ reports from PMRN DRA2 Class Status Reports District Benchmark Data Reports

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

No Data Submitted

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	60%(79)of the students will make learning gains on the reading FCAT
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
53%65)	60%(79)

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 Identify and track all level 2 students not in the bottom quartile and develop a plan for students to make learning gains.	3a.1.Establish specific nurture groups Use 'Insight" program to track students Analyze insight data to plan next steps Use thinking maps to help students visualize reading concepts/strategies Guided reading groups Reading center activities FCIM Calendar FCIM Enrichment FCIM Reteach/ small groups Interactive Word Wall	3a.1.School reading coach District reading coach RED coaches Thinking Map trainers	3a.1. Classroom visitations Lesson Plans Student thinking maps posted in classrooms and selected bulletin boards Grade level meeting where teachers share student thinking maps Guided reading lesson plans Use of reading center activities in classroom FCIM Calendar FCIM Enrichment FCIM Reteach/ small groups Interactive Word Wall	3a.1.Classroom observations (formal and informal) Student thinking maps in classrooms Student thinking maps on selected thinking map bulletin boards Students use of thinking maps on various assessments (scrimmages, benchmarks and end of unit exams) Antidotal notes from guided reading tracking Student progress Assessments based on guided reading/center activities F.A.I.R. Assessment Data/ reports from PMRN DRA2 Class Status Reports District Benchmark Data Reports
2	3a.2.Time for remediation	3a.2.Schedule daily FCIM time	3a.2.Principal School reading coach District staff Classroom teachers	3a.2.Classroom visitations FCIM calendar FCIM lesson s FCIM assessments	3a.2.Classroom observations (formal and informal) Analysis of FCIM assessments to determine next steps F.A.I.R. Assessment Data/ reports from PMRN DRA2 Class Status Reports

					District Benchmark Data Reports
3	3a.3.Teacher knowledge of explicit instruction for scaffolding reading strategies	3a.3.PLP on explicit instruction PLC on scaffolding reading Strategies New Literacy block in daily schedule New literacy block lesson plan template Deeper analysis of FAIR data for student grouping	3a.3.School coaches District staff Classroom teachers	3a.3.Classroom visitations Lesson Plans Assessments Analysis of assessment for next steps	3a.3.Classroom observations (formal and informal) Benchmark results Scrimmage results Student thinking maps Analysis of insight data F.A.I.R. Assessment Data/ reports from PMRN DRA2 Class Status Reports District Benchmark Data Report New Literacy lesson plan template

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	66%(32) of the students in the lowest 25% quartile will make learning gains on the reading FCAT
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56%(24)	66%(32)

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	4a.1.Identify and track all students in the bottom quartile and develop a plan for students to make Learning gains using guided reading and center activities to reinforce Bottom quartile is made up of students from the ELL and STAR programs.	4a.1 Establish specific nurture groups Use 'Insight" program to track students Analyze insight data to plan next steps Use thinking maps to help students visualize reading concepts/strategies Guided reading groups Reading center activities FCIM Calendar FCIM Enrichment FCIM Reteach/ small groups Interactive Word Wall Common Board Configuration	4a.1 School reading coach District reading coach RED coaches Thinking Map trainers	4a.1. Establish specific nurture groups Use 'Insight" program to track students Analyze insight data to plan next steps Use thinking maps to help students visualize reading concepts/strategies Guided reading groups Reading center activities FCIM Calendar FCIM Enrichment FCIM Reteach/ small groups Interactive Word Wall Common Board Configuration	4a.1..School reading coach District reading coach RED coaches Thinking Map trainers FCIM Assessments Interactive Word Wall Common Board Configuration F.A.I.R. Assessment Data/ reports from PMRN DRA2 Class Status Reports District Benchmark Data Reports
2	4a.2. Time for remediation Bottom quartile is made up of students from the ELL and STAR programs.	4a.2. Schedule daily FCIM time	4a.2..Principal School reading coach District staff Classroom teachers	4a.2..Classroom visitations FCIM calendar FCIM lesson s FCIM assessments	4a.2..Classroom observations (formal and informal) Analysis of FCIM assessments to determine next steps
3	4a.3 Teacher knowledge of explicit instruction for scaffolded reading Strategies using guided reading and center activities Bottom quartile is made up of students from the ELL and STAR programs.	4a.3. PLP on explicit instruction PLC on scaffolding reading Strategies PLC on guided reading and Proper use of center activities New Literacy block in daily schedule New literacy block lesson plan template Deeper analysis of FAIR data for student grouping	4a.3..School coaches District staff Classroom teachers	4a.3. .Classroom visitations Lesson Plans Assessments/ Running Records Analysis of assessment for next steps	4a.3. Classroom observations (formal and informal) Benchmark results Scrimmage results Student thinking maps Analysis of insight data F.A.I.R. Assessment Data/ reports from PMRN DRA2 Class Status Reports District Benchmark Data Reports New literacy lesson plan template

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

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

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

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.	49% of each subgroup: White: Black: Hispanic:

Reading Goal #5B:	will make satisfactory progress in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White 26%(19) Black:58%(30) Hispanic: 88% (30)	White: 49% (36) Black: 49% (25) Hispanic: 49% (18)

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. White: Student lack of understanding the complexity of NGSSS Black: Student lack of understanding the complexity of NGSSS Hispanic: Student lack of understanding the complexity of NGSSS	5B.1 Increase high complexity of NGSSS through the use of Thinking Maps Interactive Word Wall Increase high complexity of NGSSS through the use of Thinking Maps Interactive Word Wall Increase high complexity of NGSSS through the use of Thinking Maps Interactive Word Wall	5B.1. Thinking Map trainers School reading coach District reading coach RED coach Thinking Map trainers School reading coach District reading coach RED coach Thinking Map trainers School reading coach District reading coach RED coach	5B.1 Monitor assessment and check for High complexity of understanding of NGSSS By the use of student thinking maps Addition of frame of reference in thinking maps which add rigor Interactive Word Wall Monitor assessment and check for High complexity of understanding of NGSSS By the use of student thinking maps Addition of frame of reference in thinking maps which add rigor Interactive Word Wall Monitor assessment and check for High complexity of understanding of NGSSS By the use of student thinking maps Addition of frame of reference in thinking maps which add rigor Interactive Word Wall	5B.1. Classroom observations (formal and informal) Lesson Plans Analysis of assessments Student thinking maps F.A.I.R. Assessment Data/ reports from PMRN DRA2 Class Status Reports District Benchmark Data Reports Classroom observations (formal and informal) Lesson Plans Analysis of assessments Student thinking maps F.A.I.R. Assessment Data/ reports from PMRN DRA2 Class Status Reports District Benchmark Data Reports Classroom observations (formal and informal) Lesson Plans Analysis of assessments Student thinking maps F.A.I.R. Assessment Data/ reports from PMRN DRA2 Class Status Reports District Benchmark Data Reports
2	Student lack of understanding of vocabulary	Introduce new vocabulary found in the learning schedule	Principal Teacher	Classroom observations Lesson plans	Word Wall Analysis of assessments

3	Inconsistent analysis of guided reading data to drive next step	Train staff how to analyze data	Teacher Coach Principal	Guided reading data then analysis of data then next lesson	Guided reading Lesson plans with antidotal notes at least 3x a week
4	5B.2. White: Student lack of understanding of new vocabulary Black: Student lack of understanding of new vocabulary Hispanic: Student lack of understanding of new vocabulary	5B.2. Introduce new vocabulary found in the learning schedule via common board configuration and thinking maps Interactive Word Wall Introduce new vocabulary found in the learning schedule via common board configuration and thinking maps Interactive Word Wall Introduce new vocabulary found in the learning schedule via common board configuration and thinking maps Interactive Word Wall	5B.2. Thinking Map trainers Principal Reading Coach District reading coach RED coach Thinking Map trainers Principal Reading Coach District reading coach RED coach Thinking Map trainers Principal Reading Coach District reading coach RED coach	5B.2 Common Board configuration used daily by teacher and students Classroom visitations Student thinking maps Lesson Plans Interactive Word Wall Common Board configuration used daily by teacher and students Classroom visitations Student thinking maps Lesson Plans Interactive Word Wall Common Board configuration used daily by teacher and students Classroom visitations Student thinking maps Lesson Plans Interactive Word Wall	5B.2. Active work wall Student thinking maps Analysis of assessment data to drive next step Interactive Word Wall F.A.I.R. Assessment Data/ reports from PMRN DRA2 Class Status Reports District Benchmark Data Reports Active work wall Student thinking maps Analysis of assessment data to drive next step Interactive Word Wall F.A.I.R. Assessment Data/ reports from PMRN DRA2 Class Status Reports District Benchmark Data Reports Active work wall Student thinking maps Analysis of assessment data to drive next step Interactive Word Wall F.A.I.R. Assessment Data/ reports from PMRN DRA2 Class Status Reports District Benchmark Data Reports
	5B.3. White: Teacher knowledge of explicit instruction for scaffolded reading Strategies using guided reading and center activities Black: Teacher knowledge of explicit instruction for scaffolded reading Strategies using guided reading and center activities Hispanic: Teacher knowledge of explicit instruction for	5B.3. PLP on explicit instruction PLC on scaffolding reading Strategies PLC on guided reading and Proper use of center activities New Literacy block in daily schedule New literacy block lesson plan template Deeper analysis of FAIR data for student grouping PLP on explicit instruction	5B.3. Reading coach District staff Classroom teachers Reading coach District staff Classroom teachers Reading coach District staff Classroom teachers	5B.3. Classroom visitations Lesson Plans Assessments Analysis of assessment for next steps Classroom visitations Lesson Plans Assessments Analysis of assessment for next steps Classroom visitations Lesson Plans Assessments Analysis of assessment for next steps	5B.3. Classroom observations (formal and informal) Benchmark results Scrimmage results Student thinking maps Analysis of insight data F.A.I.R. Assessment Data/ reports from PMRN DRA2 Class Status Reports District Benchmark Data Reports New literacy lesson

5	scaffolded reading Strategies using guided reading and center activities	PLC on scaffolding reading Strategies PLC on guided reading and Proper use of center activities New Literacy block in daily schedule New literacy block lesson plan template Deeper analysis of FAIR data for student grouping PLC on explicit instruction PLC on scaffolding reading Strategies PLC on guided reading and Proper use of center activities New Literacy block in daily schedule New literacy block lesson plan template Deeper analysis of FAIR data for student grouping			plan template Classroom observations (formal and informal) Benchmark results Scrimmage results Student thinking maps Analysis of insight data F.A.I.R. Assessment Data/ reports from PMRN DRA2 Class Status Reports District Benchmark Data Reports New literacy lesson plan template Analysis of insight data Classroom observations (formal and informal) Benchmark results Scrimmage results Student thinking maps F.A.I.R. Assessment Data/ reports from PMRN DRA2 Class Status Reports District Benchmark Data Reports New literacy lesson plan template

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:	30%(14) of the English language learners making satisfactory progress in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
11%(3)	30%(14)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	5C.1.ELL students lack of understanding new and grade level vocabulary	5C.1.Utilization of the ELL Avenue curriculum Introduction of new and grade level vocabulary by using Common Board Configuration Introduction of new and grade level vocabulary by using Thinking Maps	5C.1.Thinking Map Trainers School coaches District coaches RED coach	5C.1.Classroom visitations Lesson plans with avenue curriculum which Will bridge to Houghton Mifflin reading series Daily common board configuration used by teachers and students	5C.1.Classroom observations (formal and informal) Avenue assessments (pretest/unit progress test/post test)

1		Introduction of new and grade level vocabulary by using Interactive Word Wall Use of IDEA kits in lessons		Student thinking maps found in classroom Student thinking maps found on selected bulletin boards In grade level meeting student thinking maps are showcased Interactive Word Wall found in classroom	Interactive Word walls Student thinking maps F.A.I.R. Assessment Data/ reports from PMRN DRA2 Class Status Reports District Benchmark Data Reports
2	5C.2.ELL students lack of background knowledge and Cultural values of American culture	5C.2. Utilization of the ELL Avenues curriculum Students will use Thinking Maps to visualize background knowledge	5C.2.Thinking Map Trainers School coaches District coaches RED coach	5C.2..Classroom visitations Lesson plans with avenue curriculum which Will bridge to Houghton Mifflin reading series Daily common board configuration used by teachers and students Student thinking maps found in classroom Student thinking maps found on selected bulletin boards In grade level meeting student thinking maps are showcased Interactive word wall	5C.2. Classroom observations (formal and informal) Avenue assessments (pretest/unit progress test/post test) Interactive word wall Student thinking maps F.A.I.R. Assessment Data/ reports from PMRN DRA2 Class Status Reports District Benchmark Data Reports
3	5C.3. Teacher knowledge of explicit instruction for scaffolded reading Strategies using guided reading and center activities	5C.3. PLC on explicit instruction PLC on scaffolding reading Strategies PLC on guided reading and Proper use of center activities New Literacy block in daily schedule New literacy block lesson plan template Deeper analysis of FAIR data for student grouping	5C.3. School coaches District staff Classroom teachers	5C.3. Classroom visitations Lesson Plans (Avenues/HoughtonMifflin) Assessments Analysis of assessment for next steps	5C.3. classroom observations (formal and informal) Benchmark results Scrimmage results Student thinking maps F.A.I.R. Assessment Data/ reports from PMRN DRA2 Class Status Reports District Benchmark Data Reports New literacy lesson plan template

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:	60%(9) of the students with disabilities will make satisfactory progress in reading
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
53%(8)	60%(9)

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

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	5D.1.SWD students lack of understanding new and grade level vocabulary	5D.1.Utilization of the Houghton Mifflin series Introduction of new and grade level vocabulary by using Common Board Configuration Introduction of new and grade level vocabulary by using Thinking Maps Introduction of new and grade level vocabulary by using Interactive word wall	5D.1.Thinking Map Trainers School coaches District coaches RED coach	5D.1.Classroom visitations Lesson plans with avenue curriculum which Will bridge to Houghton Mifflin reading series Daily common board configuration used by teachers and students Student thinking maps found in classroom Student thinking maps found on selected bulletin boards In grade level meeting student thinking maps are showcased Interactive Word Wall	5D.1.Classroom observations (formal and informal) Avenue assessments (pretest/unit progress test/post test) Interactive word walls Student thinking maps F.A.I.R. Assessment Data/ reports from PMRN DRA2 Class Status Reports District Benchmark Data Reports
3	5D.2.SWD students lack of background knowledge	5D.2. Utilization of the Houghton Mifflin reading series Students will use Thinking Maps to visualize background knowledge Students will use interactive word wall	5D.2.Thinking Map Trainers School coaches District coaches RED coach	5D.2..Classroom visitations Lesson plans with avenue curriculum which Will bridge to Houghton Mifflin reading series Daily common board configuration used by teachers and students Student thinking maps found in classroom Student thinking maps found on selected bulletin boards In grade level meeting student thinking maps are showcased Interactive word wall found in classroom	5D.2. Classroom observations (formal and informal) Avenue assessments (pretest/unit progress test/post test) Interactive word wall Student thinking maps FCIM assessments F.A.I.R. Assessment Data/ reports from PMRN DRA2 Class Status Reports District Benchmark Data Reports
4	5D.3. Teacher knowledge of explicit instruction for scaffolded reading Strategies using guided reading and center activities	5D.3. PLC on explicit instruction PLC on scaffolding reading Strategies PLC on guided reading and Proper use of center activities New Literacy block in daily schedule New literacy block lesson plan template Deeper analysis of FAIR data for student grouping	5D.3. School coaches District staff Classroom teachers	5D.3. Classroom visitations Lesson Plans (Avenues/HoughtonMifflin) Assessments Analysis of assessment for next steps	5D.3. classroom observations (formal and informal) Benchmark results Scrimmage results Student thinking maps New literacy lesson plan template

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:	49% (46) of the students who are economically disadvantaged making satisfactory progress in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

29% (28) box.	49% (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	5E.1. ED students lack of understanding new and grade level vocabulary	5E.1. Introduction of new and grade level vocabulary by using Common Board Configuration Introduction of new and grade level vocabulary by using Thinking Maps Introduction of new and grade level vocabulary using interactive word wall	5E.1. Thinking Map Trainers School coaches District coaches RED coach	5E.1..Classroom visitations Lesson plans check Daily common board configuration used by teachers and students Student thinking maps found in classroom Student thinking maps found on selected bulletin boards In grade level meeting student thinking maps are showcased Interactive word wall found in classroom	5E.1.. .Classroom observations (formal and informal) Assessments (scrimmages/benchmarks/end of unit tests) Interactive word walls Student thinking maps F.A.I.R. Assessment Data/ reports from PMRN DRA2 Class Status Reports District Benchmark Data Reports
2	5E.2. ED students lack of background knowledge especially in the STAR program	5E.2 Utilization of Houghton Mifflin reading series and authentic literature Students will use Thinking Maps to visualize background knowledge Interactive word wall	5E.2. Thinking Map Trainers School coaches District coaches RED coach	5E.2.Classroom visitations Lesson plans with Houghton Mifflin reading series and authentic literature Daily common board configuration used by teachers and students Student thinking maps found in classroom Student thinking maps found on selected bulletin boards In grade level meeting student thinking maps are showcased Interactive word wall found in classroom	5E.2. Classroom observations (formal and informal) Assessments (scrimmages/benchmarks/end of unit tests) Interactive word walls Student thinking maps FCIM assessments F.A.I.R. Assessment Data/ reports from PMRN DRA2 Class Status Reports District Benchmark Data Reports
3	Students lack background knowledge	Increase high complexity of benchmarks	Principal Teachers District Coaches	Monitoring assessment and checking for high complexity of understanding of benchmarks	Lesson plans Assessments
4	5E.3. Teacher knowledge of explicit instruction for scaffolded reading Strategies using guided reading and center activities	5E.3 PLC on explicit instruction PLC on scaffolding reading Strategies PLC on guided reading and Proper use of center activities New Literacy block in daily schedule New literacy block lesson plan template Deeper analysis of FAIR data for student grouping	5E.3 School coaches District staff Classroom teachers	5E.3 Classroom visitations Lesson Plans Assessments Analysis of assessment for next steps	5E.3 classroom observations (formal and informal) Benchmark results Scrimmage results Student thinking maps F.A.I.R. Assessment Data/ reports from PMRN DRA2 Class Status Reports District Benchmark Data Reports New literacy lesson plan template

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
Thinking Maps	K-5	Thinking Map trainers	Three teachers and Principal	June 11,12,13, 2012 October 10, 11, 2012	School implementation of thinking maps Increasing rigor of thinking maps	Principal
FAIR Training	K-5	School Reading Coach	All reading teachers K-5	September 5, 2012	Teachers learn all screens of FAIR and how to collect data from FAIR for instructions	Principal Reading Coach
Thinking Maps	K-5	School Thinking Map trainers	All WRES Teachers	August 17, Sept 4, 19 Oct. 3, 17 Nov 7 Jan 23 Feb	Student thinking maps will be shared at grade level meetings	Principal Reading Coach
FCIM	K-5	School Instructional Coach	All teachers K-5	September 5, 2012	Teachers learn about Focus Calendars and cycles of Focus lessons that target priority benchmarks for their grade levels	Principal Instructional Coach
Common Board Configuration	K-5	Instructional Coach	All teachers K-5	August 14, 2012	Teachers learn the subject components for Board Configurations and its purpose	Principal Instructional Coach
DRA2 Training	K-5	School Reading Coach	All reading teachers K-5	September 6 &7, 2012	Teachers learn and review the components of the DRA2, coding the running record, and the importance of the “What’s Next for Instruction?” piece and how to use it.	Principal Reading Coach
Interactive Word Walls	K/1/2 3/4/5	School Reading Coach	K/1/2 teachers 3/4/5 teachers	September 25, 2012 October 2, 2012	Article study on what an Interactive Word Wall is, how to use an interactive word wall and activities teachers can do with their word wall, modeling of some of the activities for teachers by coach	Principal Reading Coach Instructional coach
Guided Reading	K-5	Reading Coach, Instructional Coach	All teachers K-5	TBA	PLC in grades K-5 Reading teachers, Guided Reading Template/ Modeling best practices for guided reading	Principal Reading Coach Instructional Coach
Explicit Instruction	K-5	School Coaches Principal	All teachers K-5	Ongoing throughout the school year	Book study with Explicit Instruction by Anita Archer, teachers use explicit instruction in classrooms	Principal School coaches
FAIR data grouping students by reading needs grades 3/4/5	3-5	State reading Coach Debra Massey	Principal and WRES coaches	9/24/12	Coaches use current FAIR data and learn to group students by need for literacy groups	Principal School coaches
Introduction to new literacy block and new literacy lesson plan template	K-5 literacy teachers	Executive Director Principal WRES coaches	All teachers K-5 who teach literacy	10/3/12	Introduction to the new delivery of literacy in grades K-5 as well as new lesson plan template for literacy	Principal WRES coaches
Grade level training on FAIR data grouping students by reading need	3-5 K/1/2	WRES coaches	Grades 3/4/5 teachers Grades K/1/2 teachers	9/25/12 10/2/12	Teachers use current FAIR data and learn to group students by need for literacy groups	Principal Reading coach Instructional coach
FAIR training on how to group K/1/2 students	K/1/2	WRES reading coach	All literacy teachers grades K/1/2	9/28/12	Coach uses current FAIR data in grades K/1/2 to learn how to group students by need for literacy groups	Reading coach
In depth review of new literacy block and literacy plan template	K-5 literacy teachers	State reading coach Debra Massey	All literacy teachers K-5	10/5/12	More in depth understanding of new literacy block and literacy lesson plan template	Principal WRES coaches New daily schedule for literacy teachers

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Houghton Mifflin reading series	Core curriculum	District	$0.00
Avenues curriculum	ELL curriculum	District	$0.00
Thinking Maps	Title 3	District	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Thinking maps	Thinking maps 8 visual representations	Title 3	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
FAIR data – grouping students	State reading coach	State	$0.00
Interactive word wall	WRES Coaches	School	$0.00
New literacy block and literacy lesson plan template	State/District/school coaches	State/district/school literacy coaches	$0.00
Thinking Maps	District	Title 3	$0.00
Explicit instruction	WRES Coaches	School	$0.00
DRA2/insight/guided reading/FCIM/IPDP	WRES Coaches	School	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $0.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	40% (36) will score proficient in Listening/ Speaking section of the CELLA for 2013
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
27% of all ESOL students are proficient in Listening and 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
	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.	1.1.

1	Students that are scoring proficient in listening and speaking, are not proficient in using academic vocabulary.	Implementation of NGSSS Vocabulary Standards. ESOL Teachers will bridge the Avenue's Curriculum to the Houghton Mifflin Reading Curriculum, to give students exposure to grade level academic vocabulary. ESOL teachers will implement Marzarro's Vocabulary Building Strategies and Thinking Maps into their instruction, to build academic vocabulary.	Instructional Coach; Reading Coach; District Reading Coach; ESOL Resource Teacher; Principal	Lesson Plans Focused Observations Data Notebook Common Board Configuration Teacher/student created Thinking Maps Student created Thinking Maps SOLOM checklist	Thinking Maps CELLA/LAS Testing Benchmark-Vocabulary Section
2	1.2. Limited Parental Support due to a high percentage of parents not fluent in English.	1.2. Use Trans-Act for translating forms to parents. Use Spanish Para Professionals as interpreters for parent conference and literacy meetings.	1.2. ESOL Teachers, ESOL District Resource Teacher, Coaches, Principal	1.2. Parent Surveys in home language	1.2. Parent Survey Sign In Sheets for Conferences and School Activities to promote learning.
3	1.3. Students that are not proficient in Listening and Speaking need to be exposed to rich language and explicit instruction.	1.3. Use the county Avenues Curriculum which is strong in listening and speaking. Give students at all grade levels opportunities to learn the language and speak. Provide teachers in-service on Explicit Teaching. Teachers use proven ESOL strategies in lessons.	1.3. ESOL Teachers, ESOL District Resource Teacher; Coaches, Principal	1.3. Focused Observations Common Board Configuration Thinking Maps	1.3. Lesson Plans documenting ESOL Strategies

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:	30% (27) ESOL students will score proficient in Reading on the CELLA
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	
Currently, we have 18% of our ESOL students that scored 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
1	2.1. There is a correlation between low reading scores and low listening and speaking scores.	2.1. Bridge the gap of language by using the Avenues Curriculum. Use Language Master, Rosetta Stone and other district software	2.1. ESOL teachers, ESOL District Resource Teacher, Reading Coach, Instructional	2.1. Focused Observations Analysis of Data Lesson Plans Thinking Maps Marzarro Vocabulary	2.1. DRA Assessments Avenue Unit assessments

		programs, Leap Frog, Small group Instruction Effective use of Learning Centers	Coach, Principal	Building Strategies	
2	2.2. Having multiple levels of reading in each grade level of ESOL.	2.2. For reading instruction, analyze the student data and regroup students within ESOL classes by reading /language levels. Only combine two grade levels. Ex. 1st and 2nd; and 4th and 5th.	2.2. ESOL Teachers ESOL District Resource Teacher Principal	2.2. Focused Observations Lesson Plans Formal and Informal Assessments	2.2. DRA Lesson Plans Avenues Assessment District Assessments SOLOM Checklist
3	2.3 Teachers knowledge on explicit instruction.	2.3 Teachers will have in-service on explicit instruction.	2.3 Coaches Principal	2.3 Focused Observations Lesson Plans	2.3 Formal and informal observations

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	20% (18) will score proficient in Writing on the CELLA
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:	
12% of our current ESOL students are proficient in writing	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3.1. Lack of English with our ESOL students as well as academic vocabulary.	3.1. Incorporate the writing in the Avenues curriculum. Explicit instruction in grammar to our ESOL students.	3.1. ESOL teachers Instructional Coach	3.1. Analysis of Monthly writing prompts in grade level meetings.	3.1. District writing prompts Avenues writing assessments
2	3.2. Teachers need to know at all grade levels what is acceptable writing.	3.2. Team building with other teachers in writing lesson plans. District learning schedule	3.2. ESOL teachers Regular Ed Teachers Instructional Coach Principal	3.2. Lesson Plans Focused Observations District Writing Prompts	3.2. Writing Portfolios
3	3.3 Teachers need to know how to teach explicit writing instruction.	3.3 Training on explicit writing strategies that are researched based	3.3 ESOL teachers Instructional Coach Principal	3.3 Lesson Plans Focused Observations	3.3 Formal and Informal Observations

CELLA Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Avenues Curriculum	ESOL DCSB curriculum	District	$0.00
Thinking Maps	ESOL curriculum	District Title 3	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Compass odyssey	Computer program on reading	DCSB	$0.00
Soar to Success	Computer program on reading	DCSB	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Thinking maps	ESOL training by schools	District	$0.00
Guided reading	Group ESOL according to reading level	School coaches training	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Explicit instruction	School coaches train using book study	FDLERS	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $0.00

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	33%(60) of the students in grades 3/4/5 will score a level 3 in mathematics
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
22%(37)	33%(60)

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.Lack of teacher understanding of rigor in math NGSSS.	1a.1.Increase high complexity of understanding of NGSSS through Thinking Map training Use of common board configuration Use of math conceptual standards Common core math practices Interactive word wall	1a.1.Thinking Map trainers School math coach District math coach RED coach	1a.1.Classroom visitations Common board configuration Lesson Plans Student thinking maps used in work time of math Math conceptual standards found in lessons Interactive word wall	1a.1.Classroom observations (formal and informal) Student thinking maps displayed Math conceptual standards found in student work Assessments (scrimmages/benchmarks, end of module assessments) Common Board Configuration Interactive word wall
2	1a.2 Identify students who are a level 3 in math and develop a plan for students to make AYP in: Numbers and operation Geometry and measurement, algebra, Data analysis	1a.2.Teachers will use the core curriculum of envision and Math Investigations with an emphasis on Math Investigations. Teachers will Follow the district's math learning schedule. Teachers will reinforce math skills through ready made centers for reinforcement of math concepts Thinking Maps will be used Common Board Configuration Interactive word wall	1a.2.Classroom teachers School math coach District Math coach RED coach	1a.2.Classroom visitations Teachers will share insight data with Coaches and Principal Teachers will analyze insight data And determine next steps Student thinking maps Common Board Configuration Interactive word wall	1a.2.Classroom observations (formal and informal) Lesson Plans Common Board Configuration Assessments (scrimmages/benchmark/end of module test) Student thinking maps Interactive word wall
3	1a.3.Reinforcement of numbers and operations, geometry and measurement, algebra and data analysis	1a.3.Use of Technology which may include: destination success, envision, GIZMO, Compass Odyssey, FCAT explorer, Sum Dog, Student Thinking Maps Math Investigation games Math strategy charts Math centers and Math	1a.3.Classroom teachers School Math coach District Math coach RED coach	1a.3. Classroom visitations Teachers will share insight data with Coaches and Principal Teachers will analyze insight data And determine next steps Student thinking maps Math centers/games/facts in	1a.3..Classroom observations (formal and informal) Lesson Plans Common Board Configuration Assessments (scrimmages/benchmark/end of module test) Student thinking maps Data from technology programs

		facts FCIM lessons FCIM enrichments Interactive word wall		use in classroom FCIM calendar FCIM enrichments Common Board Configuration Interactive word wall	FCIM assessments driving next steps

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:	In grades 3/4/5 students at Level 4 and 5 will increase from 64% to 68%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
64%	68%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2a.1..Lack of teacher understanding of rigor in math NGSSS.	2a.1. Increase high complexity of understanding of NGSSS through Thinking Map training Use of common board configuration Use of math conceptual standards Interactive word wall	2a.1. Thinking Map trainers School math coach District math coach RED coach	2a.1. Classroom visitations Common board configuration Lesson Plans Student thinking maps used in work time of math Math conceptual standards found in lessons Interactive word wall	2a.1. Classroom observations (formal and informal) Student thinking maps displayed Math conceptual standards found in student work Assessments (scrimmages/benchmarks, end of module assessments) Common Board Configuration Interactive word wall
	2a.2. Identify students who are a level 4/5 in	2a.2. Teachers will use the core curriculum of	2a.2. Classroom teachers	2a.2. Classroom visitations	2a.2. Classroom observations (formal and

2	math and develop a plan for students to make AYP in: Numbers and operation Geometry and measurement, algebra, Data analysis	envision and Math Investigations with an emphasis on Math Investigations. Teachers will Follow the district's math learning schedule. Teachers will reinforce math skills through ready made centers for reinforcement of math concepts Thinking Maps will be used Common Board Configuration Interactive word wall	School math coach District Math coach RED coach	Teachers will share insight data with Coaches and Principal Teachers will analyze insight data And determine next steps Student thinking maps	informal) Lesson Plans Common Board Configuration Assessments (scrimmages/benchmark/end of module test) Student thinking maps Interactive word wall
3	2a.3 Reinforcement of numbers and operations, geometry and measurement, algebra and data analysis	2a.3Use of Technology which may include: destination success, envision, GIZMO, Compass Odessey, FCAT explorer, Sum Dog, Student Thinking Maps Math Investigation games Math strategy charts Math centers and Math facts FCIM lessons	2a.3 Classroom teachers School Math coach District Math coach RED coach	2a.3 Classroom visitations Teachers will share insight data with Coaches and Principal Teachers will analyze insight data And determine next steps Student thinking maps Math centers/games/facts in use in classroom FCIM calendar FCIM enrichment FCIM re-teach/ small groups Common Board Configuration Interactive word wall	2a.3Classroom observations (formal and informal) Lesson Plans Common Board Configuration Assessments (scrimmages/benchmark/end of module test) Student thinking maps Data from technology programs FCIM assessments driving next steps

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning	

gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	In grades 4/5 students making learning gains in math will increase from 53% (65)to 65%(85).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
53%(65)	63%(85)

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.Identify the level 2 students who are not in the bottom quartile and determine a plan for student AYP	3a.1.Establish a nurture group Use Inform to gather data Analyze data to determine next steps Common board configuration Thinking Maps FCIM lessons FCIM enrichment FCIM re-teach/ small groups Core curriculum (math investigations use with fidelity) Math strategy charts Math games/centers/facts Interactive word walls	3a.1.Classroom teachers School Math Coach District Math coach RED coach	3a.1.Classroom visitations Lesson Plans Common Board configuration used daily FCIM calendar Student use of thinking maps Student use of concepts of math Teacher use of Inform data Teacher analyzing Inform data to Determine next step REA (student can re-state the problem, show the evidence and give the answer) FCIM enrichment FCIM re-teach/ small groups	3a.1.Classroom observations (formal and informal) Student data on Inform Assessments (scrimmages, benchmarks, end of module tests) FCIM assessments Student thinking maps Student can explain REA Common Board Configuration Interactive word wall
2	3a.2. Lack of teacher understanding of rigor in math NGSSS. Teacher staying in low complexity	3a.2. Increase high complexity of understanding of NGSSS through Thinking Map training Use of common board configuration Use of math conceptual standards Interactive word wall	3a.2. Thinking Map trainers School math coach District math coach RED coach	3a.2.. Classroom visitations Common board configuration Lesson Plans Student thinking maps used in work time of math Math conceptual standards found in lessons Interactive word wall	3a.2. Classroom observations (formal and informal) Student thinking maps displayed Math conceptual standards found in student work Assessments (scrimmages/benchmarks, end of module assessments) Common Board Configuration Interactive word wall
3	3a.3. Reinforcement of numbers and operations, geometry and measurement, algebra and data analysis	3a.3.Use of Technology which may include: destination success, envision, GIZMO, Compass Odessey, FCAT explorer, Sum Dog, Student Thinking Maps Math Investigation games Math strategy charts Math centers and Math facts FCIM lessons	3a.3. Classroom teachers School Math coach District Math coach RED coach	3a..3. Classroom visitations Teachers will share Inform data with Coaches and Principal Teachers will analyze Inform data And determine next steps Student thinking maps Math centers/games/facts in use in classroom FCIM calendar FCIM enrichment FCIM re-teach/ small groups Interactive word wall	3a.3. Classroom observations (formal and informal) Lesson Plans Common Board Configuration Assessments (scrimmages/benchmark/end of module test) Student thinking maps Data from technology programs FCIM assessments driving next steps Interactive word wall

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	In grades 4/5 students in the lowest 25% making learning gains will increase from 36% (15)to 50%(23).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
36%(15)	50%(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	4a.1. Identify and track all students in the bottom quartile and develop a plan for students to make AYP using math investigations and conceptual strategies to reinforce Bottom quartile is made up of students from ELL and STAR programs.	4a.1. Establish a nurture group Use insight to gather data Analyze data to determine next steps Common board configuration Thinking Maps FCIM lessons Core curriculum (math investigations use with fidelity) Math strategy charts Math games/centers/facts Interactive word wall	4a.1. Classroom teachers School Math Coach District Math coach RED coach	4a.1.Classroom visitations Lesson Plans Common Board configuration used daily FCIM calendar Student use of thinking maps Student use of concepts of math Teacher use of Inform data Teacher analyzing Inform data to Determine next step REA (student can re-state the problem, show the evidence and give the answer FCIM enrichment FCIM re-teach/ small groups	4a.1. Classroom observations (formal and informal) Student data on insight Assessments (scrimmages, benchmarks, end of module tests) FCIM assessments Student thinking maps Student can explain REA Common Board Configuration

2	4a.2. Lack of teacher understanding of rigor in math NGSSS. Teacher staying in low complexity Bottom quartile is made up of students from ELL and STAR programs.	4a.2. Increase high complexity of understanding of NGSSS through Thinking Map training Use of common board configuration Use of math conceptual-common core standards Interactive word wall	4a.2. Thinking Map trainers School math coach District math coach RED coach	4a.2. Classroom visitations Common board configuration Lesson Plans Student thinking maps used in work time of math Math conceptual standards found in lessons Interactive word wall	4a.2. Classroom observations (formal and informal) Student thinking maps displayed Math conceptual standards found in student work Assessments (scrimmages/benchmarks, end of module assessments) Common board configuration
3	4a.3. Reinforcement of numbers and operations, geometry and measurement, algebra and data analysis Bottom quartile is made up of students from the ELL and STAR Programs.	4a.3.Use of Technology which may include: destination success, envision, GIZMO, Compass Odyssey, FCAT explorer, Sum Dog, Student Thinking Maps Math Investigation games Math strategy charts Math centers and Math facts FCIM lessons Interactive word wall	4a.3. Classroom teachers School Math coach District Math coach RED coach	4a.3. Classroom visitations Teachers will share Inform data with Coaches and Principal Teachers will analyze Inform data And determine next steps Student thinking maps Math centers/games/facts in use in classroom FCIM calendar FCIM enrichment FCIM re-teach/ small groups	4a.3. Classroom observations (formal and informal) Lesson Plans Common Board Configuration Assessments (scrimmages/benchmark/end of module test) Student thinking maps Data from technology programs FCIM assessments driving next steps

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

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

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

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	49% of each subgroup: White(36) Black(25) Hispanic(18) Will make satisfactory progress in mathematics
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White:42% (31) Black:74%(38) Hispanic:76% (26)	White:49% (36) Black:49% (25) Hispanic: 49% (18)

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
	5B.1. White: Student lack of understanding the complexity of NGSSS and	5B.1. Increase high complexity of NGSSS and common core math practices content standards	5B.1. Classroom teachers School math coach	5B.1 .Monitor assessment and check for High complexity of understanding of NGSSS	5B.1. Classroom observations (formal and informal)

1	common core math practices content standards Black: Student lack of understanding the complexity of NGSSS and common core math practices content standards Hispanic: Student lack of understanding the complexity of NGSSS and common core math practices content standards	through the use of Thinking Maps Interactive word walls Increase high complexity of NGSSS and common core math practices content standards through the use of Thinking Maps Interactive word walls Increase high complexity of NGSSS and common core math practices content standards through the use of Thinking Maps Interactive word walls	District math coach RED coach Thinking Map trainers Classroom teachers School math coach District math coach RED coach Thinking Map trainers Classroom teachers School math coach District math coach RED coach Thinking Map trainers	and common core math practices content standards By the use of student thinking maps Addition of frame of reference in thinking maps which add rigor Interactive word walls Monitor assessment and check for High complexity of understanding of NGSSS and common core math practices content standards By the use of student thinking maps Addition of frame of reference in thinking maps which add rigor Interactive word walls Monitor assessment and check for High complexity of understanding of NGSSS and common core math practices content standards By the use of student thinking maps Addition of frame of reference in thinking maps which add rigor Interactive word walls	Lesson Plans Analysis of assessments Student thinking maps Interactive word walls Classroom observations (formal and informal) Lesson Plans Analysis of assessments Student thinking maps Interactive word walls Classroom observations (formal and informal) Lesson Plans Analysis of assessments Student thinking maps Interactive word walls
2	5B.2. White Student lack of understanding of new vocabulary Black Student lack of understanding of new vocabulary Hispanic Student lack of understanding of new vocabulary	5B.2. Introduce new vocabulary found in the learning schedule via common board configuration and thinking maps Interactive word walls Introduce new vocabulary found in the learning schedule via common board configuration and thinking maps Interactive word walls Introduce new vocabulary found in the learning schedule via common board configuration and thinking maps Interactive word walls	5B.2. Thinking Map trainers Principal Reading Coach District reading coach RED coach Thinking Map trainers Principal Reading Coach District reading coach RED coach Thinking Map trainers Principal Reading Coach District reading coach RED coach	5B.2. Common Board configuration used daily by teacher and students Classroom visitations Student thinking maps Lesson Plans Interactive word walls Common Board configuration used daily by teacher and students Classroom visitations Student thinking maps Lesson Plans Interactive word walls Common Board configuration used daily by teacher and students Classroom visitations Student thinking maps Lesson Plans Interactive word walls	5B.2. Active work wall Student thinking maps Analysis of assessment data to drive next step Interactive word walls Active work wall Student thinking maps Analysis of assessment data to drive next step Interactive word walls Active work wall Student thinking maps Analysis of assessment data to drive next step Interactive word walls
	5B.3. White: Teacher knowledge of explicit instruction for scaffolded math strategies using Math Investigations activities	5B.3. PLP on explicit instruction PLC on scaffolding math Strategies PLC on common core math practices concept standards	5B.3. Math coach District staff Classroom teachers Math coach District staff Classroom teachers	5B.3. Classroom visitations Lesson Plans Data from assessments Analysis of assessment for next steps Math strategy charts visible in classroom	5B.3. Classroom observations (formal and informal) Benchmark results Scrimmage results Student thinking

3	Black Teacher knowledge of explicit instruction for scaffolded math strategies using Math Investigations activities Hispanic Teacher knowledge of explicit instruction for scaffolded math strategies using Math Investigations activities	Math strategy charts Proper use of math center activities PLP on explicit instruction PLC on scaffolding math Strategies PLC on common core math practices concept standards Math strategy charts Proper use of math center activities PLP on explicit instruction PLC on scaffolding math Strategies PLC on common core math practices concept standards standards Math strategy charts Proper use of math center activities	Math coach District staff Classroom teachers	Math activities visible in classroom Classroom visitations Lesson Plans Data from assessments Analysis of assessment for next steps Math strategy charts visible in classroom Math activities visible in classroom Classroom visitations Lesson Plans Data from assessments Analysis of assessment for next steps Math strategy charts visible in classroom Math activities visible in classroom	maps Analysis of insight data Classroom observations (formal and informal) Benchmark results Scrimmage results Student thinking maps Analysis of insight data Classroom observations (formal and informal) Benchmark results Scrimmage results Student thinking maps Analysis of insight data

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	30%(14) of English language learners (ELL) will make satisfactory progress in math
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
24%(8)	30%(14)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5C.1. ELL students lack of understanding new and grade level vocabulary	5C.1. Utilization of the ELL Avenue curriculum Introduction of new and grade level vocabulary by using Common Board Configuration Introduction of new and grade level vocabulary by using Thinking Maps Introductions of new and grade level vocabulary by using interactive word wall	5C.1. Thinking Map Trainers School math coach District math coaches RED coach	5C.1. Classroom visitations Lesson plans with Avenue curriculum which will bridge to Houghton Mifflin reading series Daily common board configuration used by teachers and students Student thinking maps found in classroom Student thinking maps found on selected bulletin boards In grade level meeting student thinking maps are showcased Interactive word wall found in classroom	5C.1. Classroom observations (formal and informal) Avenue assessments (pretest/unit progress test/post test) Interactive word walls Student thinking maps

2	5C.2. ELL students lack of background knowledge	5C.2. Utilization of the ELL Avenues curriculum Students will use Thinking Maps to visualize background knowledge	5C.2.Thinking Map Trainers School math coaches District coaches RED coach	5C.2..Classroom visitations Lesson plans with avenue curriculum which will bridge to envision and Math Investigation Daily common board configuration used by teachers and students Student thinking maps found in classroom Student thinking maps found on selected bulletin boards In grade level meeting student thinking maps are showcased Interactive word wall	5C.2. Classroom observations (formal and informal) Avenue assessments (pretest/unit progress test/post test) Interactive word wall Student thinking maps
3	5C.3. Teacher knowledge of explicit instruction for scaffolded math Strategies using conceptual math activities	5C.3. PLC on explicit instruction PLC on scaffolding math Strategies PLC on conceptual math Proper use of center activities	5C.3. School coaches District math staff Classroom teachers	5C.3. Classroom visitations Lesson Plans (Avenues/Math Investigations /enVision) Assessments Analysis of assessment for next steps	5C.3. classroom observations (formal and informal) Benchmark results Scrimmage results Student thinking maps

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:	65%(7) of the students with disabilities (SWD will make satisfactory progress in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
55%(6)	65%(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	5D.1. SWD students lack of understanding new and grade level vocabulary	5D.1. Utilization of the Math Investigation and envision curriculum Introduction of new and grade level vocabulary by using Common Board Configuration Introduction of new and grade level vocabulary by using Thinking Maps Introduction of new and grade level vocabulary by using interactive word wall	5D.1. Thinking Map Trainers School math coach District math coaches RED coach	5D.1. Classroom visitations Lesson plans with avenue curriculum which will bridge to Houghton Mifflin reading series Daily common board configuration used by teachers and students Student thinking maps found in classroom Student thinking maps found on selected bulletin boards In grade level meeting student thinking maps are showcased Interactive word wall found in classroom	5D.1. Classroom observations (formal and informal) Avenue assessments (pretest/unit progress test/post test) Interactive word wall Student thinking maps
	5D.2. .SWD students lack of background knowledge	5D.2. Utilization of Math Investigations and envision curriculum Students will use Thinking Maps to	5D.2.Thinking Map Trainers School math coaches District coaches	5D.2..Classroom visitations Lesson plans with avenue curriculum which will bridge to envision and	5D.2. Classroom observations (formal and informal) Avenue

2		visualize background knowledge Students will use interactive word wall	RED coach	Math Investigation Daily common board configuration used by teachers and students Student thinking maps found in classroom Student thinking maps found on selected bulletin boards In grade level meeting student thinking maps are showcased Interactive word wall found in classroom	assessments (pretest/unit progress test/post test) Interactive word wall Student thinking maps
3	5D.3. Teacher knowledge of explicit instruction for scaffolded math Strategies using conceptual math activities	5D.3. PLC on explicit instruction PLC on scaffolding math Strategies PLC on conceptual math Proper use of center activities	5D.3. School coaches District math staff Classroom teachers	5D.3. Classroom visitations Lesson Plans (Avenues/Math Investigations /enVision) Assessments Analysis of assessment for next steps	5D.3. Classroom observations (formal and informal) Benchmark results Scrimmage results Student thinking maps FCIM Assessment results

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	49% (46)of the economically disadvantaged students will show satisfactory progress in mathematics
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29% (28)	49% (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	5E.1. ED students lack of understanding new and grade level vocabulary especially in the STAR program.	5E.1. Introduction of new and grade level vocabulary by using Common Board Configuration Introduction of new and grade level vocabulary by using Thinking Maps Introductions of new and grade level vocabulary by using interactive word wall	5E.1. Thinking Map Trainers School math coaches District math coaches RED coach	5E.1..Classroom visitations Lesson plans check Daily common board configuration used by teachers and students Student thinking maps found in classroom Student thinking maps found on selected bulletin boards In grade level meeting student thinking maps are showcased Interactive word wall found in classroom	5E.1.. .Classroom observations (formal and informal) Assessments (scrimmages/benchmarks/end of unit tests) Math words on interactive word wall Student thinking maps
2	5E.2. ED students lack of background knowledge especially in the STAR program	5E.2 Utilization of Math Investigation and enVision rmath series Students will use Thinking Maps to visualize background knowledge Math Strategy charts Interactive word wall	5E.2. Thinking Map Trainers School coaches District coaches RED coach	5E.2.Classroom visitations Lesson plans with Math Investigations and envision series Daily common board configuration used by teachers and students Student thinking maps found in classroom	5E.2. Classroom observations (formal and informal) Assessments (scrimmages/benchmarks/end of unit tests) Math words on interactive word wall Student thinking maps FCIM assessments

				Student thinking maps found on selected bulletin boards In grade level meeting student thinking maps are showcased Interactive word wall found in classroom	
3	5E.3. Teacher knowledge of explicit instruction for scaffolded reading Strategies using guided reading and center activities	5E.3 PLC on explicit instruction PLC on scaffolding reading Strategies PLC on guided reading and Proper use of center activities	5E.3 School coaches District staff Classroom teachers	5E.3 Classroom visitations Lesson Plans Assessments Analysis of assessment for next steps	5E.3 classroom observations (formal and informal) Benchmark results Scrimmage results Student thinking maps FCIM assessments

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common core math standards	K-5	Math Coach	All math teachers K-2	Sept. 27, 28, 2012	Classroom focus walks	Principal School coaches
Common core math practices standard	K-5	School Coaches	All math teachers	TBA	Classroom focus walks	Principal Math Coach
FCIM	K-5	Instructional Coach	All WRES teachers	September 5, 2012	Teachers learn about Focus Calendars and cycles of Focus lessons that target priority benchmarks for their grade levels	Principal School Coaches
Interactive Word Walls	K-5	School Reading Coach	All teachers K-5	September 25, 2012	Article study on what an Interactive Word Wall is, how to use an interactive word wall and activities teachers can do with their word wall, modeling of some of the activities for teachers by coach	Principal Reading Coach
Thinking Maps	K-5	Thinking Map Trainer	All WRES teachers	August 17, Sept 4, 19 Oct. 3, 17 Nov 7 Jan 23 Feb	Student thinking maps will be shared at grade level meetings	Principal Math coach
Explicit instruction	K-5	School Coaches	All math teachers K-5	Ongoing throughout the school year	Book study with Explicit Instruction by Anita Archer, teachers use explicit instruction in classrooms	Principal Math coach
Common Board Configuration	K-5	School Coaches	All WRES teachers	August 16, 2012 Additional training TBA	Teachers learn the subject components for Board Configurations and its purpose	Principal School Coaches

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Instructional core curriculum	Math Investigation/envision/Avenues	District	$0.00
Thinking Maps	8 visual thinking maps	Title 3	$0.00

			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Brain based programs to increase math skills	envision/GIZMO/Compass Odyssey/ FCAT explorer/Sum Dog	District	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
WRES math committee	Insight/learning schedules/lesson plans	District	$0.00
Thinking maps	Thinking maps	Title 3	$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:	46%(27) of the fifth grade science students will score a 3 on FCAT science test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27%(15)	46%(27)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1a.1.Implementing with fidelity the new Scott Foresmann curriculum in grades K-4 and the new P-Sell curriculum in grade 5	1a.1.Teachers will use the 5E ,model to teach the new core Curriculum in grades K-5 Teachers will use the new Hands-on inquiry P-Sell curriculum in grade 5. Student will conduct hands-on Experiments. Thinking maps used by students To visualize science concepts Interactive Word Wall FCIM Lessons	1a.1. Thinking Map trainers Classroom teachers District science coach P-Sell coordinator Principal	a.1. Classroom visitations Lesson Plans Student Thinking Maps Student responses to hands-on activities Students use word wall words in science responses FCIM re-teach or enrichment Common Board Configuration	1a.1. Classroom observations (formal and informal) Core curriculum assessments Next steps based on data of Assessments Science benchmarks 5th Science formatives K-4 Student thinking maps FCIM assessments Common Board

		Common Board Configuration			Configuration
2	1a.2.Lack of understanding science vocabulary	1a.2. Implementation of science vocabulary notebook K-5 Using Marzano's vocab sheets and thinking maps Common Board Configuration Interactive Word Wall FCIM Lessons	1a.2. Classroom teachers Science Committee District Science Coach Principal	1a.2. Classroom visitations Lesson Plans Check for daily common board configuration Student thinking maps Marzano's vocabulary sheets in student notebook Students use word wall words in science responses	1a.2 Classroom observations (formal and informal) Student science notebook with science vocabulary Student thinking maps Science Assessments Assessments analyzed for next steps FCIM assessments Common Board Configuration
3	1a.3.Lack of science hands on activities	1a.3.Core curriculum used with fidelity. New core curriculum is an active hands on curriculum Use of GIZMO Use of interactive core curriculum activities ESOL students push-in to 5th grade science class Common Board Configuration	1a.3. Classroom teachers Science Committee District Science coach District science coach Principal	1a.3. Classroom visitations Lesson Plans Check for daily common board configuration Student thinking maps Check student science interactive workbook ESOL student work found in gen-ed science class Common Board Configuration	1a.3. Classroom observations (formal and informal) Student thinking maps Science Assessments Assessments analyzed and next steps formulated Exit tickets for hands-on activities Common Board Configuration

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.	26%(15) of the fifth grade science students will score a

Science Goal #2a:	four or higher on the FCAT science test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
9%(5)	26%(15)

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	a.1.Implementing with fidelity the new Scott Foresman curriculum in grades K-4 and the new P-Sell curriculum in grade 5	2a.1.Teachers will use the 5E ,model to teach the new core Curriculum in grades K-5 Teachers will use the new Hands-on inquiry P-Sell curriculum in grade 5. Student will conduct hands-on Experiments. Thinking maps used by students To visualize science concepts Interactive Word Wall FCIM Lessons Common Board Configuration	2a.1. Thinking Map trainers Classroom teachers District science coach P-Sell coordinator Principal	2a.1. Classroom visitations Lesson Plans Student Thinking Maps Student responses to hands-on activities Students use word wall words in science responses FCIM re-teach or enrichment Common Board Configuration	2a.1. Classroom observations (formal and informal) Core curriculum assessments Next steps based on data of Assessments Science benchmarks 5th Science formatives K-4 Student thinking maps FCIM assessments Common Board Configuration
2	2a.2.Lack of understanding science vocabulary	2a.2. Implementation of science vocabulary notebook K-5 Using Marzano's vocab sheets and thinking maps Common Board Configuration Interactive Word Wall FCIM Lessons	2a.2. Classroom teachers Science Committee District Science Coach Principal	2a.2. Classroom visitations Lesson Plans Check for daily common board configuration Student thinking maps Marzano's vocabulary sheets in student notebook Students use word wall words in science responses	2a.2 Classroom observations (formal and informal) Student science notebook with science vocabulary Student thinking maps Science Assessments Common Board Configuration Assessments analyzed for next steps .FCIM Assessments
3	2a.3.Lack of science hands on activities	2a.3.Core curriculum used with fidelity. New core curriculum is an active hands on curriculum Use of GIZMO Use of interactive core curriculum activities	2a.3. Classroom teachers Science Committee District Science coach District science coach Principal	2a.3. Classroom visitations Lesson Plans Check for daily common board configuration Student thinking maps Check student science interactive workbook	2a.3. Classroom observations (formal and informal) Student thinking maps Science Assessments Assessments analyzed and next steps formulated Exit tickets for hands-on activities

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
Thinking Maps	K-5	Thinking Map trainers	All WRES teachers	August 17, Sept 4, 19 Oct. 3, 17 Nov 7 Jan 23 Feb	Student thinking maps will be shared at grade level meetings	Principal District science coach
P-Sell	5th grade science teachers	P-Sell trainers	5th grade science teachers	August 14,16,17 TBA	Lesson Plans Classroom visitations	P-Sell coordinator District science coach
Scott Foresmann new core curriculum	K-4	School science committee	Classroom teachers K-4	Monthly science committee mtgs 4th Tuesday of the month	Agenda and minutes of science committee meetings	Science cmte chairperson Science cmte secretary

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Thinking Maps	8 visual thinking maps	Title 3	$0.00
P-Sell	P-Sell curriculum	NSF grant	$0.00
Scott Foresmann	core curriculum	District	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Scott Foresmann	Interactive program in core	District	$0.00
GIZMO	Interactive program	District	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Thinking Maps	Thinking map trainers with 8 maps	Title 3	$0.00
P-sell	P-Sell curriculum training	NSF grant	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $0.00

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	60%(35) of the students in fourth grade will achieve a level 3 on the Florida Writes! 35%20) of the students in fourth grade will achieve a level 4 or higher on the Florida Writes!
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
12%(6)	60%(35) 45%(20)

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.Lack of student knowledge of grammar, spelling and sentence syntax.	1a.1. Thinking Maps Anchor lessons from DCSB writers workshop Daily 30 minute skills block Daily connection between readers/writers workshop Grade level words that students should know how to spell All teachers/students speak in complete sentences. (contest) Common Board Configuration Interactive Word Wall	1a.1. Instructional coach Classroom teachers School writing committee District literacy coach RED coach	1a.1. Classroom visitations Student thinking maps Active word walls Student published writing examples Writing portfolios (genres) Common Board Configuration Interactive Word Wall	1a.1. Classroom observations (formal and informal) Writing rubrics Writing prompts Student Thinking Maps Data from writing prompts determine next steps Improved spelling, grammar, and sentence syntax in writing prompts. Common Board Configuration Interactive Word Wall

2	1a.2.Fidelity of writing learning schedule used daily by writing teachers	1a.2. New literacy block in K-5 Writing embedded in the literacy block New literacy lesson plan template Students using thinking maps ESOL 4th grade student push in for writing in fourth grade with gen ed. STAR students push in for writing with gen ed Common Board Configuration	1a.2. Instructional coach Classroom teachers School writing committee District literacy coach RED coach	1a.2. Classroom visitations Student thinking maps Active word walls Student published writing examples Writing portfolios (genres) Common Board Configuration	1a.2. Classroom observations (formal and informal) Writing rubrics Writing prompts Student Thinking Maps Data from writing prompts determine next steps Improved spelling, grammar, and sentence syntax in writing prompts. Common Board Configuration New literacy lesson plan template
3	1a.3.Students need to be writing everyday (response to literature, writing genres, science vocabulary notebooks)	1a.3. Drop everything and write! In reading students daily write a response to literature Students science vocabulary notebooks Student writing daily in writer's workshop ESOL student push in for writing in fourth grade gen ed STAR students push in for writing in fourth grade gen ed Common Board Configuration P-SELL writing in science	1a.3. Instructional coach Classroom teachers School writing committee District literacy coach RED coach	1a.3. Classroom visitations Student thinking maps Active word walls Student published writing examples Writing portfolios (genres) Common Board Configuration	1a.3. Classroom observations (formal and informal) Writing rubrics Writing prompts Student Thinking Maps Data from writing prompts determine next steps Improved spelling, grammar, and sentence syntax in writing prompts. Common Board Configuration

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
Introduction of new literacy block and new literacy lesson plan template	K-5	Executive Director Principal WRES coaches	K-5 literacy teachers	October 3, 2012	Check daily teacher schedules for new literacy block New lesson plan template implemented 10/8/12	Principal WRES coaches
FCAT writes!	4th grade	Melvin Davis	4th grade writing teachers, instructional coach, ,Principal	September 7, 2012	Information presented will be seen in lesson plans	Instructional coach Principal
Thinking Maps	K-5	Thinking Map trainers	All WRES teachers	August 17, Sept 4, 19 Oct. 3, 17 Nov 7 Jan 23 Feb	Student thinking maps will be shared at grade level meetings	Principal Instructional coach
Grammar and conventions	K-5	Instructional coach	Writing committee	Monthly writing committee meeting 3rd Tuesday of the month	Improved grammar and convections in student writing	Principal Instructional coach
In depth training on new literacy block and new literacy template	K-5	State reading coach Debra Massey	K-5 literacy teachers	October 5, 2012	New daily schedules with literacy block New lesson plan template implemented on 10/8/12	Principal WRES coaches

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s) / Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
DCSB Writing Learning schedule	Learning schedule	District	$0.00
Writer's Workshop Model	America's Choice	District	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Using 6 pt rubric grade last year's FCAT Writes! Prompts	CD from FLDOE of last years prompts	FLDOE	$0.00
Anchor Papers	Riverdeep	District	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Thinking Maps	8 visual thinking maps	Title 3	$0.00
FCAT Writes! training	State instructor	District	$0.00
FCAT Writes! training	State instructor	District	$0.00
Using the Anchor papers to score	Riverdeep, Instructional Coach	District	$0.00
Grammar and Conventions	Learning Schedule, Instructional Coach, Vertical Alignment	District	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $0.00

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	Reduce the number of students absent ten days or more by 20%. From 46% (158) To 26% (48) Reduce the number of students with 10 or more tardies From 25 % (84) To 20% (67)
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
93.6%	95%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
46%	26%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
84 25%	67 20%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1.Communication with the parents about the importance of students being to school on time and present every day.	1.1Student who have 3 or more unexcused absences will receive a letter stating the importance of school attendance. Guidance counselor to target top "offenders" for tardy and absences. Check on children and families to improve attendance. After 5 unexcused absences the student will be referred to the AIT. Awards will be presented per student for perfect attendance. Each awards assembly (9wks) students can	1.1.Classroom teacher CRT Guidance counselor AIT team Volunteer Liaison Principal	1.1.CRT will run monthly attendance/tardy reports to monitor student absences and tardies. CRT will give list to guidance counselor twice a month to monitor and communicate with families. Guidance counselor and Principal will meet monthly to discuss absenteeism and tardiness issues.	1.1.Reduction of absences and trardies looking at monthly reports. Results from AIT meetings Reduction of absences and tardies on CRT reports by 20%. School monthly newsletter.

		earn charm for attendance on his/her awards necklace. Reward families with gift card for most improved attendance each nine weeks. School monthly newsletter stress importance of attendance in school. Daily check-ins with guidance counselor for students with 30 or more tardies- weekly/ monthly rewards			
2					

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
Communicate with parents	K-5 teachers	Principal	All WRES teachers	September 2012	More parent involvement at school PTA membership increase Volunteer membership increase	PTA Volunteer Liaison Teachers
Guidance counseling for attendance issues	K-5	Guidance counselor	All WRES students	Sept. 2012 ongoing	Counseling can determine root of attendance issues	Guidance counselor
Importance of accurate attendance records	K-5 teachers	Principal	All WRES homeroom teachers	September 2012	Analysis of daily attendance Month attendance reports	CRT Guidance Counselor

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Attendance topic articles in school newsletter	Monthly newsletter	School	$450.00
Gift cards	Volunteer Liaison get cards from local business	Community businesses	$80.00
			Subtotal: $530.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Oncourse attendance program	Daily attendance	District	$0.00
3 day and 5 day absent letter	Microsoft word	District	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Staff understanding of community culture	Connecting with parents	District	$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: $530.00

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	1.1.Keeping fidelity of school wide discipline program of Foundations and CHAMPS.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
15	13
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
9	7
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
26	20
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
17	14

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Keeping fidelity of the school-wide program of CHAMPS in all classrooms.	Implementation of school-wide CHAMPS strategies on a daily basis in all classrooms.	Classroom Teachers Guidance Counselor Principal CRT	CRT will print monthly reports and they will be reviewed by the Leadership Team and the Foundation Team	Reduction in referrals
	1.2.Analyze 2011-2012 referrals by grade and offense to determine	1.2.To determine patterns of student misconduct	1.2.Guidance counselor	1.2.Collect data and analyze the 214 school	1.2.Spreadsheet listing referrals by infactions and

2	patterns of student misconduct		Principal Teachers	referrals into infractions and grade levels Look for a common pattern of offenses.	grade levels. Identify patterns and determine next steps.
3	1.3.Children reacting to situations without understanding options for self control.	1.3.Small group counseling using Student Success Skills by guidance counselor School wide peer mediation program Implementation of bully free program	1.3.Guidance counselor Teachers	1.3.Monitor Student success skills Program Monitor and track peer mediation program Survey children on “bullying”, Collect data and analyze for next steps	1.3.Monitor number of school referrals
4					

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
Foundation Training	K-5	Foundation Committee	School Wide	October 2012	Analyze referrals, implement new cafeteria plan	Foundation cmte chairperson
Peer Mediation	K-5	Guidance counselor	School wide	Fall 2012	Monitor number of students who need peer mediation	Guidance counselor

Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Positive reinforcement	Foundation	District	$0.00
Peer Mediation Curriculum	DCSB	District	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Genesis program	Monitors # of in-school and out of school suspensions	District	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Foundations	Classroom Management	School	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Increase positive choices	Student of the month bulletin board	School	$50.00
			Subtotal: $50.00
			Grand Total: $50.00

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	In 2012-2013 to increase the PTA membership to 50% (171).
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
37%(129)	50%(171)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1.Lack of parent involvement in child's school.	1.1.Encourge parents to communicate with teachers using the student planner. Send monthly school newsletter with upcoming events. Attend Open House Encourage joining PTA Encourage joining PTA board Encourage attending PTA general meetings Encourage joining SAC Encourage becoming a homeroom mom or dad Encourage joining All Pro Dads	1.1.Classroom teachers Guidance Counselor Principal School coaches PTA officers SAC members All Pro Dad's President	1.1.Notes from teachers and parents found in student planner Monthly newsletter sent home first of the month Invitation to parents to join PTA PTA facebook page lists board meetings and general meetings Invitation to parents to become room mom or dad PTA facebook page lists All Pro Dads meetings Invitation to attend SAC monthly meetings	1.1.Increase communication between teachers and parents monitored in student planner Increase in PTA membership Increase in attendance at PTA board/general meetings from sign in sheet Increase in attendance to SAC meeting from sign in sheet Increase in attendance of SAC meetings from sign in sheet
2	2.Some parents do not speak or understand English(ESOL population)	1.2.use of Trans Act for teachers and office to use to help parents understand needed information. ESOL paraprofessionals help translate Spanish to English. Classroom referral has been translated into Spanish.	1.2.Classroom teachers Office Staff ESOL paraprofessionals	.2.Office staff will keep record of forms not returned and notify the classroom teacher if specific forms are not on file.	1.2.TransAct allows needed forms to return to school.
3	1.3.Increase the number of community volunteers at WRES	1.3.Invite community to volunteer via PTA/SAC Volunteer Liaison position established to go into community to seek out volunteers.	1.3.PTA president SAC chairperson Volunteer Liaison Principal	1.3.Increase in the number of volunteers from the increase number of volunteer hours in Volunteer report.	1.3.Increase of volunteers in the building Award the "Golden Apple" for increase of volunteers from DCSB

4					

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
Student performances	K-5	Principal	parents	August 17, Sept. 6, Dec.8, May 2013	If students perform parents will come to school.	principal, PTA president

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Volunteer Liaison	Goes into community to increase volunteer support of school	district	$12,000.00
			Subtotal: $12,000.00
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: $12,000.00

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

Safety Goal
A drainage system for the WRES campus.
1.1. Anticipated Barriers
No drainage system for the entire city block that WRES sits on
1.1. Strategy
City of Jacksonville installs a proper drainage system for city block
1.1. Person Responsible
City of Jacksonville
JEA
District Maintenance
1.1. Process used to determine effectiveness
Water drained properly on cit block
1.1. Evaluation tool
Land is not saturated with water
On city block. Goal:

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

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

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

Budget:

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

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

End of Safety Goal
A drainage system for the WRES campus.
1.1. Anticipated Barriers
No drainage system for the entire city block that WRES sits on
1.1. Strategy
City of Jacksonville installs a proper drainage system for city block
1.1. Person Responsible
City of Jacksonville
JEA
District Maintenance
1.1. Process used to determine effectiveness
Water drained properly on cit block
1.1. Evaluation tool
Land is not saturated with water
On city block. Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Houghton Mifflin reading series	Core curriculum	District	$0.00
Reading	Avenues curriculum	ELL curriculum	District	$0.00
Reading	Thinking Maps	Title 3	District	$0.00
CELLA	Avenues Curriculum	ESOL DCSB curriculum	District	$0.00
CELLA	Thinking Maps	ESOL curriculum	District Title 3	$0.00
Mathematics	Instructional core curriculum	Math Investigation/envision/Avenues	District	$0.00
Mathematics	Thinking Maps	8 visual thinking maps	Title 3	$0.00
Science	Thinking Maps	8 visual thinking maps	Title 3	$0.00
Science	P-Sell	P-Sell curriculum	NSF grant	$0.00
Science	Scott Foresmann	core curriculum	District	$0.00
Writing	DCSB Writing Learning schedule	Learning schedule	District	$0.00
Writing	Writer's Workshop Model	America's Choice	District	$0.00
Attendance	Attendance topic articles in school newsletter	Monthly newsletter	School	$450.00
Attendance	Gift cards	Volunteer Liaison get cards from local business	Community businesses	$80.00
Suspension	Positive reinforcement	Foundation	District	$0.00
Suspension	Peer Mediation Curriculum	DCSB	District	$0.00
Parent Involvement	Volunteer Liaison	Goes into community to increase volunteer support of school	district	$12,000.00
				Subtotal: $12,530.00

Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Thinking maps	Thinking maps 8 visual representations	Title 3	$0.00
CELLA	Compass odyssey	Computer program on reading	DCSB	$0.00
CELLA	Soar to Success	Computer program on reading	DCSB	$0.00
Mathematics	Brain based programs to increase math skills	envision/GIZMO/Compass Odyssey/ FCAT explorer/Sum Dog	District	$0.00
Science	Scott Foresmann	Interactive program in core	District	$0.00
Science	GIZMO	Interactive program	District	$0.00
Writing	Using 6 pt rubric grade last year's FCAT Writes! Prompts	CD from FLDOE of last years prompts	FLDOE	$0.00
Writing	Anchor Papers	Riverdeep	District	$0.00
Attendance	Oncourse attendance program	Daily attendance	District	$0.00
Attendance	3 day and 5 day absent letter	Microsoft word	District	$0.00
Suspension	Genesis program	Monitors # of in-school and out of school suspensions	District	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00

Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	FAIR data – grouping students	State reading coach	State	$0.00
Reading	Interactive word wall	WRES Coaches	School	$0.00
Reading	New literacy block and literacy lesson plan template	State/District/school coaches	State/district/school literacy coaches	$0.00
Reading	Thinking Maps	District	Title 3	$0.00

Reading	Explicit instruction	WRES Coaches	School	$0.00
Reading	DRA2/insight/guided reading/FCIM/IPDP	WRES Coaches	School	$0.00
CELLA	Thinking maps	ESOL training by schools	District	$0.00
CELLA	Guided reading	Group ESOL according to reading level	School coaches training	$0.00
Mathematics	WRES math committee	Insight/learning schedules/lesson plans	District	$0.00
Mathematics	Thinking maps	Thinking maps	Title 3	$0.00
Science	Thinking Maps	Thinking map trainers with 8 maps	Title 3	$0.00
Science	P-sell	P-Sell curriculum training	NSF grant	$0.00
Writing	Thinking Maps	8 visual thinking maps	Title 3	$0.00
Writing	FCAT Writes! training	State instructor	District	$0.00
Writing	FCAT Writes! training	State instructor	District	$0.00
Writing	Using the Anchor papers to score	Riverdeep, Instructional Coach	District	$0.00
Writing	Grammar and Conventions	Learning Schedule, Instructional Coach, Vertical Alignment	District	$0.00
Attendance	Staff understanding of community culture	Connecting with parents	District	$0.00
Suspension	Foundations	Classroom Management	School	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
CELLA	Explicit instruction	School coaches train using book study	FDLERS	$0.00
Suspension	Increase positive choices	Student of the month bulletin board	School	$50.00
				Subtotal: $50.00
				Grand Total: $12,580.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

○ Priority	● Focus	○ Prevent	○ NA

Are you a reward school: ○ Yes ● No

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

View uploaded file (Uploaded on 10/23/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

✓ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
Purchase authentic literature books, materials for science experiments, funds for field trips, Assemblies, and student incentives to promote attendance.	$1,474.00

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

The activities of the SAC for the upcoming year is to work on the budget, sip review, increase volunteer and community support, and help to support any of the special needs for staff and children

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
WEST RIVERSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	64%	64%	74%	41%	243	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	60%	49%			109	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	50% (YES)	63% (YES)			113	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					465	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Duval School District
WEST RIVERSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	67%	69%	78%	52%	266	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	61%	65%			126	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	63% (YES)	67% (YES)			130	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					522	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested