

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: JOSEPH FINEGAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Duval

Principal: Alan Due

SAC Chair: Malissa Caraway

Superintendent: Dr. Nikolai Vitti

Date of School Board Approval: November 5, 2012

Last Modified on: 1/7/2013

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Alan Due	Bachelor of Arts in English; Masters of Divinity; English (Grades 6-12) Educational Leadership (all levels); School Principal (all levels)	1	7.5	Principal of John Stockton Elementary 2005- 2006; Grade A; made AYP; Reading Proficiency -88%; Math Proficiency – 80%; Writing Proficiency – 97% Principal of John Stockton Elementary 2006-2007; Grade A; made AYP; Reading Proficiency - 89%; Math Proficiency -88 %; Writing Proficiency -89% Principal of John Stockton Elementary 2007-2008; Grade A; made AYP; Reading Proficiency -88 %; Math Proficiency -81 %; Writing Proficiency – 88% Principal of Pinedale Elementary 2008-2009; Grade C; Reading Proficiency - 47%; Math Proficiency - 40%; Writing Proficiency 81% - did not make AYP in mathematics for the following subgroups: black and students with disabilities Principal of Pinedale Elementary 2009-2010; Grade F ; Reading Proficiency – 41%; Math Proficiency – 41%; Writing Mastery - 69%; did not make AYP in reading and mathematics for the following subgroups: black and economically

					disadvantaged Principal of Bank of America Learning Academy 2010-2011; Grade: A; Made AYP; Reading proficiency-92%; Math proficiency-97%; Writing proficiency-80% Principal of Joseph Finegan Elementary 2011-2012; Grade B; Reading proficiency-61%; Math proficiency-57%; Writing proficiency-82%; Reading gains-67%; Math gains-61%; BQ reading gains-71%; BQ Math gains-54%
--	--	--	--	--	---

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)
Math/ELA	N/A	N/A			N/A
NA					

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. Use of teacher leaders (trained in both content areas and the school improvement process) to guide the development and monitoring of the School Improvement Plan. All teachers participate in SIP teams.	Principal and SIP Chairs	June 2013	
2	2. Ongoing training at both the school level (Early Dismissal, differentiated faculty meetings and grade level training sessions) and district level (content training and leadership development)	Principal and Professional Development Facilitator	June 2013	
3	3. Grade level teacher teams participate in the hiring of applicants for vacancies	Principal	Ongoing	
4	4. Use calibration exercises, ongoing focus walks and informal/formal district observation instruments to provide feedback on instructional practices.	Principal and classroom teachers	May 2013	
5	5. Grade level and content area meetings before, after &/or during school	Principal and grade/content level lead teachers	June 2013	
6	6. Implement Instructional Rounds as a means for teachers to observe and learn from another.	Principal	June 2013	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

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

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
37	2.7%(1)	10.8%(4)	40.5%(15)	45.9%(17)	35.1%(13)	83.8%(31)	2.7%(1)	5.4%(2)	54.1%(20)

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
Miranda Pridgen	Summer Youngblood	Both are STAR teachers	Assist in completion of Mentoring and Induction for Novice Teachers (MINT) program. 2. Observe lessons and provide feedback 3. Assist in the development of the teacher's Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP) 4. Plan lessons together 5. Provide district coaching support
Diane Fulp	Latrelle Cameron Morris	Both teach on the same grade level (2nd); they are in the same rotation together (departmentalized)	Assist in completion of Mentoring and Induction for Novice Teachers (MINT) program. 2. Observe lessons and provide feedback 3. Assist in the development of the teacher's Individual Professional Development Plan (IPDP) 4. Plan lessons together 5. Provide district coaching support

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Members of the school's MTSS Team: In addition to the principal, Alan Due, the following members are included: Susan Smart (Chair) has 30 years of ESE academic service in the State of Florida. As a Behavioral Specialist she brings a unique perspective to the team pertaining to not only academics, but also behavioral issues and accommodations. Donna Davis, the school's Guidance Counselor/ESE Liaison comes from a family with a military background. She plays an important role in our military community attached to Naval Station Mayport. Donna brings over 21 years of experience to the team. Deborah Amodeo, VE specialist, has 14 years of experience working with students requiring ESE support services; her area of certification is Mentally Handicapped. Nancy Garrett, our Speech and Language Pathologist, brings over 30 years of knowledge and experience. Sharon Kasica (ELA Lead) is a former Instructional Coach and the SIP Chair for reading. Her knowledge of Readers and Writers Workshop and the interventions therein are imperative to the Tier 1 -3 processes.

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 MTSS Leadership Team has four primary functions:

1. Regularly attend all district MTSS training sessions;
2. Provide presentations to the school faculty and staff on the MTSS model and best practices;
3. Review school wide student performance data, identifying large scale needs and problems at particular grade levels; and
4. Monitor the implementation of the three-tiered MTSS model in the school.

The entire school-based MTSS Leadership Team meets at least monthly to engage in school wide problem-solving. The team will engage in the following activities:

1. Facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation;
2. Identify professional development needs and MTSS resources;
3. Review universal screening data and link to instructional decisions;

4. 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;
5. Monitor MTSS activities conducted by the collaborative teacher teams to assure sound problem-solving and fidelity of intervention implementation.

The MTSS Team will follow the Problem Solving Model (problem identification, problem analysis, intervention design and implementation, and evaluation) to conduct all meetings. Based on data and discussion, the team will identify students who are in need of additional academic and/or behavioral support (Tier 2 or Tier 3). An intervention plan will be developed which identifies a student's specific areas of deficiencies and appropriate research-based interventions to address these deficiencies. The team will ensure the necessary resources are available and the intervention is implemented with fidelity.

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

Members of the MTSS Team are also members of the School Improvement Plan teams. Hence, they will be a direct contact for ensuring that SIP strategies are in place when dealing with the tier supports at all levels. The same process used in our MTSS Team meetings will be used by the SIP teams in the development of this plan: teams reviewed the school data for each of the content areas (identified current state and desired state of performance), used the fish bone strategy (diagrams) to identify possible causes/barriers; brainstormed strategies to address the causes, and will be involved in assessing the effectiveness of the strategies at monthly meetings. Our School Advisory Council will also be involved in monitoring the implementation of the plan.

MTSS Implementation

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

The school will use data from the following academic sources: FCAT, FAIR, district benchmark assessments, district writing prompts, district Progress Monitoring Assessments, DRA2, and curriculum-based measures (classroom level) to monitor academic performance. Data on absenteeism, tardies, early dismissal, discipline, and suspensions from Genesis will be utilized to monitor behavioral performance. Pearson's Learning Station programs (Insight and Inform) are the district's management system tools that will be used to monitor data at all levels.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The MTSS team has developed a flowchart outlining the process to support students who are struggling academically and/or behaviorally. The chart also provides a brief description of each event within the process. The chart will be used to provide additional training on the process and will serve as a navigation guide for teachers to effectively students who are in need of the tier supports.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Not only does the principal serve as an active member of this team, but the team has developed a flowchart/procedural system to ensure that MTSS protocols/steps are followed. Weekly meetings of the team will also ensure that students are appropriately monitored.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Members of the school-based Literacy Team include:

1. Alan Due, Principal
2. Sharon Kasica, 4th grade teacher, Chairperson
3. Jennifer VanHoose, 3rd grade teacher, Co-chair
4. Sandra DeAngelis, Kindergarten teacher
5. Latrelle Morris, 2nd grade teacher
6. Lezley Bemoll, 5th grade teacher
7. Deborah Amodeo, ESE Specialist
7. Malissa Caraway, PTA/SAC representative

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

The district's reading/language arts philosophy is clear in suggesting that a successful reading teacher not only teaches a child how to read, but also incorporates strategies that foster a love of reading and prepares the student to enjoy a lifetime of reading. In support of the district's reading goals and our school based reading goals, we have established a monthly literacy team data review meeting to assist us in aligning with DCPS Comprehensive K-12 Reading Plan. Team members review current and longitudinal data to ensure the successful implementation of the core reading series and research-based strategies for supporting students in the core curriculum.

The team further meets to assess faculty professional development needs and to formulate plans on effective implementation of targeted reading goals within our surrounding community. The team's main goal is to continuously address the instructional rigor in our reading curriculum and the manner in which it is being delivered across content and grade levels to provide next steps for improving the reading achievement of our students. The team meets on a regular basis to monitor the implementation of the Reading portion of the School Improvement Plan.

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

- Develop and monitor the implementation of the SIP reading strategies
- Use the Pearson Data Management System (Inform) to track progress of students in reading
- Ensure that the necessary Professional Development is being provided for teachers in unpacking the reading benchmarks, instructional pedagogy, and using data to drive instruction
- Ensure that all students are meeting the Reading Habit Standard in order to increase the volume of reading
- Plan literacy and FCAT parent nights in order to help parents work successfully with their children at home

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

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



PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	In 2013, 64% (129) of the students will score at Achievement Level 3 or above on the state assessment (FCAT) in reading; 21% (42) of these students will score at Achievement Level 3
---	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
24% (45)	21% (42)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1A.1. Students have limited vocabulary and struggle using comprehension strategies in unfamiliar texts	1A.1. Teachers will provide explicit instruction in vocabulary utilizing the strategies from Creating Robust Vocabulary. Increase students' exposure to informational texts at every grade level using authentic, real-world texts, periodicals and text feature boards.	1A.1. Principal; SIP Reading Chair	1A.1. Classroom walk through; student use of modeled vocabulary, review of district benchmark data and FCAT	1A.1. Classroom walk through instrument; Inform
2	1A.2. Typically, students don't express themselves in complete thoughts/sentences	1A.2. All students, K-5, will be expected to follow the rules of conversation, as stated in the Common Core State Standards; the rules will be taught through weekly modeling on WFIN and small group guidance lessons.	1A.2. Grade level chairs	1A.2. Review of student writing; measuring conversations against conversation rubric	1A.2. Writing rubric; conversation rubric
3	1A.3. Students struggle with applying reading strategies to grade level texts	1A.3. Expose students to complex texts and application of strategies through explicit instruction (using the gradual release model)	1A.3. Principal	1A.3. Focus walk	1A.3. Focus walk instrument

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:	In 2013, 43% (87) of students will score at or above Achievement Level 4 or above on the state assessment (FCAT) in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
35% (66)	43 %(87)

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 lose motivation to read	2A.1. Nine-week reading goals will be established for each grade level and tracked in all classrooms; principal will recognize and celebrate students meeting quarterly goals; implement Accelerated Reader in grades 3-5; million word recognition each nine weeks displayed school wide.	2A.1. Classroom Teachers, Principal	2A.1. Review of Classroom reading logs, tracking systems on focus walks, Accelerated Reader reports, school wide display	2A.1. Reading logs, focus walk instrument; district benchmark assessments, FAIR
2	2A.2. Students are not challenged	2A.2. Provide professional development on increasing rigor and differentiating reading instruction.	2A.2. Principal; SIP Reading Chair	2A.2. Use Webb's Depth of Knowledge to measure level of rigor required in reading strategies/assignments; periodic walk throughs; review of reading data	2A.2.CAST: Domains 1 and 3; lesson plan focus walk; reading progress monitoring documents

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	In 2013, 70% (141) of the students will make learning gains on the state assessment (FCAT) in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67% (126)	70% (141)

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. Students have low reading stamina (cognitive endurance)	3A.1. Increase the volume of reading over the span of the year in order to extend the amount of focused time students will spend in Independent Reading	3A.1. Principal and SIP Reading Chair	3A.1. Results on the Independent Reading rubrics by grade level	3A.1. School-wide chart of reading times per grade level; Independent Reading rubrics, school wide display
2	3A.2. Students have low reading stamina (cognitive endurance)	3A.2. Principal will encourage reading at home through the monthly newsletter and School Messenger; institute an at-home reading log/program to monitor progress	3A.2. Principal; classroom teacher	3A.2. Review of reading logs and classroom reading habit charts	3A.2. Nine-week reporting tool indicating number of students meeting the reading habit standard

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	In 2013, 74% (149) of the students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on the state assessment (FCAT) in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71% (133)	74% (149)

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. Students have limited vocabulary and struggle using comprehension strategies in unfamiliar texts	4A.1. Teachers will provide explicit instruction in vocabulary by modeling weekly on WFIN using strategies from Creating Robust Vocabulary. Increase students' exposure to informational texts at every grade level using authentic, real-world texts/periodicals, text feature boards in every reading classroom.	4A.1. Principal; SIP Reading Chair	4A.1. Classroom walk through; student use of modeled vocabulary, review of district benchmark data and FCAT	4A.1. Classroom walk through instrument; Inform
2	4A.2. Students lack confidence in reading abilities	4A.2. Establish reading partnerships K & 5, K-kids will read with targeted students. Lowest 25% will be provided mentors from the community.	4A.2. Classroom teacher	4A.2. Review of student data	4A.2. Inform
3	4A.3. Students have limited interest in reading	4A.3. Provide books/periodicals that are relevant to students' interest. Use the Accelerated Reading program to better match interest levels with reading levels.	4A.3. Classroom Teacher, Media Specialist	4A.3. Review of Interest Survey; reading logs	4A.3. Nine-week reporting tool indicating number of students meeting the reading habit standard

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 #					
	The percent of students scoring satisfactory for reading will increase 4% during the 2012-2013 school year.					
5A :						
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

	64%	68%	71%	74%	77%	
--	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	--

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	In 2013, the number of Black students not making satisfactory progress in reading will be reduced by 14%, and the number of White students not making satisfactory progress in reading will be reduced by 7%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 33% (33) Black: 55% (23)	White: 26% (29) Black: 41% (19)

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. Students lack confidence in reading abilities	5B.1. Establish reading partnerships with students from the other classes; have K-kids read with targeted students; provide mentors from the community. Establish individual learning paths on Compass Odyssey.	5B.1. Classroom teacher	5B.1. Review of student data	5B.1. Inform, Compass Odyssey

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	The percent of Students with Disabilities not making satisfactory progress will be reduced by 23%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

70% (23)			47% (13)		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students struggle with reading fluently and having adequate comprehension	The Accelerated Reader program will be used to foster reading fluency and comprehension	Classroom teachers	Review of Accelerated Reader reports by the classroom teacher and Leadership Team	Accelerated Reader reports

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	The percent of Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease by 9%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
51% (54)	42% (50)

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. Many students have limited access to books of interest and on their reading levels at home	5E.1. Assist parents/guardians in finding additional, appropriate resources (school media center, public library, Mayport Naval Station tech/media center, grants, electronic sources, etc.) to increase students' access to books.	5E.1. Principal; Media Specialist; classroom teachers	5E.1. Review of reading habit standard data	5E.1. Nine-week reporting tool indicating number of students meeting the reading habit standard
2	5B.1. Students lack confidence in reading abilities	5B.1. Establish reading partnerships with students from the other classes; have K-kids read with targeted students; provide mentors from the community. Establish individual learning paths on Compass Odyssey.	5B.1. Classroom teacher	5B.1. Review of student data	5B.1. Inform, Compass Odyssey

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
Triangulating data and differentiating instruction	K-5	Principal	K-5 teachers	Selected EDD Training	Review of Progress Monitoring Forms and Differentiated Lesson Plans	Principal
Using Accelerated Reader to match interest levels with reading levels	3-5 reading	Kasica	3-5 Reading Teachers	November EDD Training	Accelerated Reader Reports	3-5 Reading Teachers
Increasing rigor in the reading classroom	K-5	Principal	All instructional staff	Sept-May at selected EDDs	Review of Classroom Artifacts	Principal
Text Complexity	K-5	Principal District Reading Coach	K-5 Teachers	October EDD	Lesson Observations; review of lesson plans	Principal

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Use of Accelerated Reader to provide an array of reading material and to document student progress	Accelerated Reader	Dollar General Grant Internal Accounts 5.5075 (Media)	\$2,955.80
			Subtotal: \$2,955.80
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
Increase students' exposure to informational texts at every grade level using authentic, real-world texts, periodicals and text feature boards.	Weekly Reader 4 & 5, Time for Kids K-3	PTA Fund 10008	\$2,297.82
			Subtotal: \$2,297.82
			Grand Total: \$5,253.62

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.

CELLA Goal #1:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2. Students scoring proficient in reading.

CELLA Goal #2:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1a:	In 2013, 60% (121) of the students will score at Achievement Level 3 or above on the state assessment (FCAT) in mathematics; 25% (50) of the students will score at Achievement Level 3
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28% (53)	25% (50)

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 have limited vocabulary and struggle using comprehension strategies in unfamiliar texts	1A.1. Teachers will provide explicit instruction in vocabulary using strategies from school-wide book study; increase students' exposure to problem-solving texts at every grade level using authentic, real-world texts/media.	1A.1. SIP Math and Reading chairs	1A.1. Grades 2-5 assign LSA's on the computer for students to practice to prepare for 5th grade online assessments	1A.1. Classroom walk through instrument; Inform
2	1A.2. Typically, students don't express themselves in complete thoughts/sentences	1A.2. All students, K-5, will be expected to follow the rules of conversation.	1A.2. Classroom teachers	1A.2. Review of student writing; measuring conversations against conversation rubric	1A.2. Writing rubric; conversation rubric
3	1A.3. Teachers may have difficulty in aligning the curricular resources (EnVision) with the workshop model	1A.3. Provide training on EnVision materials, curricular resources, and technical support to align with the workshop model.	1A.3. Principal	1A.3. Review of lesson plans	1A.3. Lesson plan walk through
4	1 A.4. Students don't know their math facts at a level of automaticity in order to perform more complex operations	1 A.4. Implement the Reflex program for students in grades 1 through 5 to develop math fact fluency.	1 A.4. Grade level teachers	1 A.4. Review of the data on Reflex program	1 A.4. Review of the data on Reflex program
5	1 A.5. Lack of student experience with taking online assessments to prepare for 5th grade online assessment.	1 A.5. Assign grades 2-5 LSA's on the computer for students to practice using online assessments.	1 A.5. Grade level teachers	1 A.5.Review of student online data through teacher conversations	1 A.5. LSA data on Insight

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 2013, 35% (70) of the students will score at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 on the state assessment (FCAT) for mathematics
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27% (50)	35% (70)

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. Limited differentiated instruction in math lessons	2A.1. PLC meetings will be conducted to provide strategies to enhance differentiated instruction for 4 and 5 level students. Teachers will discuss complexity levels of standards/benchmarks for both instruction and assessment.	2A.1. SIP Math chair	2A.1. Focus walks around the alignment of: standards, instruction, and assessment	2A.1. CAST Domain 3

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	In 2013, 65% (131) of the students will make learning gains on the state assessment (FCAT) for mathematics
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
61% (115)	65% (131)

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. Students' lack of prior knowledge or required skills	3A.1. Build up students' prior knowledge during Skills Block and daily scheduled RtI tier 2/3 support times. Students will reflect in both journals and in conferences on ways to make their strategies both effective and efficient.	3A.1. Classroom teachers	3A.1. Progress monitoring of assessment data	3A.1. DCPS Math Assessments
2	3A.2. Students have difficulty making sense of and applying mathematical concepts in real life situations	3A.2. Implement the 8 Mathematical Practices in classrooms at every grade level; students will demonstrate their problem solving strategies and write about them in math journals.	3A.2. Principal and SIP Math Chair	3A.2. Conducting conversations with students; reviewing student work; monitoring implementation of the 8 Math Practices	3A.2. CAST Domain 3 instrument; Mathematical Practices Monitoring Form

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	In 2013, 60% (121) of the students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on the state assessment (FCAT) for mathematics
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
54%(102)	60% (121)

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. Students' lack of prior knowledge or required skills	4A.1. Build up students' prior knowledge during Skills Block and daily scheduled RTI tier 2/3 support times	4A.1. Classroom teachers	4A.1. Review of student performance data; particularly concentrating on AIM lines	4A.1. Pearson Inform; DCPS Math Assessments
2	4A.2. Lack of funding for tutoring to increase student knowledge of skills and math standards	4A.2. Work with Naval Station Mayport Educational Liaison to coordinate or look into funding of math tutoring programs. Use of SAI funds for small groups tutoring to improve students' math skills.	4A.2. Principal	4A.2. Review of math programs and SAI tutoring and student performance data	4A.2. Mini-assessments

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 #					
	For 2012-2013 academic year, the percent of students scoring satisfactory in mathematics will increase 3%.					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	61%	64%	68%	71%	75%	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	In 2013, the number of Black students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics will be reduced by 23%, and the number of Hispanic students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics will be reduced by 14%.
---	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Black: 70% (29) Hispanic: 58% (12)	Black: 47% (21) Hispanic: 44% (8)

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. Students have deficits in particular skills	5B.1. Build up students' prior knowledge during Skills Block and daily scheduled RtI tier 2/3 support times. Use of Reflex and Compass Odyssey to reduce deficits of student's math skills.	5B.1. Classroom Teachers	5B.1. Cycle review of student performance data in targeted areas	5B.1. Mini-assessments, Reflex fluency results, Compass Odyssey 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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	The percentage of Students with Disabilities not making satisfactory progress in mathematics will decrease by 21%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
74% (24)	53% (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
	Students have difficulty	The Reflex program will	Classroom teachers	Review of the Reflex data	Reflex Progress

1	recalling math facts at an automatic level in order to solve more complex problems	be used to build math fact fluency	by classroom teachers and the school's Leadership Team.	Monitoring Charts
---	--	------------------------------------	---	-------------------

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

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:	In 2013, the number of economically disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics on the state assessment (FCAT) will be reduced by 9%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
54% (56)	45% (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	5E.1. Students have deficits in particular skills	5E.1. Build up students' prior knowledge during Skills Block and daily scheduled RTI tier 2/3 support times. Use Reflex and Compass Odyssey to reduce deficits of students' math skills	5E.1. Classroom Teachers	5E.1. Cycle review of student performance data in targeted areas	5E.1. Mini-assessments, Reflex fluency reports, Compass Odyssey reports, District benchmark results

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
Training on CCSS and use of curricular resources	K-5	District Math Coach	K-5 Teachers	K-2 and 3-5 Faculty Meetings (October 2012)	Review of lesson plans	Principal
Differentiation in math workshop model	K-5	Grade Level Content/PLCs	K-5 Teachers	K-2 and 3-5 Faculty Meetings (November 2012)	Review of lesson plans	SIP Math Team/PLC
School-wide book study: Common Core Mathematics in a PLC at Work	K-5	Principal Math SIP Chair	K-5 Teachers	Monthly Early Dismissal Training	Review of classroom artifacts, monitoring implementation by principal	Principal
Use of EnVisions in the workshop model	K-5	District Math Coach	K-5 Teachers	K-2 and 3-5 Faculty Meetings (October 2012)	Review of lesson plans and classroom observations	Principal

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Build math fact fluency	Reflex is a web-based program that develops math fact fluency	Fund 10008 and PTA	\$2,995.00
			Subtotal: \$2,995.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Conduct a PLC using Common Core Mathematics in a PLC at Work	Provides guidance and focus needed to work outside of existing paradigms regarding the teaching and learning of mathematics. Will assist teachers in the implementation of the CCSS for mathematics	Business Partner: Palms Presbyterian Fund 10000	\$711.72
			Subtotal: \$711.72
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$3,706.72

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.		In 2013, 48% (26) of the students will score at or above Achievement Level 3 on the state assessment (FCAT) in science; 24% (13) will score at Achievement Level 3			
Science Goal #1a:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
26% (16)		24% (13)			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1A.1 Students have limited vocabulary and struggle using comprehension strategies in unfamiliar texts	1A.1 Teachers will provide explicit instruction in vocabulary by modeling weekly on WFIN using strategies from Creating Robust Vocabulary. Increase students' exposure to	1A.1. SIP Science Chair and 5th Grade Science Lead	1A.1. Classroom walk throughs; evidence of content-specific vocabulary recorded in students' science journals	1A.1. Science journal focus walk instrument

		informational texts at every grade level using authentic, real-world texts and periodicals.			
2	1A.2. Students are not effectively using appropriate vocabulary when discussing scientific content	1A.2. Teacher will model use of appropriate vocabulary when discussing scientific concepts (Think alouds) and assist students in using context clues for decoding meaning.	1A.2. Classroom teachers	1A.2. Accountable talk; review of student journals	1A.2. Conversation rubric
3	1A.3 Limited use of the learning cycle model (hands-on, minds-on activities) for the teaching of science	1A.3 Teachers will receive training on and implement the 5E model to drive instruction.	1A.3. Principal	1A.3. Review of lesson plans; Domain 3 observations	1A.3. CAST Domain 1 and Domain 3 instruments

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	In 2013, 24% (13) of the 5th grade students will score at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 on the state assessment (FCAT) in science
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
16% (10)	24% (13)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
2A.1. Limited use of the learning cycle model for the teaching	2A.1. Have district science coach and district-trained	2A.1. Principal	2A.1. Review of science journals, lesson plans	2A.1. Task and Transfer documents;

1	of science	teachers provide professional development for science teachers at every each grade level			CAST Domain 1 document
2	2A.2. Maintaining a level of interest for higher performing students	2A.2. Expose students to technological resources for understanding scientific concepts	2A.2. Classroom teacher	2A.2. Review of district benchmark data	2A.2. Inform

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
5E's model for science instruction	K-5	District-trained science lead teachers	K-5 teachers	October 2012 – March 2013	Increase in science benchmark data	Principal; SIP science team

Science Budget:

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

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:		In 2013, 84% (50) of the students will score at Achievement Level 3.0 in writing; 44% (26) of the students will score at Achievement Level 4.0 or higher on the state assessment for writing			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
82% (50)		84% (50)			
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. A lack of writing stamina with every student.	1A.1 The writing process will be used daily across all content areas to help build writing stamina. Ensure that updated writing portfolio requirements are met with an emphasis on student accountability for student growth.	1A.1. SIP Writing Chair and Principal	1A.1. SIP Writing Team will review student writing folders	1A.1. Focus walk checklist
2	1A.2 Students' limited understanding and use of the writing process.	1A.2. Provide district training and coaching around the writing process	1A.2. Principal	1A.2. Peer observations of effective practices within the workshop model	1A.2. Focus walk instrument: components of the writing process; exit ticket
3	1A.3 Students' inability to analyze their own writing and to determine next steps	1A.3 Scoring rubrics will be developed with students and used for student self-assessment	1A.3. SIP Writing Chair and Principal	1A.3. Observe students using scoring rubrics in the classroom; review of student work and standards-based bulletin boards	1A.3. Student work and scoring rubric
	1A.4 Students lack of	1A.4 Teach the	1A.4 Principal	1A.4 Review of lesson	1A.4 Focus walk

4	understanding of the language conventions	Foundational Skills in the daily 30 minute skills block	plans, classroom artifacts, and Skills Block lessons	instruments
---	---	---	--	-------------

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
Training on the Writing Process	K - 5	District Writing Coach	Kindergarten – 5th grade teachers	November 2012	Periodic review of student writing	Principal; SIP Writing Team
Analysis of student writing and portfolios	K - 5	Julie Ehrenberg; Principal	K-5 Teachers	December 2012	Classroom visits by SIP Chair and Principal	Principal and SIP Writing Chair

Writing Budget:

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

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

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:

1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	For 2013, the average attendance rate will increase by 1% (4); excessive tardies will reduce by 4% (17)
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
95% (418)	96% (416)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
36% (160)	30% (130)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
19% (85)	15% (66)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Increased number of students absent from school due to deployment-related activities	1.1. School will work in conjunction with military families to accommodate absence requests due to deployment-related activities	1.1. Principal, CRT operator	1.1. Review attendance data	1.1. On-Course, Genesis
2	1.2 Parents/guardians may not be aware of the correlation between loss of instructional time and student achievement	1.2 During Orientation, Open House and on school's website provide reminders of the importance of student instructional time and achievement	1.2 Principal	1.2 Review of attendance, tardies and early dismissal data	1.2 Genesis, On-Course
	1.3. Students do not report directly to	1.3. Utilize resource teachers to monitor	1.3. Principal	1.3. Monitoring of tardy data	1.3. Genesis, On-Course

3	classrooms before the ringing of the second bell; limited adult supervision in	hallways during WFIN time			
---	--	---------------------------	--	--	--

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal # 1:	The number of out of school suspensions will be reduced by 4% (17) for the 2012-2013 school year

2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
01% (5)	.05% (3)
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
1% (5)	.05% (3)
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
6% (28)	5% (20)
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
4% (19)	3% (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	1.1. Students have limited repertoire in handling conflicts	1.1. Weekly presentation of bully-free strategies on WFIN; implementation of bi-weekly guidance lessons	1.1. Guidance Counselor	1.1. Review of discipline data	1.1. Genesis discipline reports
2	1.2. Excessive inappropriate student behavior hinders classroom instruction and academic development	1.2. Establish Placement Review Committee to review designated cases. Implement school-wide positive reinforcement protocols: silver and gold anchor awards, positive post-cards home, and the You Earned It Shop	1.2. Shared-Decision Making Team; Guidance Counselor, PTA, Principal	1.2. Review of student behavior and academic data; observations by Guidance Counselor	1.2. Genesis discipline data; students assessment results
3	1.3. Limited strategies to address students who are repeat offenders	1.3. Training will be provided on the MTSS process for addressing behavior needs and the ABCs of student behavior	1.3. Principal, members of the MTSS Team	1.3. Review of student discipline data	1.3. Discipline data in Genesis

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
------------------------------------	---------------------	----------------------------------	---	--	-----------------------------------	---

MTSS Process and the ABCs of student behavior	K-5	Amy Roberts Principal	K-5 teachers	Pre-planning Early Dismissal	Review of discipline data	Principal
---	-----	--------------------------	--------------	---------------------------------	------------------------------	-----------

Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Establishment of the You Earned It Shop	Various grade level appropriate gift items	PTA and Stakeholder Donations	\$2,000.00
			Subtotal: \$2,000.00
			Grand Total: \$2,000.00

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Parent Involvement					
Parent Involvement Goal #1:		Increase the number of volunteers supporting school events and participating school-based organizations by 30% (20)			
*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.					
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:		2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:			
66		86			
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 Parents have differing levels of understanding when it comes to many of the	1.1 Provide parent training nights in the areas of literacy, science, mathematics	1.1 Principal, SIP Chairs for reading, math and Foundations	1.1 Review attendance on training nights, Parental Feedback Forms	1.1 Parent Surveys, Attendance logs

	strategies being implemented in the SIP	and guidance.			
2	1.2 Limited involvement of parents and community members in school-based organizations	1.2 Actively recruit members (parents and community members) for both PTA and SAC	1.2 Principal, PTA and SAC Chairs	1.2 Review of memberships and attendance logs for both organizations	1.2 SAC Compliance Membership Roster, SAC minutes, PTA minutes

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

STEM Goal #1:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

Safety Goal Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1. Safety Goal Goal Safety Goal Goal #1:		The number of students involved in disputes will be reduced by 2% (7)			
2012 Current level:		2013 Expected level:			
5% (20)		3% (13)			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Students lack knowledge of how to protect themselves from emotional, psychological and physical harm	1.1. Implement Speak Up, Be Safe and Second Step programs at every grade level	1.1. Guidance counselor	1.1. Review of student discipline referrals and parent/student surveys	1.1. Genesis discipline data and survey reports

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 Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Use of Accelerated Reader to provide an array of reading material and to document student progress	Accelerated Reader	Dollar General Grant Internal Accounts 5.5075 (Media)	\$2,955.80
Mathematics	Build math fact fluency	Reflex is a web-based program that develops math fact fluency	Fund 10008 and PTA	\$2,995.00
				Subtotal: \$5,950.80
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Mathematics	Conduct a PLC using Common Core Mathematics in a PLC at Work	Provides guidance and focus needed to work outside of existing paradigms regarding the teaching and learning of mathematics. Will assist teachers in the implementation of the CCSS for mathematics	Business Partner: Palms Presbyterian Fund 10000	\$711.72
				Subtotal: \$711.72
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Increase students' exposure to informational texts at every grade level using authentic, real-world texts, periodicals and text feature boards.	Weekly Reader 4 & 5, Time for Kids K-3	PTA Fund 10008	\$2,297.82
Suspension	Establishment of the You Earned It Shop	Various grade level appropriate gift items	PTA and Stakeholder Donations	\$2,000.00
				Subtotal: \$4,297.82
				Grand Total: \$10,960.34

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/18/2012)

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
Renew site-license for the Reflex program (building math fact fluency); working in conjunction with PTA Purchase Time for Kids	\$2,934.82

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

1. Assist in developing, implementing, and monitoring the School Improvement Plan
2. Review and provide input on the use of the school's budget
3. Expand community partnerships
4. Improve image of school (grounds beautification)

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 JOSEPH FINEGAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	76%	80%	68%	49%	273	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	66%	65%			131	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	53% (YES)	70% (YES)			123	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					527	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Duval School District JOSEPH FINEGAN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	78%	84%	76%	66%	304	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	74%	60%			134	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	60% (YES)	53% (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					551	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested