FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: NORMANDY VILLAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Duval

Principal: Lisa G. Brady

SAC Chair: Amanda Strickler

Superintendent: Ed Pratt-Dannals

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/22/2012

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	Lisa G. Brady	B.S. in Education; M.Ed. in Educational Leadership Elementary Education 1-6, Educational Leadership	3	11	Principal of Normandy Village ES in 2011-2012: Grade D; Rdg. Mastery: 37%, Math Mastery: 38%, Science Mastery: 32%, Writing Mastery: 76%. 2010-2011: Grade D, Rdg. Mastery: 52%, Math Mastery: 59%, Science Mastery: 24%, Writing Mastery: 51%. 2009-2010: Grade D, Rdg. Mastery: 55%, Math Mastery: 52%, Science Mastery: 31%, Writing Mastery: 73%. Principal of Ramona Blvd. ES in 2008-2009: Grade A, Rdg. Mastery: 69%, Math Mastery: 67%, Science Mastery: 38%, Writing Mastery: 84%, ALL subgroups made AYP. 2007-2008: Grade C, Rdg. Mastery: 62%, Math Mastery: 53%, Science Mastery: 22%, Writing Mastery: 53%, only white subgroup met AYP in reading proficiency. 2006-2007: Grade C, Rdg. Mastery: 60%, Math Mastery: 37%, Science Mastery: 27%, Writing Mastery: 71%, only white subgroup met AYP in reading and math. 2005-2006: Grade C, Rdg. Mastery: 64%,

| | | | | | Math Mastery: 43%, Writing Mastery: 61%, All students except Students with disabilities met AYP in reading, only the white subgroup met AYP in math. 2004-2005: Grade C, Rdg. Mastery: 58%, Math Mastery: 42%, Writing Mastery: 77%, All students except Students with disabilities met AYP in reading, only the white subgroup met AYP in math. |

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)
Reading	Susan Coots	BS-Elem. Ed, K-6	3	3.5	2011-2012: FAIR Green 62%, Yellow 34%, Red 4% 2010-2011: FAIR Green 40%, Yellow 49%, Green 40% 2009-2010: Green DIBELS 77%, DRA on grade level 77%, lowest 25% gains 50% AYP Reading Proficiency: 2009 – 2010: 0 out of 3 subgroups met proficiency in reading; 2010 – 2011: 0 out of 3 subgroups met proficiency in reading
Math	Susan Bell	BS, Elem. Ed. Physical Education MS, Ed.S. – Ed. Leadership,	1	1	new math coach
Instructional	Monique Worthen	BS-Elem. Ed. K-6; M.Ed. in Educational Leadership	8		New

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 meetings with teachers and principal.	Principal	On-going	
2	2. Partnering newer teachers with veteran staff	PDF	upon hire	
3	Teacher Induction Program/MINT	PDF/District Cadre	On-going	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
None	

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
34	26.5%(9)	76.5%(26)	147.1%(50)	44.1%(15)	41.2%(14)	294.1% (100)	0.0%(0)	0.0%(0)	123.5%(42)

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
Vicky Shavers	Morgan Smith	Both teach 1st grade. Mrs. Shavers has extensive experience in 1st grade curriculum and management.	Teachers will meet weekly to plan instruction and study data.
Lisa Inman	Jacqueline Lewis	Both teach Kindergarten. Ms. Inman has extensive experience in Kindergarten curriculum and management.	Teachers will meet weekly to plan instruction and study data.
Monique Worthen	Rachel Rigdon	Ms. Worthen is the Instructional Coach and has extensive experience.	Teacher and coach will meet weekly to plan instruction and study data.

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 A
> Services are provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through reading and math interventionists during school and after-school programs provided by outside programs. The district coordinates with Title II and Title III in ensuring staff development needs are provided.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

> N/A

Title I, Part D

> N/A

Title II

> N/A

Title III

N/A

Title X- Homeless

N/A

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

N/A

Violence Prevention Programs

N/A

Nutrition Programs

N/A

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.

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.
• Principal (Lisa Brady): Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making; ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS; conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff; ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation requirements; ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation; and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities.
• Math Coach (Susan Bell): Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches; identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk"; assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.
• MTSS Facilitator (Susan Coots): Participates on Building Leadership Team; acts as liaison for implementation of MTSS at the school level; receives ongoing MTSS training and delivers information to school; provides direct intervention services to an identified group of students and tracks student progress; guides school in using data to make decisions about interventions and strategies that support MTSS.
• Instructional Coach (Monique Worthen): Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches; identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk"; assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.

- Reading and Math Interventionist (Terry Roberts and Melissa Hager): Participates in student data collection; assists in determination for further assessment; integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction; and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching, facilitation, and consultation.
- School Counselor (Corene Davis): Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students; link community agencies to schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success; provides consultation services to general and special education teachers, parents, and administrators; provides group and individual student interventions; and conducts direct observation of student behavior.
- Select General Education Teachers (Leslie Bolante, Michelle Mendes, Corryn Massey, Barbara Ingham, Katherine Gordon, Timothy Layne): Provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; delivers Tier 1 instruction/interventions; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 interventions; and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.
- Special Education Teacher (Agnes Penn): Participates in student data collection; assists in determination for further assessment; integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 instruction; and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching, facilitation, and consultation.
- Foundations Team Chair (Ivy Murphey): Provides information about school wide and class wide behavior curriculum and instruction; participates in behavioral data collection; provides professional development principles of Foundations to faculty and staff; and collaborates with staff to implement behavioral interventions.
- ESOL Teachers: Educates the team in the role that second language acquisition plays in the learning process and collaborates with general education teachers.
- Select personnel with technical expertise: Develops or brokers technology necessary to manage and display data; provides professional development and technical support to teachers and staff regarding data management and display.

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 will meet every 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 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 Building Leadership Team leads the faculty in a review of the data and, with input from building instructional teams (MTSS Leadership Team, Grade level teams, parent group) develops the initial draft of the School Improvement Plan utilizing the template provided by the Department of Education. The draft SIP is then presented to the School Advisory Council for review and recommendations. The Building Leadership Team finalizes the plan. The School Improvement Plan becomes the guiding document for the work of the school. The Building Leadership Team should regularly revise and update the plan as the needs of students change throughout the school year. The plan includes a formal review process which demonstrates how the school has used MTSS to inform instruction and made mid-course adjustments as data are analyzed.

MTSS Implementation

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

Baseline data: Inform, Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Diagnostic Reading Assessment-2 (DRA-2), District Benchmark Assessments as appropriate, Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)
Midyear: FAIR, DRA-2, District Benchmark Assessments as appropriate
End of year: FAIR, FCAT
Ongoing Progress Monitoring: PMRN, Curriculum based assessments

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The school's Professional Development Plan will 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. School Instructional Leadership Teams must establish protocols for on-going assessment and adjusting of the plan to meet school needs.
MTSS Professional Development should include more than scheduled workshops. In addition to traditional MTSS training during the summer, pre-planning, early dismissal, and faculty meetings, MTSS learning should be job-embedded and occur

during the following:
- Professional learning communities
- Classroom observations
- Collaborative planning
- Analysis of student work
- Book study
- Lesson study
Action research

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The team, teachers, tutors, interventionists, etc. will all support the efforts behind MTSS. Students will participate in all Tier I activities, most students will participate in Tier II activities, and select students will participate in Tier III activities. Activities will be data driven and materials will be used/purchased for those activities. Progress monitoring will be implemented to determine if the MTSS is working for each student.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) is comprised of Lisa G. Brady, Principal, Susan Coots, Reading Coach, Monique Worthen, Instructional Coach, and Terry Roberts, Reading Interventionist.

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 the DCPS Comprehensive K-12 Reading Plan/Read it Forward Jax. 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. We also meet to assess faculty professional development needs and to formulate plans on effective implementation of targeted reading goals within our surrounding community. Our 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.

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

The main goal of the Literacy Leadership Team is to improve the reading achievement of all students. To accomplish this goal, we will utilize data from F.A.I.R., DRA's and District Benchmarks to identify areas in need of improvement in Reading. We will implement FCRR activities in the classroom based on school FAIR Reports. Students will participate in individualized instruction as well as small group instruction based upon their individual needs. The Reading Coach and the Instructional Coach will model reading and guided reading lessons for identified teachers as needed. Weekly grade level PLC's will take place to analyze data, look at student work and plan for instructional "next steps". All teachers participate in grade level specific Book Studies. Each grade level will participate in at least one all-day, grade level specific Professional Learning Community with the principal, reading coach and instructional coach.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
View uploaded file (Uploaded on 10/22/2012)

*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.

Incoming Kindergarten students and their parents were invited to a Kindergarten orientation prior to the end of the last school year. We also held a Kindergarten Meet the Teacher session prior to the first day of school. Kindergarten students are

assessed using FLKRS and FAIR within the first 20 days of school. This assists the teacher in providing individualized instruction for each student to meet their needs.

*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:	Students will maintain proficiency and/or increase achievement to above proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 3-5, 37% (80) of students achieved mastery on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test	In grades 3-5, 46% (89) of the students will achieve mastery for reading on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of differentiation that extends beyond proficiency	Utilize the FCIM to identify students in the CORE curriculum needing interventions and enrichment.	Principal, Reading Coach, Instructional Coach, Reading Interventionist	Review student grouping charts frequently and ensure groups are redesigned to target the needs of students based on assessments.	Effectiveness will be determined by FAIR and Benchmark assessments
2	1A.2. Lack of question complexity	1A.2. Teachers/Coaches collaborate during common planning. Coaching support	1A.2. Principal; coaching staff	1A.2. Observations by Principal and coaching staff	1A.2. Walk through anecdotal notes; formal and informal observations.
3	3A.3. Ineffective implementation of the standards	3A.3. Common planning supported by coaches to review/examine the standards/ Coaching support in the classrooms	3A.3. Principal, Reading and Instructional Coaches	3A.3. Observations Notes from common planning sessions Lesson plans	3A.3. C.A.S.T. document; anecdotal notes; Walk-through forms

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:	Students will maintain and/or increase high levels of proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 3-5, 3% (6) of students achieved Level 4 or 5 on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test	In grades 3-5, 10% (19) of the students will achieve Levels 4 or 5 for reading on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test.

	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	New teachers to the grade level and/or subject area.	2.1. Professional Development of new teachers: PLC's; mentors; District training; observations	2.1. Principal, Assistant Principal and the Reading Coach	2.1. Monthly Observations	2.1. C.A.S.T. document; anecdotal notes; Walk-through forms
2	2.3. Lack of differentiation that extends beyond proficiency	2.3. Utilize the FCIM to identify students in the CORE curriculum needing enrichment.	2.3 Teachers, Coaching Staff	2.3. Review student grouping charts frequently and ensure groups are redesigned to target the needs of students based on assessments.	2.3. Effectiveness will be determined by FAIR and Benchmark assessments

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:	To increase the number of students making Learning Gaines in reading
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 3-5, 65% (140)of students achieved learning gains on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.	In grades 3-5, 70% (135)of students will achieve learning gains on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.

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	New teachers to the grade level and/or subject area.	Professional Development of new teachers: PLC's; mentors; District training; observations	Principal, Assistant Principal and the Reading and Instructional Coaches	Monthly Observations	C.A.S.T. document; anecdotal notes; Walk-through forms
2	3A.2 Lack of differentiation for student needs	3.A.2Data driven grouping that will remediate/enricch students	3.A.2Principal, Coaching Staff, Reading Interventionist, Media Specialist, Teachers	3A.2. Review student data frequently and ensure groups are redesigned to target the needs of students based on assessments.	3.A.2 Effectiveness will be determined by mini-assessments, FAIR, Benchmarks
3	3A.3. New teachers to the grade level and/or subject area.	3A.3. Professional Development of new teachers: PLC's; mentors; District training; observations	3A.3. Principal, Reading and Instructional Coaches	3A.3. Monthly Observations	3A.3. C.A.S.T. document; anecdotal notes; Walk-through forms

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:	To increase the number of students in the Lowest 25% making learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 4-5, 66% (38) of the bottom quartile students achieved learning gains on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.	In grades 4-5, 72% (35)of bottom quartile students will achieve learning gains on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.

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	New teachers to the grade level and/or subject area.	Professional Development of new teachers: PLC's; mentors; District training; observations	Principal, Assistant Principal, the Reading and Instructional Coach	Monthly Observations	C.A.S.T. document; anecdotal notes; Walk-through forms
2	Lack of differentiation for student needs	Data driven grouping that will remediate students	Principal, Coaching staff, Reading Interventionist, Teachers	Review student data frequently and ensure groups are redesigned to target the needs of students based on assessments.	Effectiveness will be evaluated by mini-assessments, FAIR, Benchmarks.
3	Student attitude toward learning	Strategies on attitude and building relationships; Data chats with students; Mentoring; Enrichment programs	Principal, Coaching Staff, Reading Interventionist, Teachers	Observations of student work	Teacher observations, student performance on 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%.	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. Reading Goal #5B:	To increase the number of students making satisfactory progress in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 25% (23) Black: 13% (16)	White: 35% (28) Black: 35% (38)

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	5A.1. White: Lack of proper differentiation Black: Lack of proper differentiation	5A.1. Teachers will be instructed on the proper analysis of collected data and how to use that data to differentiate their instruction to meet individual students' needs.	5A.1. Principal, Coaching staff, Reading Interventionist	Coaching Staff will assist teachers in the analysis and use of data for small group and Tier 2 instruction.	5A.1. Student progress on all assessments.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

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

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	To increase the number of Economically Disadvantaged students making satisfactory progress.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On the 2012 FCAT Reading test, 35% (56) of ED students made satisfactory progress on the 2012 FCAT reading test	58% (88) of Economically Disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress on the 2013 FCAT Reading test.

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.3. Insufficient amount of differentiation Incorrect targets for students	Teachers will be instructed on the proper analysis of collected data and how to use that data to differentiate their instruction to meet individual students' needs.	Principal, Coaching staff, Reading Interventionist	Coaching Staff will assist teachers in the analysis and use of data for small group and Tier 2 instruction.	Student progress on all assessments.

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
Dufferentiating Instruction	All grades	Coaching Staff, ESE Liaison	All teachers	Weekly common planning time	School leadership team will conduct targeted walkthroughs to monitor effectiveness of differentiated instruction training.	Administration and Coaches
Instruction on Bottom Quartile groupings	3-5	Principal, Coaches	3-5 teachers	Early Release dates, Common Planning time	Monitoring of BQ students' assessments, Benchmarks, FAIR	Administration and Coaches
Student Data Analysis	All grades	Principal, Coaching Staff	All teachers	Weekly common planning time	School leadership team will conduct targeted walkthroughs to monitor effectiveness of differentiated instruction	Administration and Coaches

| | | | | training. | |

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 district approved websites	Study Island	Title I	$2,500.00
			Subtotal: $2,500.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
District provided PD	Temporary Recovery for PD	District	$2,000.00
Common Planning Time	After-school planning time for teachers	Title I	$25,000.00
			Subtotal: $27,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $29,500.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:	

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

CELLA Budget:

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

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

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:	Students will maintain proficiency and/or increase achievement to above proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 3-5, 38% (82) of students achieved mastery on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Math Test.	In grades 3-5 46% (89) of the students will achieve mastery on the 2013 FCAT Math Test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Teacher being new to the grade level and/or subject.	1.1 Professional Development of new teachers: PLC's; mentors; District training; observations	1.1. Principal; Coaches; Mentors	1.1. Monthly Observations	1.1. C.A.S.T. document; anecdotal notes; Walk-through forms
2	1A.2. Lack of question complexity	1A.2. Use item specs during planning; gradual release of responsibility from teacher to student	1A.2. Principal; coaching staff	1A.2. Observations by Principal and coaching staff	1A.2. Walk through anecdotal notes; formal and informal observations.
3	1A.3. Lack of differentiated instruction	1A.3. Utilize items specs in planning. Use of live data to inform instruction; Teacher understanding of proficiency and prerequisites that are required.	1A.3. Principal and coaching staff	1A.3. Review students' data frequently and ensure groups are redesigned to target the needs of students based on assessments.	1A.3. Effectiveness will be determined by Quantiles and Benchmark assessments.

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:	Students will maintain their above proficiency level.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
15% (32) students achieved high levels of proficiency on the 2011 administration of the FCAT Math test.	25% (48) of students will achieve high levels of proficiency on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Math test.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>2.1.
Teachers new to the grade level and/or subject.</td><td>2.1.
Anecdotal notes

Assessments
Anecdotal notes
Assessments</td><td>2.1.
Principal; Coaches; mentors</td><td>2.1.
Monthly observations</td><td>2.1.
C.A.S.T. document; anecdotal notes; Walk-through forms</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>2.2.
Motivation of students to perform at a higher level.</td><td>2.2.
High 5 Club
Data Chats
Enrichment programs, Incentives</td><td>2.2.
Principal
Teachers
Teachers/Club sponsors</td><td>2.2.
Student engagement
Student progress on assessments
Anecdotal notes</td><td>2.2.
Anecdotal notes
Assessments</td></tr>
</table>

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:**

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">No Data Submitted</td></tr>
</table>

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.	To increase the number of students making Learning Gaines

		in math.
Mathematics Goal #3a:		

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 4-5, 54% (116) of students achieved learning gains on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Math Test.	In grades 4-5, 60% (126)of students will achieve learning gains on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Math Test.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td align="center">Anticipated Barrier</td>
<td align="center">Strategy</td>
<td align="center">Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td>
<td align="center">Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td>
<td align="center">Evaluation Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1.
Teachers new to the grade level and/or subject</td>
<td>3.1.
Professional Development of new teachers: PLC's; mentors; District training; observations</td>
<td>3.1
Principal, Coaches; mentors.</td>
<td>3.1.
Monthly observations</td>
<td>3.1.
C.A.S.T. document; anecdotal notes; Focus Walk forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2.
Lack of question complexity</td>
<td>3.2.
Utilize Webb's DOK; Item specs; objective based questioning</td>
<td>3.2.
Principal; Coaching staff; Reading Interventionist, Teachers</td>
<td>3.2.
Observations by Principal and coaching staff</td>
<td>3.2.
Walk through Anecdotal notes; formal and informal observations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3.
Lack of differentiation for student needs.</td>
<td>3.3.
Data driven grouping that will remediate/enrich students.</td>
<td>3.3.
Principal, Coaching Staff, Reading Interventionist, Media Specialist, Teachers</td>
<td>3.3.
Review student data frequently and ensure groups are redesigned to target the needs of students based on assessments.</td>
<td>3.3.
Effectiveness will be evaluated by mini-assessments, FAIR, Benchmarks.</td>
</tr>
</table>

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:

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated Barrier</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td>
<td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td>
<td>Evaluation Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="5" align="center">No Data Submitted</td>
</tr>
</table>

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:	To increase the number of students in the Lowest 25% making learning gains.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 4-5, 41% (22) of the bottom quartile students achieved learning gains on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Math Test.	In grades 4-5, 50% (24)of bottom quartile students will achieve learning gains on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Math Test.

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	4.1. Teachers new to the grade level and/or subject	4.1. Professional Development of new teachers: PLC's; mentors; District training; observations	4.1 Principal, Coaches; mentors.	Monthly observations	4.1. C.A.S.T. document; anecdotal notes; Focus Walk forms
2	4A.2 Lack of question complexity	4A.2 Utilize Webb's DOK; Item specs; objective based questioning	4A.2 Principal; Coaching Staff; Reading Interventionist, Teachers	4A.2 Observations by Principal and coaching staff	4A.2 Walk through anecdotal notes; formal and informal observations.
3	4A.3. Lack of differentiation for student needs.	4A.3. Data driven grouping that will remediate/enrich students.	4A.3. Principal, Coaching Staff, Reading Interventionist, Media Specialist, Teachers	4A.3. Review student data frequently and ensure groups are redesigned to target the needs of students based on assessments.	4A.3. Effectiveness will be evaluated by mini-assessments, FAIR, Benchmarks.

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:	To increase the number of students making satisfactory Progress in reading.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 3-5 the percentage of students making level 3 and above on the 2012 FCAT Math test was as follows: White: 16% (14) Black: 20% (24)	In grades 3-5 the percentage of students making level 3 and above on the 2013 FCAT Math test will be as follows: White: 30% (24) Black: 30% (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
	5A.1. White: Student lack of prior knowledge	5A.1. Tier 2: Plan supplemental instruction/intervention for students not	5A.1. Teachers Math Coach Math	5A.1. Review of results on common assessment data every month	5A.1. Common assessments, mini assessments

1	Black: Student lack of prior knowledge	responding to core instruction. DeSensi strategies: SRE; 4-column method Data Chats Before/during/after school tutoring	Interventionist		

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

<p align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</p>

	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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

<p align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</p>

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	To increase the number of Economically Disadvantaged students making satisfactory Progress
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

| | On the 2012 FCAT Math test, 35% (56) of ED students made satisfactory progress | 55% (83) of Economically Disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress on the 2013 FCAT Math test. |

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. Lack of prior knowledge;	5D.1 Tier 2: Plan supplemental instruction/intervention for students not responding to core instruction.	5D.1. Teachers Math Coach Math Interventionist	5D.1. Review of results on common assessment data every month	5D.1 Common assessments
2	5D.2. Environment	5D.2. Students/Parents can borrow manipulatives	5D.2. Teacher Math Coach Math Interventionist	5D.2. Student understanding of concepts on assessments	5D.2. Common 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
District Math training for new math teachers	All	District	New Math teachers	On-going	Task and Transfer Observation	Principal, Math Coach
Instruction on Bottom Quartile	3-5	Principal, Coaching staff	3-5 teachers	Early dismissal days, common planning time	Monitoring of BQ students' assessments, Benchmarks	Principal, Math Coach

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
Use District approved software	Study Island	Title I	$2,500.00
	Quantiles	Title I	$2,500.00
			Subtotal: $5,000.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
District Training	Math Academy; Math 101	District Substitute Funds	$3,000.00
School based PD	Common planning time after school	Title I	$25,000.00
			Subtotal: $28,000.00
Other			

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $33,000.00

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:	Students will maintain proficiency and/or increase achievement to above proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
32% (21) of students achieved mastery on the 2012administration of the FCAT Science Test.	40% (22) of the students will achieve mastery on the 2013 FCAT Science Test.

	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 differentiated instruction	1.1. Planning using item specs and live data to inform instruction; Building teacher understanding of what proficiency is and what prerequisites are required.	1.1. Teachers Coaches	1.1. Grade level teams will review results of common assessment data to determine progress towards benchmark (70% proficiency).	1.1. Common assessments
2	1.2. Lack of question complexity	1.2. Planning using item specs; planning using gradual release of responsibility	1.2. Principal; coaching staff	1.2. Observations by Principal and coaching staff	1.2. Walk through anecdotal notes; formal and informal observations.

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:	Students will maintain and/or increase high levels of proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
3% (2) of students had high levels of proficiency on the 2011 administration of the FCAT Science test.	10% (6) of students will achieve high levels of proficiency on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Science test.

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 differentiation beyond proficiency.	2A.1. Students will receive targeted enrichment through the problem-solving process.	2.A1. Teacher Club Sponsor	2.1. Grade level teams will review results of common assessment data to determine progress towards benchmark (70% proficiency).	2.1. Common Assessments

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

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Science Academy	5	District	5th grade teachers	ongoing	Task and transfer observations	Principal; Coaching staff
PLC's in professional reading	5	Coaches	5th grade teachers	ongoing	Observing lessons, participation in book talk	Coaching staff

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
After school Science Club for enrichment	Lab Materials	Title I	$200.00
			Subtotal: $200.00
			Grand Total: $200.00

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:	Students will maintain proficiency (level 4) and/or increase achievement to above proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
39% (24) of students achieved a level 4 on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Writing Test.	76% (61) of the students will achieve a level 4 on the 2013 FCAT Writing Test.

	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 consistent modeling practices.	1A.1. Common planning supported by coaching to include daily modeling of writing instruction.	1.A1. Principal Coach	1A.1. Observations Rubric use Student writing	1.A1. Walk through forms Student writing
2	1A.2. Lack of literacy instruction that integrates reading and writing.	1A.2. Planning supported by coaches to determine mentor texts and exemplars and to plan for integrated reading and writing instruction.	1A.2. Principal; Coach	1A.2. Observations Lesson Plans Student writing	1A.2. Student writing Walk through forms

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
PLC's: Professional Reading	4th grade	Principal, Instructional Coach	4th grade teachers	On-going	Observations; student writing samples	Principal; Instructional Coach
Writers' Workshop	All	Instructional Coach	All writing teachers	Early dismissal; teacher work days.	Observations; student writing samples	Principal; Instructional Coach
Outside P.D.	All	Melissa Forney	Open	July 2012	Observations; student writing	Principal; Instructional Coach

					samples	Coach

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
Writing Workshop	Melissa Forney	Title I	$1,375.00
			Subtotal: $1,375.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $1,375.00

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	To decrease the number of students with excessive absences and tardies.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
In 2011-2012 our attendance rate was 94% (425)	In 2012-2013 the anticipated attendance rate is 96% (415)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
20	The number of students with excessive absences will decrease by at least 1% (2)students.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
The current percentage of students with excessive tardies is 5% (23).	The number of students with excessive tardies will decrease by at least 1% (2).
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		1.1. Student bus transportation affected by the 2 mile bus riding rule Student illnesses Parents lack of available transportation	1.1. Monthly attendance incentive for students. Incorporate the importance of student attendance into Parent Involvement Meetings. Assistant Principal Guidance Counselor Monitor the number of students whose absences exceed 5 per month. A decrease should be evident	1.1. Guidance Counselor	1.1 Monitor the number of students whose absences exceed 5 per month. A decrease should be evident.	1.1. Student attendance rate should increase as measured in Genesis.
2		1.2. Parents' unwillingness to enforce school attendance.	1.2. Parents of students with excessive absences will meet with the Attendance Improvement Team (AIT) to encourage regular attendance.	1.2. Guidance Counselor School Social Worker	1.2. Monitor the number of students whose absences exceed 5 per month. A decrease should be evident.	1.2. Student attendance rate should increase as measured 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
Parent Meetings	All	Guidance Counselor	Parents	Bi-monthly PTA meetings	Surveys	Guidance Counselor
Home/School communication (The Eagle Express)	All	Principal	Parents	Weekly	None	Principal

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Parent Nights/PTA	Information Brochures	PTA	$100.00
			Subtotal: $100.00

Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Nine weeks awards for students with good attendance.	Award certificates and ribbons	Student Awards fund	$400.00
			Subtotal: $400.00
			Grand Total: $500.00

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	Reduce the number of students suspended
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
2	1
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
2	1
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
32	15
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
9	4

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. Student attitude towards school	1.1. Access to students; respect for students by teachers	1.1 all adults	1.1. Decrease in referrals and suspensions	1.1. Bi-monthly count of infractions.
2	Student understanding of rituals and routines	Quarteryl assemblies on rituals and routines; bullying; expectations	Principal	Decrease in referrals and suspensions	Bi-monthly count of infractions

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
Foundations Training	All	Foundations Team	All	Pre-planning; early dismissal	Referral Count	Principal
C.H.A.M.P.s Training	All	District	All	District timeline	Classroom management observations	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
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $0.00

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	To increase parent involvement in school activities.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
35% (157) of parents participated in one or more activities throughout the year.	50% (216) of parents will participate in one or more activity throughout the year.

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
				Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	
1	Parent participation	meetings held at different times during the day/week; door prizes; incentives for students	Principal; Coaches; Teachers	Survey sheets for parent meetings; school activities	Surveys; Sign-in sheets

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)

Bullying Prevention: Our goal is to decrease the number of students with excessive referrals for bullying/harassment. 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. Bullying Prevention: Our goal is to decrease the number of students with excessive referrals for bullying/harassment. Goal Bullying Prevention: Our goal is to decrease the number of students with excessive referrals for bullying/harassment. Goal #1:	To decrease the number of students with excessive referrals for bullying/harassment.
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
In the 2011-2012 school year, 25% (19) of all referrals written were for bullying and harassment.	In the 2012-2013 school year the referral percentage for bullying/harassment will decrease to 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	Students not understanding what bullying/ harassment means.	Discipline assemblies to explain what bullying/harassment is, how to prevent it, and what to do if a student is bullied/harassed.	Lisa Brady, Principal; Guidance Counselor	Number of referrals written.	Monthly log of referrals written.
2	1.2. Students not understanding what bullying/harassment means.	1.2. Participation in SSS	1.2. Guidance Counselor; 5th grade teachers	1.2. Number of referrals written for 5th grade students	1.2. Monthly log of referrals written
3	1.3 Increase teacher/student protection on play ground and during emergencies	1.3 Replace walkie-talkies as needed	Principal	Number of referrals written	Monthly log of referrals written

---

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
SSS Training	5th Grade	District	5th Grade teachers, guidance	Sept. 2012	Observation of lessons taught	Guidance Counselor

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
Increase teacher/student protection on playground and during emergencies	Replace walkie-talkie as needed	SIP dollars	$500.00
			Subtotal: $500.00
			Grand Total: $500.00

End of Bullying Prevention: Our goal is to decrease the number of students with excessive referrals for bullying/harassment. 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 district approved websites	Study Island	Title I	$2,500.00
Mathematics	Use District approved software	Study Island	Title I	$2,500.00
Mathematics		Quantiles	Title I	$2,500.00
				Subtotal: $7,500.00

Professional Development

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	District provided PD	Temporary Recovery for PD	District	$2,000.00
Reading	Common Planning Time	After-school planning time for teachers	Title I	$25,000.00
Mathematics	District Training	Math Academy; Math 101	District Substitute Funds	$3,000.00
Mathematics	School based PD	Common planning time after school	Title I	$25,000.00
Writing	Writing Workshop	Melissa Forney	Title I	$1,375.00
Attendance	Parent Nights/PTA	Information Brochures	PTA	$100.00
				Subtotal: $56,475.00

Other

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Science	After school Science Club for enrichment	Lab Materials	Title I	$200.00
Attendance	Nine weeks awards for students with good attendance.	Award certificates and ribbons	Student Awards fund	$400.00
Bullying Prevention: Our goal is to decrease the number of students with excessive referrals for bullying/harassment.	Increase teacher/student protection on playground and during emergencies	Replace walkie-talkie as needed	SIP dollars	$500.00
				Subtotal: $1,100.00
				Grand Total: $65,075.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

jn Priority	jn Focus	jn Prevent	jn NA

Are you a reward school: jn Yes jn No

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

View uploaded file (Uploaded on 8/31/2012)

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
Bullying Prevention program	$200.00
Replacement of Walkie Talkies for teachers	$500.00
Author Visit	$1,000.00

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

The focus for SAC will be our school increasing the number of children who are proficient in reading, math and science. In addition, we will focus on all children exhibiting a years growth. They will work to help us gain and maintain dedicated business partners. In addition, they will support the school by assisting the Parental Involvement Activities to increase the involvement of families. They will also work to keep our school safe and orderly.

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Duval School District
NORMANDY VILLAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	52%	59%	51%	24%	186	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	50%	56%			106	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?	56% (YES)	55% (YES)			111	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					403	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					D	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Duval School District
NORMANDY VILLAGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	55%	52%	73%	31%	211	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	54%	42%			96	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?	42% (NO)	58% (YES)			100	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					407	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					D	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested