

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: JOHN G. DUPUIS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Dade

Principal: Claudine Winsor

SAC Chair: Wantana Vassana

Superintendent: Alberto Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 10/11/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
		BA – Psychology, Master of Science in Educational Leadership (K- 12)			2012 School Grade B AYP N/A High Standards Rdg. 57 High Standards Math 65 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 61 Lrng Gains-Math 67 Gains-Rdg-25% 70 Gains-Math-25% 71 2011 School Grade A AYP N High Standards Rdg. 83 High Standards Math 85 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 69 Lrng Gains-Math 63 Gains-Rdg-25% 59 Gains-Math-25% 65 2010 School Grade A AYP N High Standards Rdg. 81

Principal	Claudine Winsor	Certification-Elementary Education (Grades 1- 6), Psychology (Grades 6-12), Educational Leadership (K-12), ESOL endorsed	10	11	<p>High Standards Math 82 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 65 Lrng Gains-Math 62 Gains-Rdg-25% 60 Gains-Math-25% 77</p> <p>2009 School Grade A AYP Y High Standards Rdg. 76 High Standards Math 78 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 64 Lrng Gains-Math 68 Gains-Rdg-25% 63 Gains-Math-25% 66</p> <p>2008 School Grade A AYP N High Standards Rdg. 72 High Standards Math 74 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 67 Lrng Gains-Math 66 Gains-Rdg-25% 58 Gains-Math-25% 69</p>
Assis Principal	Lourdes Nunez	<p>BA – Early Childhood/Elementary Education, Master of Science in Reading (K-12), Specialist Degree in Educational Leadership, (K-12)</p> <p>Certification – Early / Elementary Education, Reading, Educational Leadership (K-12), ESOL endorsed</p>	4	8	<p>2012 School Grade B AYP N/A High Standards Rdg. 57 High Standards Math 65 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 61 Lrng Gains-Math 67 Gains-Rdg-25% 70 Gains-Math-25% 71</p> <p>2011 School Grade A AYP N High Standards Rdg. 83 High Standards Math 85 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 69 Lrng Gains-Math 63 Gains-Rdg-25% 59 Gains-Math-25% 65</p> <p>2010 School Grade A AYP N High Standards Rdg. 81 High Standards Math 82 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 65 Lrng Gains-Math 62 Gains-Rdg-25% 60 Gains-Math-25% 77</p> <p>2009 School Grade A AYP Y High Standards Rdg. 76 High Standards Math 78 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 64 Lrng Gains-Math 68 Gains-Rdg-25% 63 Gains-Math-25% 66</p> <p>2008 School Grade A AYP N High Standards Rdg. 72 High Standards Math 74 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 67 Lrng Gains-Math 66 Gains-Rdg-25% 58 Gains-Math-25% 69</p>
					<p>2012 School Grade B AYP N/A High Standards Rdg. 57 High Standards Math 65 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 61 Lrng Gains-Math 67 Gains-Rdg-25% 70 Gains-Math-25% 71</p> <p>2011 School Grade A AYP N High Standards Rdg. 83 High Standards Math 85</p>

Assis Principal	Idalis Betancourt	<p>BA – Early Childhood/ Master of Science in Educational Leadership, (K-12)</p> <p>Certification – Early Childhood, Educational Leadership (K-12), ESOL endorsed</p>	10	<p>Lrng Gains-Rdg. 69 Lrng Gains-Math 63 Gains-Rdg-25% 59 Gains-Math-25% 65</p> <p>2010 School Grade A AYP N High Standards Rdg. 81 High Standards Math 82 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 65 Lrng Gains-Math 62 Gains-Rdg-25% 60 Gains-Math-25% 77</p> <p>2009 School Grade A AYP Y High Standards Rdg. 76 High Standards Math 78 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 64 Lrng Gains-Math 68 Gains-Rdg-25% 63 Gains-Math-25% 66</p> <p>2008 School Grade A AYP N High Standards Rdg. 72 High Standards Math 74 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 67 Lrng Gains-Math 66 Gains-Rdg-25% 58 Gains-Math-25% 69</p>
-----------------	-------------------	---	----	---

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	Maria Fleitas	<p>BA – Elementary Education, Master of Science in Elementary Education</p> <p>Certification – Elementary Education (Grades 1-6), Specific Learning Disability (Grades K-12), Emotionally Handicapped, (Grades K-12), Mentally Handicapped (Grades K-12), Gifted endorsed and Reading endorsed</p>	29	13	<p>2012 School Grade B AYP N/A High Standards Rdg. 57 High Standards Math 65 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 61 Lrng Gains-Math 67 Gains-Rdg-25% 70 Gains-Math-25% 71</p> <p>2011 School Grade A AYP N High Standards Rdg. 83 High Standards Math 85 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 69 Lrng Gains-Math 63 Gains-Rdg-25% 59 Gains-Math-25% 65</p> <p>2010 School Grade A AYP N High Standards Rdg. 81 High Standards Math 82 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 65 Lrng Gains-Math 62 Gains-Rdg-25% 60 Gains-Math-25% 77</p> <p>2009 School Grade A AYP Y High Standards Rdg. 76 High Standards Math 78 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 64 Lrng Gains-Math 68</p>

					Gains-Rdg-25% 63 Gains-Math-25% 66 2008 School Grade A AYP N High Standards Rdg. 72 High Standards Math 69 Lrng Gains-Rdg. 63 Lrng Gains-Math 73 Gains-Rdg-25% 64 Gains-Math-25% 80
--	--	--	--	--	---

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	Support through professional developments	Administration	June 7, 2013	
2	Access to mentor teachers	Administration	June 7, 2013	
3	Collaboration with colleagues	Administration	June 7, 2013	
4	Partnerships with local universities to recruit future teachers	Administration	June 7, 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
2.5% 1 teacher	Ms. Joyce will be taking the Elementary Education test in the summer of 2013.

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
48	2.1%(1)	10.4%(5)	43.8%(21)	43.8%(21)	45.8%(22)	81.3%(39)	8.3%(4)	0.0%(0)	87.5%(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
		Ms. Cao demonstrates outstanding	

Maria Cao	Sharon Ochotorena	knowledge of content, materials, and methods that support high standards in the curriculum areas.	Ms. Cao will assist Ms. Ochotorena in gaining knowledge in the curriculum areas by meeting with her once a week.
-----------	-------------------	---	--

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

The services provided at John G. DuPuis Elementary School ensure that students requiring additional remediation are assisted through after-school programs. The district coordinates with Title II and Title III in ensuring staff development needs are provided. Curriculum Coaches develop, lead, and evaluate school core content standards/programs; identify and analyze existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. They identify systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assist in the design and implementation for progress monitoring data collection, and data analysis; participate in the design and delivery of professional development; and provide support for assessment and implementation monitoring. Other components that are integrated into the school-wide program include an extensive Parental Program; Bilingual Parent Outreach Program (BPOP), Title I CHES and Supplemental Educational Services (SES).

Title I, Part C- Migrant

N/A

Title I, Part D

N/A

Title II

Health Connect in Our Schools (HCiOS) offers a coordinated level of school-based healthcare, which integrates education, medical and/or social and human services on John G. DuPuis Elementary school grounds.

Title III

Title III funds will be utilized to supplement and enhance the instruction of ELL students. After school tutorials will be offered to ELL students in grades 3-5 in reading and mathematics. The Waterford program, purchased with Title III funds, will also be utilized by ELL students in first, second, and fifth grade.

Title X- Homeless

At John G. DuPuis Elementary School the Homeless Assistance Program seeks to ensure a successful educational experience for homeless children by collaborating with parents, schools, and the community.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

John G. DuPuis Elementary School will receive funding from Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) as part of its Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) allocation. SAI funds will be used with Title I funds to provide after school tutorial services to level 1 and 2 students. DuPuis will allow SES providers to house tutorial programs on site during the school week for after school tutorials in reading and mathematics for eligible students.

Violence Prevention Programs

John G. DuPuis Elementary School offers an Anti-Bullying Program and Anti-Drug Program to students. Administration works cohesively with the counselor, teachers, parents and students to resolve problems that may arise to ensure a safe learning environment. Students in group counseling sessions are able to discuss the importance of anti-bullying with the counselors and are given strategies to resolve conflicts peacefully. In addition, the Anti-Bullying Curriculum is taught to all students and Character Education is infused in the curriculum. Students are selected by their classroom teachers and recognized monthly at

our Character Education Celebration.

Nutrition Programs

Nutrition Programs

- 1) The school adheres to and implements the nutrition requirements stated in the District Wellness Policy.
- 2) Nutrition education, as per state statute, is taught through physical education. In addition, the physical education department offers a fit for life program which encourages students to run a mile every morning before school. This initiative is set forth to help prevent childhood obesity and supports the importance of proper exercise and nutrition in order for young students to become healthy adults.
- 3) The School Food Service Program, school breakfast, school lunch, and after care snacks, follow the Healthy Food and Beverage Guidelines as adopted in the District's Wellness Policy. Vending machines are not available for students use.

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

John G. DuPuis Elementary School has one Pre-K ESE Reverse Mainstream Program that services students with special needs and utilizes general education students as role models. There is also one Title I VPK Program that has 20 general education students and one student with disabilities. John G. DuPuis does have a Head Start program of it's own. It houses three Head Start classrooms on campus who transition to DuPuis' kindergarten program. Head Start and DuPuis work cohesively throughout the year to ensure that all students are ready for kindergarten.

In order to facilitate the transition from Pre-K to Kindergarten, time is set aside for students in all Pre-K programs to visit the Kindergarten classrooms.

John G. DuPuis Elementary School also offers ongoing opportunities for feeder pattern schools to visit our Kindergarten Program.

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

Other

Parental Involvement Program Description

John G. DuPuis Elementary School involves parents in the planning and implementation of the Title I Program and extends an open invitation to parents to visit our school's parent resource center in order to inform parents regarding available programs, their rights under No Child Left Behind and other referral services.

John G. DuPuis Elementary School increases parental engagement/involvement through developing on-going parental input for the Title I School-Parent Compact for each student; the school's Title I Parental Involvement Policy; scheduling the Title I Orientation Meeting; and other documents/activities necessary in order to comply with dissemination and reporting requirements.

The school conducts informal parent surveys to determine specific needs of our parents and schedules workshops and Parent Academy courses with flexible times to accommodate our parents' schedule as part of our goal to empower parents and build their capacity for involvement.

School Improvement Grant Fund/School Improvement Grant Initiative

The school receives funding under the School Improvement Grant Fund/School Improvement Grant Initiative in order to increase the achievement of the lowest performing subgroups through comprehensive, ongoing data analysis, curriculum and instruction alignment, and specific interventions such as extended day remedial tutorial instruction, Differentiated instruction/intervention, classroom libraries, and Project CRISS. Additionally, Title I School Improvement Grant/Fund supports funding and assistance to schools in Differentiated Accountability based on need.

The Voluntary Public School Choice Program (I Choose!) a federally funded grant, is a district wide initiative designed to assist in achieving the Miami-Dade County Public Schools' District Strategic Plan goal to expand the availability of and access to high quality public school choice options for all parents in Miami-Dade County. Voluntary Public School Choice grant funds are used

to evaluate programs, inform parents of educational options, and re-culture teaching practices to establish quality school environments.

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

MTSS/RtI is an extension of John G. DuPuis' Leadership Team, strategically integrated in order to support the administration through a process of problem solving as issues and concerns arise through an ongoing examination of data which impact student achievement, school safety, school culture, literacy, attendance, and prevention of student failure through early intervention.

John G. DuPuis Elementary School's MTSS/RtI Leadership Team is composed of: the Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, Mathematics/Science Facilitator, ELL Teacher, EESAC Chairperson, School Psychologist, and School Counselor. The MTSS/RtI team addresses student learning based on analysis of data. The MTSS/RtI team works cohesively to initiate plans for students that will address the intervention strategies needed to be implemented in order to promote student achievement. This team ensures that MTSS/RtI is being implemented with fidelity and that assessment of MTSS/RtI skills is being documented and used to drive instruction. The team will ensure that adequate professional development to support MTSS/RtI is implemented and will communicate with parents regarding school based MTSS/RtI plans and activities.

General Education Teachers: Provides intervention for students in the first level (core), second level (supplemental) and third level (intensive), collects data, collaborates with other staff and provides information about core subjects. Data will be used to guide instructional decisions for all students and to adjust delivery of curriculum and instruction to specific needs of students.

The Exceptional Student Education (SWD) Teachers: Integrates core instructional activities/materials into instruction and collaborates with general education teachers; collects data and uses this information to drive instruction when planning interventions; monitors progress to ensure that students are improving in academic achievement; ensures that students are exposed to grade level instruction, as well as, meeting individual goals.

The Reading Coach and Math/Science Facilitator: Provides guidance on the Comprehensive Reading Plan; Common Core, District Pacing guides, technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning and supports the implementation of Tier I and Tier II intervention plans.

The School Psychologist, School Counselor, and the Social Worker: Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students. In addition to providing interventions in the first level (core), second level (supplemental) and third level (intensive), the student service team will continue to link child-serving and community agencies to the school and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral and social success.

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?

1. Monitor academic and behavior data evaluating progress.
 2. Gather and analyze data to determine professional development for faculty as indicated by student intervention and achievement needs.
 3. Hold regular team meetings.
 4. Maintain communication with staff for input and feedback, as well as updating them on procedures and progress.
 5. Support a process and structure within the school to design, implement, and evaluate both daily instruction and specific interventions.
 6. Provide clear indicators of student need and student progress, assisting in examining the validity and effectiveness of program delivery.
- Assist with monitoring and responding to the needs of subgroups within the expectations for adequate yearly progress.

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

The MTSS Leadership Team at John G. DuPuis Elementary School met with the Educational Excellence School Advisory Council (EESAC) to help develop the SIP. The Leadership Team will monitor and adjust the academic and behavioral goals through data gathering and data analysis. The Leadership Team will monitor the fidelity of the delivery of instruction and intervention. The Leadership Team will provide levels of support and interventions to students based on data.

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.

To summarize the baseline data, mid-year and end of year reviews in reading, mathematics, science, and writing, the MTSS Leadership Team at John G. DuPuis Elementary School will use: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), CELLA, Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Edusoft, Interim Assessments, Baseline assessments, the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) and the Standardized Assessment Test (SAT). The following data will be used to monitor student behavior: Student Case Management System, detentions, suspensions, attendance referrals, and referrals for the MTSS/RtI Team.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

John G. DuPuis Elementary School will provide support for school staff to understand MTSS/RtI principles and procedures. Professional development will be provided during teachers' planning time and during professional development days.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The MTSS/RTI is completely supported by the administrative team of the school along with all members of the Team. Communication is key when supporting the MTSS/RTI process. All TEAM members work with the teachers and staff at John G. DuPuis to keep the system effectively flowing. Frequent meetings helps keep all members in communication while highlighting both short and long term goals.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) is an extension of John G. DuPuis' Leadership Team that encourages a literate climate to support effective teaching and learning.

John G. DuPuis Elementary School's Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) is composed of: the Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, EESAC Chairperson, a Third Grade Teacher, a Fourth Grade Teacher, a Fifth Grade Teacher, and an ELL Teacher. The Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) addresses student learning based on data analysis. The Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) works cohesively to initiate action plans and support exiting programs in order to promote student achievement. This team ensures that all programs are implemented with fidelity and are monitored in order to drive instruction. The team will ensure that adequate professional development is conducted for all stakeholders.

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

1. Hold regular team meetings.
2. Provide clear indicators of student need and student progress, assisting in examining the validity and effectiveness of program delivery.
3. Assist with monitoring and responding to the needs of students.
4. Develop a school-based literacy plan of action.
5. Provide research-based professional development.
6. Professional Learning Communities (PLC's).
7. Analyze and review data.
8. Provide materials, resources, and assistance to address areas of concern.
9. Model lessons in classrooms.
10. Study scientifically based reading research.
11. Utilize data to drive instruction.

The principal will cultivate the vision for increased school-wide literacy across all content areas by being an active participant in all LLT meetings and all activities. As the instructional leader of the school, the principal supports literacy instruction and will promote membership on the LLT by:

- Holding meeting at convenient times;
- Providing adequate notice of meetings;
- Providing time/coverage (if needed) to attend meetings;
- Offering professional growth opportunities such as educational retreats.

The Assistant Principal will facilitate and assist the principal as needed with all LLT meetings and activities.

The Reading Coach will share her expertise in reading instruction, and assessment and observational data to assist the team in making instructional and programmatic decisions. She will work with the LLT to guarantee fidelity of the implementation of the K-12 CRRP. Further, she will establish model classrooms, conference with teachers and administrators, and provide professional development as needed.

Our teachers will provide motivation and a spirit of collaboration within the literacy leadership team to create a school wide focus on literacy achievement.

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

The principal selects team members for the literacy leadership team based on a cross section of the faculty and administrative team that represent highly qualified professionals who are interested in serving to improve literacy instruction across the curriculum.

The major initiatives from the LLT this year include:

- including representation from all curricular areas on the MTSS/RTI
- selecting team members who are skilled and committed to improving literacy
- offering professional growth opportunities for team members
- creating a collaborative environment that fosters sharing and learning
- developing a school wide organizational model that supports literacy instruction in all classes
- encouraging the use of data to improve teaching and student achievement

As a result, our school will be able to:

- Increase the total percent of students meeting high standards of learning in Reading
 - Increase the achievement level of those students falling in the lowest 25 percentile in the area of reading
- Increase the total percent of students meeting Annual Yearly Progress in reading

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification

[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 10/6/2012)

*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.

Title I Administration assists the school by providing supplemental funds beyond the State of Florida funded Voluntary Pre-Kindergarten Program (VPK). Funds are used to provide extended support through a full time highly qualified teacher and paraprofessional. This will assist with providing young children with a variety of meaningful learning experiences, in environments that give them opportunities to create knowledge through initiatives shared with supportive adults. In selected school communities, the Title I Program further provides assistance for preschool transition through the Home Instruction for Parents of Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY) Program. HIPPY provides in-home training for parents to become more involved in the educational process of their three and four-year old children.

John G. DuPuis Elementary School houses approximately 60 students from ages 3 to 4 in the Head Start Program. In addition to the Head Start program offered on campus, John G. DuPuis Elementary School has one Pre-K ESE Reverse Mainstream Program that services students with special needs and utilizes general education students as role models and one Title I VPK Program that has 19 general education students and 1 exceptional student.

In order to facilitate the transition from Pre-K to kindergarten, time is set aside for students in the Pre-K program to visit the kindergarten classrooms. John G. DuPuis Elementary School also offers ongoing opportunities for feeder pattern schools and private schools to visit our kindergarten program throughout the year.

At John G. DuPuis Elementary School, all incoming students are assessed upon entering kindergarten in order to gather individual and group needs. All students are assessed within the areas of Basic Skills/School Readiness, Oral language/Syntax, Print/Letter Knowledge, and Phonological Awareness/Processing. Kindergarten students are assessed on the FLKRS and FAIR. Core kindergarten academic and behavior instruction will include daily explicit instruction, modeling, guided practice, observations, continuous feedback and independent practice of all academic and social emotional skills identified.

Student service personnel will provide kindergarten teachers with effective strategies for social skills instruction and will assist

teachers with positive reinforcement of pro-social behavior.

Screening tools will be re-administered throughout the year in order to determine if instruction/intervention programs need to be changed based on learning gains. Students' strengths and weaknesses will be examined to further assess students' achievement. Social skills checklist will be implemented to address pro-social behavior in kindergarten.

*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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 25% of students achieved level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase level 3 student proficiency by 8 percentage points to 33%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
25% (91)	33% (120)

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. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was in Reporting Category - Literary Analysis/Fiction/Nonfiction. These students would benefit from the ability to identify and explain the use of descriptive language to describe people, feelings, and objects.	1A.1. Use poetry to practice identifying descriptive language that defines moods and provides imagery	1A.1. MTSS/RtI Team	1A.1. Administration will review ongoing classroom assessments focusing on students' knowledge of descriptive language monthly to determine if students are making adequate progress toward the goal.	1A.1. Effectiveness will be determined through in-house assessments, District Interim Assessments, Progress Monitoring Reporting Network (PMRN) Summative: FCAT 2.0 results
2	1A.2. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was in Reporting Category- Literary Analysis/Fiction/Nonfiction. Students demonstrate difficulty when explaining and identifying the purpose of text features.	1A.2. Students will utilize grade-level appropriate texts and graphic organizers that include identifying and interpreting headings, subheadings, and captions. Students will practice locating and verifying details, critically analyzing text, and synthesizing details to draw correct conclusions.	1A.2. MTSS/RtI Team	1A.2. Administration will review ongoing classroom assessments focusing on students' ability to explain and identify the purpose of text features monthly to determine if students are making adequate progress toward the goal.	1A.2. Effectiveness will be determined through in-house assessments, District Interim Assessments, Progress Monitoring Reporting Network (PMRN). Summative: FCAT 2.0 results.
3	1A.3. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was in Reporting Category- Reading Application. These students would benefit from the ability to locate and analyze the elements of plot structure.	1A.3. Students will utilize grade-level appropriate texts and graphic organizers that include identifying and interpreting elements of story structure.	1A.3. MTSS/RtI Team	1A.3. Administration will review ongoing classroom assessments focusing on students' ability to make comparisons analyze and evaluate an author's use of descriptive language and identify relevant details within a text on a monthly basis to	1A.3. Effectiveness will be determined through in-house assessments, District Interim Assessments, Progress Monitoring Reporting Network (PMRN).

including exposition, setting, character development, conflict/resolution and rising/falling action in a story.		determine if students are making adequate progress toward the goal.	Summative: FCAT 2.0 results.
---	--	---	------------------------------

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	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 group:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 30% of students achieved levels 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012- 2013 school year is to increase levels 4 and 5 student proficiency by 3 percentage point to 33%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
30% (108)	33% (120)

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	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was in Reporting Category - Literary Analysis: Fiction and Non Fiction. These students would benefit from the ability to locate and analyze the elements of plot structure, including exposition, setting, character development, conflict/resolution and	Students will utilize grade-level appropriate texts and graphic organizers for comparing and contrasting. Concept maps and key words such as since, because, after, while, however will be taught. Students will practice identifying descriptive language that defines moods & provides imagery. Students will use figurative language and text features to	MTSS/Rti Team	Administration will review ongoing classroom assessments focusing on students' ability to make comparisons analyze and evaluate an author's use of descriptive language and identify relevant details within a text that support inferencing on a monthly basis to determine if students are making adequate progress toward the goal.	Effectiveness will be determined through in-house assessments focusing on Literary Analysis: Fiction and Non Fiction, District Interim Assessments, Progress Monitoring Reporting Network (PMRN). Summative: FCAT 2.0 results.

rising/falling action in a story	locate, interpret, and organize information.		
----------------------------------	--	--	--

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:	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 group:

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 61% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to increase students achieving learning gains by 6 percentage points to 67%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
61% (151)	67% (163)

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	As noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test, the percent of students making learning gains decreased by 8 percentage point. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was in Reporting Category-Reading Application. Appropriate availability of time and technology to implement SuccessMaker.	Computer time schedule will be implemented to optimize its use for the implementation and consistent use of the SuccessMaker program in order to complete the mandatory weekly minutes and to address main idea, relevant details, and organizational patterns.	Administrators	Administration will review SuccessMaker Data Reports to ensure student participation, as well as students' progress toward the goal on a monthly basis.	Effectiveness will be determined through in-house assessments, software data reports, District Interim Assessments, Progress Monitoring Reporting Network (PMRN). Summative: FCAT 2.0 results.

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	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 group:

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 70% of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to increase the lowest 25% achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to 75%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
70% (48)	75% (51)

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	As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test, the number of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains decreased by 1 percentage point. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was in Reporting Category-Reading Application. The students would benefit from the ability to locate and analyze the elements of plot structure, including exposition, setting, character development,	Students will utilize grade-level appropriate texts and graphic organizers that include identifying and interpreting elements of story structure.	Administration	Administration will review Custom Group Edusoft data to ensure that the resources being used are appropriate and to determine if students are making adequate progress on a monthly basis.	Effectiveness will be determined through in-house assessments, Edusoft data reports, District Interim Assessments, Progress Monitoring Reporting Network (PMRN). Summative: FCAT 2.0 results.

conflict/resolution and rising/falling action in a story.

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 results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 66 % of students achieved proficiency in Reading. 5A : Our goal is to increase students' proficiency by 16				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	66	69	72	75	78	

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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 57% of students in the Hispanic subgroup did not achieve proficiency . Our goal is to increase students' proficiency by 11 percentage points to 68%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
H: 57% (197)	H: 68% (235)

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	White: N/A Black: N/A Hispanic: As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test, the Hispanic subgroup did not achieve proficiency. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was in Reporting Category-Reading Application. Appropriate and timely placement of students in interventions needs to continue to be in place. Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A	Utilizing data to identify Tier 2 and 3 students, place in appropriate interventions within the first three weeks of the 2012-2013 school year, and monitor student progress monthly with emphasis on Reading Application.	MTSS/RtI Team	MTSS/RtI Team will meet monthly to determine if students are making adequate progress toward the goal.	Effectiveness will be determined through in house assessments, Edusoft data reports, District Interim Assessments, Progress Monitoring Reporting Network (PMRN). Summative: FCAT 2.0 results.

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

of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 48% of students in the English Language Learners subgroup did not achieve proficiency. Our goal is to increase students' proficiency By 14 percentage points to 62%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
48% (70)	62% (90)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0, 48% of students in the English Language Learners subgroup did not achieve proficiency. The English Language Learners subgroup did not make satisfactory progress. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was in Reporting Category-Reading Application.	The Reading coach along with the MTSS/RtI Team will analyze the current 2012 FCAT 2.0 data, determine the ELL students in need of intervention, and place these students in the appropriate intervention program with emphasis on Reading Application.	MTSS/RtI Team	The MTSS/RtI Team will meet monthly to analyze current data reports generated through Edusoft in order to monitor the effectiveness of the interventions and to determine if students are making adequate progress toward the goal.	Effectiveness will be determined through in house assessments, Edusoft data reports, District Interim Assessments, Progress Monitoring Reporting Network (PMRN). Summative: FCAT 2.0 results

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 31 % of students in the Students with Disabilities subgroup did not achieve proficiency. Our goal is to increase students' proficiency by 15 percentage points to 46%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
31% (13)	46% (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	As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0, 31% of students in the Students with Disabilities subgroup did not achieve proficiency. The Students with Disabilities subgroup did	The Reading coach along with the MTSS/RtI Team will analyze the current 2012 FCAT 2.0 data, determine the students in need of intervention, and place these students in the appropriate intervention program with emphasis on Reading	MTSS/RtI Team	The MTSS/RtI Team will meet monthly to analyze current data reports generated through Edusoft in order to monitor the effectiveness of the interventions and to determine if students are making adequate progress toward the	Effectiveness will be determined through in house assessments, Edusoft data reports, District Interim Assessments, Progress Monitoring

not make satisfactory progress. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was in Reporting Category-Reading Application.	Application.	goal .	Reporting Network (PMRN). Summative: FCAT 2.0 results
---	--------------	--------	---

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 55% of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup did not achieve proficiency. Our goal is to increase students' proficiency by 13 percentage points to 68%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
55% (176)	68% (218)

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	As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0, 55% of Economically Disadvantaged students did not achieve proficiency. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was in Reporting Category-Reading Application.	The Reading Coach along with the MTSS/RtI Team will analyze the current 2012 FCAT 2.0 Data, determine the ED students in need of interventions, and place these students in the appropriate intervention program with emphasis on Reading Application.	MTSS/RtI Team	The MTSS/RtI Team will meet monthly to analyze current data reports generated through Edusoft in order to determine if students are making adequate progress toward the goal.	Effectiveness will be determined through in-house assessments, Edusoft data reports, District Interim Assessments, Progress Monitoring Reporting Network (PMRN). Summative: FCAT 2.0 results.

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core	K-5 Reading Special Area	Reading Coach	School-Wide	Summer 2012 November 6, 2012 February 1, 2013	School Based Benchmark Assessments Results & District Interim Assessments Results	Administrators
MTSS/RtI	K-5 Reading	MTSS/RtI Team	School Wide	November 6, 2012 February 1, 2013	Intervention Rosters, Edusoft Custom Group Data Reports	Administrators
					FAIR Data Reports, School Based Benchmark	

Differentiated Instruction	K-5 Reading	Reading Coach	School-Wide	November 6, 2012 February 1, 2013	Assessments Results & Administrator District Interim Assessments Results	Administrators
SuccessMaker	K-5	District Training	K-5	November 6, 2012 February 1, 2013	SuccessMaker Reports	Administrators MTSS/Rtl team

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Goal Area 1,2,3,4,5A, 5B,5D	Afterschool Tutoring	Title I and Title III	\$10,000.00
			Subtotal: \$10,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Goal Areas 1,2,3,4,5A, 5B, 5C, 5D	MTSS/RTI	School Based Budget	\$500.00
Goal Areas 1,2,3,4,5A, 5B, 5C, 5D	Differentiated Instruction	School Based Budget	\$500.00
			Subtotal: \$1,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$11,000.00

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.		The results of the 2012 CELLA Test indicate that 54% of students achieved proficiency in Listening/Speaking			
CELLA Goal #1:					
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
54% (178)					
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 in the English Language Learners	As students work to obtain the necessary	Administration	Administration will have Data Debriefing	Effectiveness will be determined

1	program are working towards acquiring the English Language verbally. Students in the lower levels of the program have demonstrated a need for continuous repetition of words, phrases, directions, and instructions to complete reading assignments.	listening skills to acquire the English language, teachers will incorporate the ELL strategies of: repetition, visual aids, oral repetition of vocabulary words, phonemic awareness drills, extended time, clarification of directions, coaching, and immediate feedback, while students complete reading assignments.		Sessions with ELL Reading teachers, Reading Coach, and Leadership Team on a monthly basis to determine if students are making adequate progress toward the goal.	through in-house assessments, District Interim Assessments, Progress Monitoring Reporting Network (PMRN). Summative: CELLA 2013 Results
---	--	--	--	--	--

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:	The results of the 2012 CELLA Test indicate that 38% of students achieved proficiency in Reading.
--	---

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

38% (125)

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 in the English Language Learners program are working towards acquiring the skills to read the English Language in written form. Students in the lower levels of the program have demonstrated a need for continuous repetition of phonemes, words, phrases, vocabulary recognition, visual representations, extended time and practice, and comprehension skills while completing reading assignments.	As students work to obtain the necessary skills to read the English language at grade level, teachers will incorporate the ELL strategies of: repetition, visual aids, oral repetition of vocabulary words, phonemic awareness drills, extended time, close passages, chunking, coaching, and immediate feedback, while students complete reading assignments.	Administration	Administration will have Data Debriefing Sessions with ELL Reading teachers, Reading Coach, and Leadership Team on a monthly basis to determine if students are making adequate progress toward the goal.	Effectiveness will be determined through in-house assessments, District Interim Assessments, Progress Monitoring Reporting Network (PMRN). Summative: CELLA 2013 Results

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	The results of the 2012 CELLA Test indicate that 34% of students achieved proficiency in Writing.
--	---

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

34% (110)

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 in the English Language Learners program are working towards acquiring the English Language in written form. Students in the lower levels of the program have demonstrated a need for continuous usage of revising/editing charts and conferencing with teachers.	As students work to obtain the necessary skills to write in the English language at grade level, teachers will incorporate the ELL strategies of: repetition, visual aids, vocabulary lists, translation dictionaries, word walls, labels throughout the classroom, extended time, coaching, editing, revising and immediate feedback, while students complete writing assignments.	Administration	Administration will have Data Debriefing Sessions with ELL Reading teachers, Reading Coach, and Leadership Team on a monthly basis to determine if students are making adequate progress toward the goal.	Effectiveness will be determined through in-house assessments, District Interim Assessments, Progress Monitoring Reporting Network (PMRN). Summative: CELLA 2013 Results

CELLA Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Goal Area 1, 2	Florida Ready, Florida Treasures, and Buckle Down Supplemental Workbooks	Title I	\$500.00
			Subtotal: \$500.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$500.00

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 30% of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 3 students proficiency by 3 percentage point to 33%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
30% (108)	33% (120)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	<p>3rd Grade: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Reporting Category - Number: Fractions.</p> <p>4th Grade: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Reporting Category - Number: Operations and Problems.</p> <p>5th Grade: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Reporting Category - Number: Base Ten Fractions.</p> <p>Students would benefit from appropriate grade level activities that promote the use of base ten, and fractions, and number operation results in order to develop foundations for understanding mathematical terms.</p>	Engage students in activities to use technology such as Gizmos, Riverdeep and the National Library of Virtual Manipulatives to develop understanding of base ten, fractions, and problem situations.	Administration	Administration will review student grouping rosters and coordinate teacher data chats in order to ensure groups are fluid and redesigned to target the needs of students based on assessment on a monthly basis.	<p>Effectiveness will be determined through in-house assessments, District Interim Assessment, Gizmo reports.</p> <p>Summative: FCAT 2.0 results</p>

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	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 group:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 33% of students achieved proficiency (Level 4 and 5). Our goal for the 2012- 2013 school year is to increase student proficiency to 35%.
---	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33% (121)	35% (128)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	<p>3rd Grade: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Reporting Category - Number: Fractions.</p> <p>4th Grade: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Reporting Category - Number: Operations and Problems.</p> <p>5th Grade: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Reporting Category - Number: Base Ten Fractions.</p> <p>More emphasis on Number: Base Ten, Fractions, and Number Operation Results in differentiated instruction are required to address base ten, fractions,</p>	Students will be given opportunities to develop exploration and inquiry activities to increase understanding of skills through hands-on experiences with grade-level appropriate materials.	MTSS/RtI Team	Administration will review monthly classroom assignments and assessments that target Number: Base Ten, Fractions, Operations and Problems to determine if students are making adequate progress toward the goal.	<p>Effectiveness will be determined through in-house assessments, District Interim Assessments,</p> <p>Summative: FCAT 2.0 results.</p>

number operation results, and problem situations.			
---	--	--	--

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:	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 group:

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	On the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics test 67% of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012 – 2013 school year is to provide appropriate interventions, remediation and enrichment opportunities in order to increase the percentage of students making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 72%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67% (163)	72% (176)

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
As noted on the 2012 FCAT Mathematics administration, students making learning gains increased by 4 percentage points when compared to the 2011 administration and 1 percentage points when compared to the administration of 2010 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test. 3rd Grade: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0	Teachers along with the MTSS/RtI Team will identify students in need of Tier 2 interventions, and will plan supplemental small group instruction or remediation for students not responding to core instruction through the implementation of SuccessMaker in the area of Number: Base Ten, Fractions, Operations and Problems.	Administrators MTSS/RtI Team	Mathematics Facilitator will assist teachers in the creation of classroom centers as well as learning stations; administrators will ensure activities are implemented through classroom walkthroughs and observations; the MTSS/RtI Team will conduct monthly meetings and Data Chats to determine if students are making adequate progress toward the goal.	Effectiveness will be determined through in-house assessments, District Interim Assessments, SuccessMaker reports. Summative: FCAT 2.0 results.

1	<p>Mathematics Test was Reporting Category - Number: Fractions.</p> <p>4th Grade: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Reporting Category - Number: Operations and Problems.</p> <p>5th Grade: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Reporting Category - Number: Base Ten Fractions.</p> <p>Students will develop an understanding of base ten and fractions using models to represent numbers and generate equivalent fractions and simplify fractions.</p> <p>Students will develop an understanding of number operation results, including in problem situations.</p>		
---	--	--	--

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

<p>3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.</p> <p>Mathematics Goal #3b:</p>	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 group:

<p>4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.</p> <p>Mathematics Goal #4:</p>	<p>The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematic Test indicate that 71% of students in the lowest 25 % made learning gains.</p> <p>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the lowest 25% of students achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to 76 %.</p>
--	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71% (48)	76% (52)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	<p>On the 2012 FCAT Mathematics administration the percent of the students in the lowest 25% making learning gains increased by 6 percentage points, when compared to the 2011 administration, and increased 7 percentage points when compared to the administration of 2010 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test.</p> <p>3rd Grade: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Reporting Category - Number: Fractions.</p> <p>4th Grade: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Reporting Category - Number: Operations and Problems.</p> <p>5th Grade: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Reporting Category - Number: Base Ten Fractions.</p> <p>The students in the lowest 25% making learning gains would benefit from the ability to describe, demonstrate, and understand fractions and represent, compute, estimate and solve non-routine problems.</p>	Engage students in activities to use technology such as Gizmos, Riverdeep, and the National Library of Virtual Manipulatives to develop conceptual understanding of numbers.	MTSS/RTI Team	MTSS/RTI team will review Custom Group Edusoft Data and Gizmo reports to determine if students are making adequate progress toward the goal and ensure that the resources being used are appropriate on a monthly basis.	<p>Effectiveness will be determined through in-house assessments, Edusoft Data Reports, District Interim Assessments, Gizmo reports.</p> <p>Summative: FCAT 2.0 results</p>

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target	
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap	<p>Elementary School Mathematics Goal #</p> <p>The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Mathematics Test indicate that 68 % of students achieved proficiency in Mathematics.</p>

by 50%.			5A : Our goal is to increase students' proficiency by 15			
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	68	71	74	77	80	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 66 % of students in the Hispanic subgroup did not achieve proficiency in Mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
H: 66% (228)	H: 71% (246)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	<p>White: N/A</p> <p>Black: N/A</p> <p>Hispanic: As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test, the Hispanic subgroup did not make satisfactory progress.</p> <p>3rd Grade: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Reporting Category - Number: Fractions.</p> <p>4th Grade: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Reporting Category - Number: Operations and Problems.</p> <p>5th Grade: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Reporting Category - Number: Base Ten Fractions.</p> <p>Appropriate and timely placement of students in interventions will assist in the academic success of Hispanic students.</p>	Provide real-life contexts for mathematical explorations and develop student understanding through the support of manipulatives, oral discussions, and demonstrations during the 60 minute mathematics instructional block.	Administrators MTSS/RtI Team	The MTSS/RtI Team will meet monthly to analyze current data reports generated through Edusoft in order to determine if students are making adequate progress toward the goal.	<p>Effectiveness will be determined through in-house assessments, Edusoft Data Reports, District Interim Assessments.</p> <p>Summative: FCAT 2.0 results</p>

Asian: N/A			
American Indian: 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:

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 62% of students in the English Language Learners subgroup did not achieve proficiency. Our goal is to increase students' proficiency by 6 percentage points to 68%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
62% (90)	68% (99)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	<p>As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test, the English Language Learners did not make satisfactory progress.</p> <p>3rd Grade: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Reporting Category - Number: Fractions.</p> <p>4th Grade: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Reporting Category - Number: Operations and Problems.</p> <p>5th Grade: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Reporting Category - Number: Base Ten Fractions.</p> <p>Appropriate and timely placement of students in interventions will assist in the academic success of ELL students.</p>	Provide real-life contexts for mathematical explorations and develop student understanding through the support of manipulatives, oral discussions, and demonstrations during the 60 minute mathematics instructional block.	Administrators MTSS/RtI Team	The MTSS/RtI Team will meet monthly to analyze current data reports generated through Edusoft in order to determine if students are making adequate progress toward the goal.	<p>Effectiveness will be determined through in-house assessments, Edusoft Data Reports, District Interim Assessments.</p> <p>Summative: FCAT 2.0 results</p>

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 51% of Students with Disabilities subgroup did achieve proficiency in Mathematics.
---	--

Mathematics Goal #5D:	Our goal is to increase students' proficiency by 2 percentage points to 53%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
51% (21)	53% (22)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	<p>As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test, the Students with Disabilities did make satisfactory progress.</p> <p>3rd Grade: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Reporting Category - Number: Fractions.</p> <p>4th Grade: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Reporting Category - Number: Operations and Problems.</p> <p>5th Grade: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Reporting Category - Number: Base Ten Fractions.</p> <p>Appropriate and timely placement of students in interventions will assist in the academic success of the students.</p>	Provide real-life contexts for mathematical explorations and develop student understanding through the support of manipulatives, oral discussions, and demonstrations during the 60 minute mathematics instructional block.	Administrators MTSS/RtI Team	The MTSS/RtI Team will meet monthly to analyze current data reports generated through Edusoft in order to determine if students are making adequate progress toward the goal.	<p>Effectiveness will be determined through in-house assessments, Edusoft Data Reports, District Interim Assessments.</p> <p>Summative: FCAT 2.0 results</p>

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 62% of students in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup did not achieve proficiency.
Mathematics Goal #5E:	Our goal is to increase students' proficiency by 6 percentage points to 68%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
62% (198)	68% (218)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	<p>As noted on the administration of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test, Economically Disadvantaged Students did not make satisfactory progress.</p> <p>3rd Grade: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Reporting Category - Number: Fractions.</p> <p>4th Grade: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Reporting Category - Number: Operations and Problems.</p> <p>5th Grade: The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Reporting Category - Number: Base Ten Fractions.</p> <p>Appropriate and timely placement of students in interventions will ensure the academic success of ED students.</p>	<p>Provide real life contexts for mathematical explorations and develop student understanding through the support of manipulatives, oral discussions, and demonstrations during the 60 minute mathematics instructional block with emphasis on Numbers: Base Ten, Fractions, Operations and Problems.</p>	Administrators MTSS/RtI Team	The MTSS/RtI Team will meet monthly to analyze current data reports generated through Edusoft in order to determine if students are making adequate progress toward the goal.	<p>Effectiveness will be determined through in house assessments, Edusoft Data Reports, District Interim Assessments.</p> <p>Summative: FCAT 2.0 results.</p>

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core	K-5 Mathematics Special Area	MTSS/RtI Team	School-Wide	November 6, 2012 February 1, 2013	School Based Benchmark Assessments Results & District Interim Assessments Results	Administrators MTSS/RtI Team
MTSS/RtI	K-5 Mathematics Special Area	MTSS/RtI Team	School-Wide	November 6, 2012 February 1, 2013	School Based Benchmark Assessments Results & District Interim Assessments Results	Administrators MTSS/RtI Team
Differentiated Instruction	K-5 Mathematics Special Area	MTSS/RtI Team	School-Wide	November 6, 2012 February 1, 2013	School Based Benchmark Assessments Results & District Interim Assessments Results	Administrators MTSS/RtI Team

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Goal Area 1,2,3,4, 5B , 5D	Before & After School Tutoring	Title I and Title III	\$10,000.00
			Subtotal: \$10,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$10,000.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.		The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science Test indicate that 30% of the students achieved proficiency. Our goal is to increase students' proficiency by 3 percentage points to 33%.			
Science Goal #1a:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
30% (36)		33% (41)			
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	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Science test was in Reporting Category-Earth and Space Sciences. Students would benefit from developing higher order thinking skills in order to increase levels	The Math and Science facilitator along with the science teachers will implement science journals into their lesson plans for students to have the opportunity for inquiry-based learning and Scientific Thinking through real world science experiments.	Administrators	Lessons will be reviewed monthly by administration to ensure a link between classroom instruction and real world science experiments and to determine if students are making adequate progress toward the goal.	Effectiveness will be determined through in-house assessments, science journals, District Interim Assessments, Lab reports. Summative: FCAT 2.0 results

of proficiency.	Emphases will be placed on Earth and Space Sciences.			
-----------------	--	--	--	--

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:	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 group:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science Test indicate that 16% of the students scored above proficiency (FCAT Level 4 and 5). Our goal is to increase students' proficiency by 1 percentage points to 21%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
16% (19)	17% (21)

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	The area which showed a decrease of 2 percentage points as noted on the 2012 Science FCAT 2.0 was in the Reporting Category: Earth and Space Sciences Students would benefit from developing higher order thinking skills in order to increase levels of proficiency.	The Math and Science Facilitator will identify 4th grade students who scored a Level 4 or 5 on the 2012 FCAT 2.0, group these students, and coordinate enrichment activities using "Gizmos" that will foster further inquiry and scientific thinking on a weekly basis.	Administrators	Student progress will be tracked monthly by administration via Custom Group Reports generated by Gizmo to determine if students are making adequate progress toward the goal.	Effectiveness will be determined through in house assessments, District Interim Assessments, Gizmo Reports. Summative: FCAT 2.0 results

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:	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				

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
Gizmo	3-5	Science Facilitator	Science Teachers	November 6, 2012 February 1, 2013	Classroom Walkthroughs Teacher Observations Custom Group Reports	Administrators
Developing Earth and Space Sciences Lessons/Science Journals	3-5	Science Facilitator	Science Teachers	November 6, 2012 February 1, 2013	Classroom Walkthroughs Teacher Observations Custom Group Reports	Administrators

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

Goal Area 1	Effective lessons on Earth and Space Sciences	School Based Budget	\$300.00
			Subtotal: \$300.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$300.00

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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Writing Test indicate that 79% of students achieved a level of 3.0 and higher of proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase to 81%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
79% (104)	81% (107)

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	Results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Writing Test indicate that 79% of students achieved a level of 3.0 and higher of proficiency. Students will continue to receive the necessary tools in revising and editing to create writing that will bring precision and interest through the vivid expression of ideas and the use of varied language techniques.	Teachers will design lessons that allow students to engage in the first two steps of the writing process (plan, draft) through journal writing and other authentic writing activities based on state released topics/prompts.	Administrators	Teachers will meet with the Reading Coach to review and score student writing samples on a monthly basis to determine if students are making adequate progress toward the goal.	Effectiveness will be determined through FCAT Writing Rubric, monthly writing assessments, District Pre and post Tests. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Writing Test

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:	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				

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core	K-5 Reading Special Area	Reading Coach	School-Wide	November 6, 2012 February 1, 2013	School Based Writing Assessments Results & District Pre/Post Assessment Results	Administrators Reading Coach
Differentiated Instruction	K-5 Reading Special Area	Reading Coach	School-Wide	November 6, 2012 February 1, 2013	School Based Writing Assessments Results & District Pre/Post Assessment Results	Administrators Reading Coach

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Goal 1	Writing Professional Development	School Based Budget	\$300.00
			Subtotal: \$300.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$300.00

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:		Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase our average attendance rate to 96.96% by decreasing the number of students with excessive absences & tardies (10 or more).			
2012 Current Attendance Rate:		2013 Expected Attendance Rate:			
96.46% (756)		96.96% (760)			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)			
158		150			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)			
67		64			
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	Frequent absences due to doctor visits.	The counselor and CIS will identify students who may be developing a pattern of nonattendance and will refer them to the ARC (Attendance Review Committee).	Administrators, ARC Committee	Administrators will weekly review weekly COGNOS report to monitor the number of students that have exceeded 10 or more absences or 10 or more tardies and determine if students are making adequate progress toward the goal.	COGNOS attendance reports, daily attendance roster
2	Frequent tardiness due to doctor visits.	The school's CIS will speak at monthly workshops for parents to review school policies and to introduce new families to community agencies.	Administrators	Administrators will review CIS logs, Sign-In Sheets, and Agendas on a monthly basis to determine if students are making adequate progress toward the goal.	COGNOS attendance reports, daily attendance roster

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
Truancy Prevention	K-5 Special Area	Student Service CIS	Homeroom Teachers	September 17, 2012 November 7, 2012 December 5, 2012 January 18, 2013	School administrators, counselor and the school's CIS will monitor student attendance by grade level and individual classrooms.	Administrators

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Goal Area 1	Perfect Attendance Dance/Incentives	PTA	\$600.00
			Subtotal: \$600.00
			Grand Total: \$600.00

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:	Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to decrease the total number of suspensions by 1.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
0	0
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
0	0

2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions				
7	6				
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School				
7	6				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teachers would benefit from additional time in order to infuse character education into their lessons.	Implementation of a character education program will reward selected students on a monthly basis. Teachers will select a different student each month based on the particular character trait that is being taught. Students will be recognized at our monthly Character Education Celebration.	Administrators	Administration will monitor COGNOS report on student outdoor/indoor suspension rates on a monthly basis to determine if students are making adequate progress toward the goal.	Monthly COGNOS suspension 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
Character Education	K-5	Counselor	Classroom Teachers K-5	September 4, 2012 – June 6, 2013	Review COGNOS report for suspension rates	Administrators

Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Goal 1	Student of the Month Celebration/Character Education	PTA	\$1,000.00
			Subtotal: \$1,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$1,000.00

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:	Not Applicable				
<i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>					
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:				
Not Applicable	Not Applicable				
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						

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		Based on the data gathered from Mathematics and Science there is a need to provide students with an opportunity to apply both Mathematical and Scientific concepts with-in the real life setting.			
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
1	Students learn both Mathematical and Science concepts in the school setting, but a need is evident to have students apply these fundamental skills with-in the real life setting.	Students in grades K-5 will participate in a school-wide Science Fair. Keeping in mind the students' developmental stages, Kindergarten students will actively complete Science Fair Class Projects. Students in grades 1-2 will complete group projects completed in class, and students in grades 3-5 will complete individual Science Fair Projects that are conducted and completed in the home setting. It is important to note that students infuse their	Administration	Once a year administration will have a Science Fair to determine if students are making adequate progress toward the goal.	Effectiveness will be determined through Science Fair Criteria for judging. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics and Science Test Scores

		mathematical and science skills with the use of technology to develop and engineer their projects.		
--	--	--	--	--

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core	K-3	MTSS/RTI Team	School-wide	September 2012-June 2013	School Based Benchmark Assessments Results	Administrators MTSS/RTI Team

STEM Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Goal #1	Effective lessons	School Based Budget	\$300.00
			Subtotal: \$300.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$300.00

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Goal Area 1,2,3,4,5A, 5B,5D	Afterschool Tutoring	Title I and Title III	\$10,000.00
CELLA	Goal Area 1, 2	Florida Ready, Florida Treasures, and Buckle Down Supplemental Workbooks	Title I	\$500.00
Mathematics	Goal Area 1,2,3,4, 5B , 5D	Before & After School Tutoring	Title I and Title III	\$10,000.00
Science				\$0.00
Writing				\$0.00
Attendance				\$0.00
Suspension	Goal 1	Student of the Month Celebration/Character Education	PTA	\$1,000.00
STEM				\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$21,500.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading				\$0.00
CELLA				\$0.00
Mathematics				\$0.00
Science				\$0.00
Writing				\$0.00
Attendance				\$0.00
Suspension				\$0.00
STEM				\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Goal Areas 1,2,3,4,5A, 5B, 5C, 5D	MTSS/RTI	School Based Budget	\$500.00
Reading	Goal Areas 1,2,3,4,5A, 5B, 5C, 5D	Differentiated Instruction	School Based Budget	\$500.00
CELLA				\$0.00
Mathematics				\$0.00
Science	Goal Area 1	Effective lessons on Earth and Space Sciences	School Based Budget	\$300.00
Writing	Goal 1	Writing Professional Development	School Based Budget	\$300.00
Attendance				\$0.00
Suspension				\$0.00
STEM	Goal #1	Effective lessons	School Based Budget	\$300.00
				Subtotal: \$1,900.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading				\$0.00
CELLA				\$0.00
Mathematics				\$0.00
Science				\$0.00
Writing				\$0.00
Attendance	Goal Area 1	Perfect Attendance Dance/Incentives	PTA	\$600.00
Suspension				\$0.00

STEM	\$0.00
	Subtotal: \$600.00
	Grand Total: \$24,000.00

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 10/7/2012)

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
FCAT Incentives	\$500.00

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

School Advisory Council (EESAC) will meet on a regular basis to develop, revise and monitor the progress of the School Improvement Plan goals. In addition, the council will determine the most appropriate use of EESAC funds to support the School Improvement Plan goals.

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

Dade School District JOHN G. DUPUIS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	83%	85%	73%	66%	307	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	69%	63%			132	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?	59% (YES)	65% (YES)			124	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					563	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Dade School District JOHN G. DUPUIS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	81%	82%	88%	54%	305	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	65%	66%			131	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?	60% (YES)	77% (YES)			137	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					573	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested