FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: GREENLAND PINES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Duval

Principal: Rodilyn Bacho-logsdon

SAC Chair: Melissa Warner

Superintendent: Dr. Ed Pratt-Dannals

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/19/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
		BA: Elementary Education MS: Elementary			2011-12 Grade A (610) Greenland Pines Elementary Reading Proficiency 76% Math Proficiency 81% Writing Proficiency 86% Science Proficiency 67% Gains Reading 66% Gains Math 82% Bottom Quartile Reading 59% Bottom Quartile Math 77% 2011-12 Grade C (475) Jacksonville Heights Elementary Reading Proficiency 56% Math Proficiency 54% Writing Proficiency 74% Science Proficiency 50% Gains Reading 66% Gains Math 62% Bottom Quartile Reading 60% Bottom Quartile Math 53% 2010-2011: Jacksonville Heights Elementary

Principal	Rodilyn Bacho-Logsdon	Education Ed. D: Doctoral Candidate (Educational Leadership) FL Certification: Educational Leadership FL Certification: English Education (Grades 6-12)	1	6	School Grade C (484 Points) Reading Mastery 57% Math Mastery 59% Science Mastery 39% Writing Mastery 73% Learning Gains: Reading 58% Math 61% Lowest 25% Gains: Reading 58% Math 79% AYP: no 2009-2010: Jacksonville Heights Elementary School Grade C (457 Points) Reading Mastery 61% Math Mastery 52% Science Mastery 38% Writing Mastery 81% Learning Gains: Reading 58% Math 52% Lowest 25% Gains: Reading 55% Math 60% AYP: no
Assis Principal	David Burrell	Undergraduate Education: B.A.E, Bachelors of Arts in Early Childhood Education Graduate Degree: Masters in Educational Leadership Certification: Birth – 3rd grade, age 3–3rd , K-5th Endorsement: Exceptional Student Education.	3	3	2011-2012: Grade A (610), Assistant Principal Reading Proficiency 76% Math Proficiency 81% Writing Proficiency 86% Science Proficiency 67% Gains Reading 66% Gains Math 82% Bottom Quartile Reading 59% Bottom Quartile Math 77% 2010 – 2011: Grade A, Assistant Principal Reading Mastery 88% Math Mastery 93% Science Mastery 69% Writing Mastery 79% (4+) AYP: Met

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)
NA	NA	NA			NA

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	3. Partnering new teachers with veteran staff.	Principal and Professional Development Facilitator	On-going (August 2012 – June 2013)	
	1. Implementation of a weekly "Training Day" where small	Principal and	On-going	

2	3-4 person PLC groups will meet to discuss data, next steps, RtI and observe peers to improve instructional practices.	Assistant Principal	(August 2012 – June 2013)	
3	2. Bi-weekly professional development trainings/book talks.	Lead Teachers	June 2013	
4	4. Participation in Professional Learning Communities with grade levels to plan instruction and analyze student work.	Principal and Grade Level Teacher	June 2013	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
10 Out of Field Staff • 8 working on completion of ESOL Endorsement • 1 Temporary Certificate working on ASD Endorsement • 1 Working on Pre-K: ASD Certification	All Non-Highly Qualified Instructors will receive support from either a mentor, for those new to the school, or teacher mentor, for those who have 1 or more years at Greenland Pines Elementary. All individuals listed will be expected to participate in ongoing professional development during early release days and training offered through the district. As needs are identified, teachers receive support through the following: modeling by peers, teacher resource training time, half day trainings, frequent classroom observations, and assignment of mentors.

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
75	4.0%(3)	9.3%(7)	41.3%(31)	45.3%(34)	33.3%(25)	85.3%(64)	1.3%(1)	6.7%(5)	65.3%(49)

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
			The MINT program and guidelines will serve as the framework for which mentoring and specific professional development is given to meet the specific needs of each mentee. Based on the level of proficiency that each

Allison Wise	Kelly Flatt	Allison Wise is an experienced teacher who uses best practices in her delivery of instruction.	mentee demonstrates within the 6 Educator Accomplished Practices, needs will be identified and the mentor teachers will provide support and guidance through; modeling, early release day trainings, and classroom observations/feedback by their mentor/partner. The mentor/partner will meet biweekly to discuss evidence-based strategies for each curricular domain. The mentor is given release time to observe the mentee.
Kate Adams	Renee Collins	Kate Adams maintains consistent student gains within the population of students served within the communication and social skills program.	See Above
Kate Adams	Stephanie Leuluai	Kate Adams maintains consistent student gains within the population of students served within the communication and social skills program.	See Above

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

NA

Title I, Part C- Migrant

NA

Title I, Part D

NA

Title II

NA

Title III

NA

Title X- Homeless

NA

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

NA

Violence Prevention Programs

NA

Nutrition Programs

NA

Housing Programs

NA

Head Start

NA

Adult Education

NA

Career and Technical Education

NA

Job Training

NA

Other

NA

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Assistant Principal: David Burrell
School Psychologist:
K: Ashley Thomas
1: Nancy Brehm – MTSS Facilitator
2: Debbie Solano
3: Mary Grove
4: Donna Rae Ester
5: Margie Crump

Describe how the school-based MTSS Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?

The school based MTSS Team will meet monthly to review universal screening, diagnostic, and progress monitoring data. Based on this information, the team will identify the professional development activities needed to create effective learning environments. Teachers of identified students will be supported by school-based MTSS team.

The MTSS team will use the Problem Solving Model to conduct all meetings. Based on data and discussion, the team will identify students who are in need of additional academic and/or behavioral support (supplemental or intensive). An intervention plan will be developed which identifies a student's specific areas of deficiencies and appropriate research based interventions to address these deficiencies. The team will ensure the necessary resources are available and the intervention implemented. Each case will be assigned a case liaison to support the interventionist (e.g., teacher, MTSS/Inclusion Facilitator, guidance counselor) and report back on all data collected for further discussion at future meetings.

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?

Assistant Principal: David Burrell - provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making; ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS; conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff; ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation requirements; ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation; and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities.

Foundations Team Chair: Devlon Williams- Provides information about school wide and class wide behavior curriculum and instruction; participates in behavioral data collection; provides professional development principles of Foundations to faculty and staff; and collaborates with staff to implement behavioral interventions.

School Psychologist: Amy Winters - participates in student data collection; assists in determination for further assessment; integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 instruction; and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching, facilitation, and consultation.

MTSS Facilitator: Nancy Brehm- participates on the Building Leadership Team; acts as liaison for implementation of MTSS at the school level; receives ongoing MTSS training and delivers information to school; provides direct intervention services to an identified group of students and tracks student progress; guides school in using data to make decisions about interventions and strategies that support MTSS.

Grade Level Chairs: Fifth Grade Chairperson: Venus Brown; Fourth Grade Chairperson: Nan Ramey; Third Grade Chairperson: Janeice Ives ; Second Grade Chairperson: Pamela Rossomano; First Grade Chairperson: Melissa Stokke; RtI Facilitator: Nancy Brehm; and Kindergarten Chairperson: Penny Porter – provide information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; delivers Tier 1 instruction/interventions; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 interventions; and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.

MTSS Implementation

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

Baseline data:
- Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)
- Curriculum Based measurements
- Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR)
- Duval County Benchmarks
- Duval County Timed Writing Assessments
- Duval County Math/Science Formatives
- K-3 Literacy Assessment System
- Diagnostic Reading Assessment (DRA2)
- Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN)
- Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)
- Office Discipline Referrals
- Retentions
- Absences
Midyear data:
- Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR)
- Diagnostic Reading Assessment (DRA2)
- Duval County Benchmarks
- Duval County Timed Writing Assessments
- Duval County Math/Science Formatives
- Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN)
- K-3 Literacy Assessment System
End of year data:
- Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR)
- Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)
- FCAT Writes
- Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR)
- Diagnostic Reading Assessment (DRA2)

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional development will be offered to MTSS school based team by district staff during the 2012-2013 school year. The school-based RtI team will provide in-service to the faculty on designated professional development days (i.e. pre-planning, early dismissal, planning days, Wednesday "training days" and faculty meetings). These in-service opportunities will include, but are not limited to, the following:
- Problem Solving Model

- Consensus building
- Positive Behavioral Intervention and Support
- Data-based decision-making to drive instruction
- Progress monitoring
- Selection and availability of research-based interventions
- Tools utilized to identify specific discrepancies in reading

In addition, MTSS learning will be job-embedded and occur during the following:
- Professional Learning Communities
- Classroom Observations
- Collaborative Planning
- Analysis of Student Work
- Book Study

Individual professional development will be provided to classroom teachers, as needed.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

A specific time is dedicated every day in every classroom to provide additional educational and behavioral support for all Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 students. Research based materials/strategies are used to remediate and/or enrich students. Monthly meetings are held with the MTSS team to discuss next steps and issues, which need to be addressed concerning student needs. In addition, bi-monthly grade level meetings are held to review skills and data for student and realign groups according to student needs.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Rodilyn Bacho-logsdon
Robin Kehrt
Joan Conners
Casa Watson
Jean Hopper
Joy Martin
Cynthia Hopkins

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

The LLT meets with grade level teams monthly to discuss trends, strategies, and data to guide classroom instruction. Our goal is to address the instructional rigor in our reading curriculum and how it is implemented across grade levels. This provides next steps for improving reading achievement with our students.

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

Aside from using data from several sources (FAIR, benchmarks, FCAT, common assessment, informal observation, etc.) to guide our instruction and next steps, we will continue focusing our attention on three major initiatives which are, differentiation, essential questions, and Accelerated Reader/STAR. As a school, we met AYP last year and believe wholeheartedly that our focus on the three initiatives mentioned above is the reason for our success.
Differentiation is our major focus due to the fact that it focuses on equity rather than equality; equity being the idea that we will provide each student with what they need to be successful rather than teaching to the middle. The data we obtain from the above mentioned assessments and programs will help guide our instruction when differentiating. We will continue to set aside a consistent set time to be used specifically for MTSS in the morning, which, not always, but in many cases will be focused on remedial and strategic literacy instruction.
Within our daily instruction we will be utilizing the district learning schedule and "essential question" portion to help guide our instruction, while utilizing the higher levels of Bloom's taxonomy and Webb's Depth of Knowledge to ensure a true understanding of the topic and/or concept being taught. Increasing the consistency with which teachers chart strategies taught and used in class should make the learning/environment more authentic.

Accelerated Reader and STAR will be used as additional pieces of data to help us monitor the success of our children as they progress through the year.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

N/A

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

N/A

*High Schools Only

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

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

N/A

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

N/A

Postsecondary Transition

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

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report

N/A

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	In grade 3, 24% (37), 4 31% (40) and 5 35% (41) of the students will achieve mastery on 2013 administration of the FCAT Reading Test based on DCPS targets for level 3.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 3, 17% (24), 4 24% (33), 5 28% (41) of students achieved mastery (level 3) on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.	In grade 3, 24% (37), 4 31% (40) and 5 35% (41) of the students will achieve mastery on 2013 administration of the FCAT Reading Test based on DCPS targets for level 3.

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1A.1. Lack of thorough understanding of intervention strategies. Consistent use of differentiation with fidelity Limited teacher knowledge of strategies for teaching new vocabulary. Consistent use of Charting to summarize lessons and tie learning back to the purpose/essential questions	1A.1. Daily school-wide implementation of Response to Intervention (R.T.I.) Differentiating Instruction to meet the needs of all students. Using specific and focused vocabulary instruction (Frayer Model) when new vocabulary is introduced. Charting with fidelity.	1A.1. Classroom Teachers and Administration.	1A.1. Review FAIR data reports and Reading Data Alignment forms to ensure teachers are assessing students.	1A.1. FAIR assessment reports, PMPs, district benchmark assessments and 2012-13 FCAT scores.
2	1.2. Inconsistent use of data to guide instruction.	1.2. Administration of FAIR, DRAs, IBA's and Houghton Mifflin Baseline assessments. Use PLC time to diagnose specific needs of staff and instruct them in the use of data to guide instruction; specifically Pearson's Inform and Insight.	1.2. Classroom Teachers and Administration.	1.2. The principal and Design Team will meet with teachers as a group and one on one to discuss assessment results and student progress.	1.2. Data notebooks and safety net monitoring forms. One on one data chats with administration.
3	1.3. Inconsistent daily instructional delivery of Reader's Workshop Model.	1.3. All ELA teachers will be trained to use the Reader's Workshop model to teach reading with an emphasis on guided reading groups and	Classroom Teachers and Administration.	Lesson plans,data assessment notebooks and student portfolios will be utilized to provide evidence of instruction, assessment and differentiation to	Focus walks to determine effectiveness.

	differentiated instruction.			individual student needs.	
4	1.1. Lack of thorough understanding of intervention strategies and interventions. Limited teacher knowledge of strategies for teaching new vocabulary, specifically the Frayer Model	1.1. Daily school-wide implementation of Response to Intervention (R.T.I.) Differentiating Instruction to meet the needs of all students. Using specific and focused vocabulary instruction (i.e. Frayer Model) when new vocabulary is introduced.	1.1. Classroom Teachers and Administration.	1.1. Review FAIR data reports and Reading Data Alignment forms to ensure teachers are assessing students.	1.1. FAIR assessment reports, PMPs, district benchmark assessments and 2011-12 FCAT scores.
5	1.2. Teachers using data to guide instruction	1.2. Implementation of FAIR, DRAs and Houghton Mifflin Baseline assessments.	1.2. Classroom Teachers and Administration.	1.2. The principal and Design Team will meet with teachers as a group and one on one to discuss assessment results and student progress.	1.2. Data notebooks and safety net monitoring forms. One on one data chats with administration.
6	1.3. Teachers not using the Reader's Workshop Model with fidelity.	1.3. All ELA teachers will use the Reader's Workshop model to teach reading with an emphasis on guided reading groups and differentiated instruction.	1.3. Classroom Teachers and Administration.	1.3. Lesson plans, data assessment notebooks and student portfolios will be utilized to provide evidence of instruction, assessment and differentiation to individual student needs.	1.3. Focus walks to determine effectiveness.

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:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	NA

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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	In grade 3, 42% (65), 4 59% (76) and 5 48% (56) of the students will achieve mastery on 2013 administration of the FCAT Reading Test based on DCPS targets for level 4 and above.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

In grade 3 36% (51), 4 55% (74), 5 43% (62) of students achieved mastery on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.	In grade 3, 42% (65), 4 59% (76) and 5 48% (56) of the students will achieve mastery on 2013 administration of the FCAT Reading Test based on DCPS targets for level 4 and above.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. Delivering reading curriculum with rigor.	2.1 Supplement reading instruction with Accelerated Reader, Book Talks, specific core curriculum enrichment activities to ramp up learning rigor. Differentiation of reading curriculum. Consistent use of Charting to summarize lessons and tie learning back to the purpose/essential questions	2.1. Classroom Teachers and Administration	2.1. Monitor running records and classroom assessments (DRAs, Benchmark tests, and unit tests).	2.1. Data notebooks and safety net monitoring forms. One on one data chats with administration. Focus walks to determine effectiveness.

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:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	NA

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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	In grade 3 69.4% (108), 4 (90), 5 (82) of the students will achieve mastery on 2013 administration of the FCAT Reading Test based on DCPS targets.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grade 3 66% (93), 4 (90), 5 (96) of students achieved	In grade 3 69.4% (108), 4 (90), 5 (82) of the students will

mastery on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.			achieve mastery on 2013 administration of the FCAT Reading Test based on DCPS targets.		

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3.1. Teachers not using data to guide instruction. Part-time Media Specialist coupled with large student population. No literacy coach position.	3.1. Work on time Use PLC time to diagnose specific needs of staff and instruct them in the use of data to guide instruction; specifically Pearson's Inform and Insight. Supplement the part-time Media Specialist with a media assistant to increase the volume of books children are able to check out. Use district literacy coach to provide professional development during designated PLC time.	3.1. Administration and teachers	3.1. The principal and Design Team will meet with teachers as a group and one on one to discuss assessment results and student progress.	3.1. Data notebooks and safety net monitoring forms. One on one data chats with administration
2	3.2. Time constraints.	3.2. Creative use of the schedules and collaborative work	3.2. Teachers and Administration	3.2. Discussions during collaborative meetings.	3.2. Consistent reference to Learning Schedule.

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	In grades 4-5, 63.1% (64) of the students will achieve mastery on 2013 administration of the FCAT Reading Test based on DCPS targets.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 4-5, 59% (62) of the students made learning gains on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.	In grades 4-5, 63.1% (64) of the students will achieve mastery on 2013 administration of the FCAT Reading Test based on DCPS targets.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
---	---	---	---	---	---
1	4.1. Students enrolled with limited vocabulary. No literacy coach position to provide specific guided instruction to improve teachers' teaching ability. Insufficient number of computers to service all students.	4.1. Using designated time for Response to Intervention (RtI) to teach to the specific deficiencies that students possess. Use district literacy coach to provide professional development during designated PLC time. Use of supplemental teacher materials such as FCRR resources.	4.1. Teachers and Administration.	4.1. Improved performance/ comprehension within small groups and individuals. Collection of data to show growth.	4.1. FAIR Running records, grade level common assessments, DRAs, Benchmark tests, and unit tests.
2	4.2. Limited vocabulary/Language barriers	4.2. Soar to Success/tutoring Supplemental ESOL materials.	4.2. Teachers and Administration.	4.2. Monitor running records and classroom assessments (DRAs, Benchmark tests, and unit tests).	4.2. FAIR Running records, grade level common assessments, DRAs, Benchmark tests, and unit tests.

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 #
	83% of all students in grades 3-5 will achieve mastery on the 2012-13 Reading FCAT. 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	81%	83%	84%	86%	88%	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	In grade 3 80% (83-white), 60%(11-black), 4 (58-white), (15-black, 5 (62-white), (8-black) of the students will achieve mastery on 2013 administration of the FCAT Reading Test based on DCPS targets.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White:78% Black:56% Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	In grade 3 80% (83-white), 60%(11-black), 4 (58-white), (15-black, 5 (62-white), (8-black) of the students will achieve mastery on 2013 administration of the FCAT Reading Test based on DCPS targets.

	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	5.B.1. Lack extensive background knowledge in Reading Application, Vocabulary, Informational Text and the Research Process.	5.B.1. Daily school-wide implementation of Response to Intervention (R.T.I.) Differentiating Instruction to meet the needs of all students. Using specific and focused vocabulary instruction (Frayer Model) when new vocabulary is introduced. Charting with fidelity.	5.B.1. Classroom Teachers	5.B.1. Review FAIR data reports and Reading Data Alignment forms to ensure teachers are assessing students.	5.B.1. FAIR Running records, grade level common assessments, DRAs, Benchmark tests, and unit tests.

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:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	NA

	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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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:	50% (38) of SWD students will make satisfactory progress on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
44% (33) of SWD students made satisfactory progress on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.	50% (38) of SWD students will make satisfactory progress on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.

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

1	5.D.1. Attendance Inappropriate child behavior New VE Staff Familiarity of staff with curriculum (Reading Mastery) Varying abilities of children	5.D.1. Use of Attendance Intervention Team, administrative support, increased parent communication Mentoring, Support from Site Coach, Professional Development Detailed lesson plans, District level support, professional development Collaboration with general education teachers to gain a better understanding of needs and expectation	5.D.1. ESE Lead Teacher, Administration, District Support Staff	5.D.1. Monitoring and disaggregation of data generated from the following: formal and informal assessments, benchmark assessments, DCPS Math Assessments and the FCAT.	5.D.1. Focused walkthrough by administration will be used to ensure all math teachers are implementing the curriculum.

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:	67% of ED students will make satisfactory progress on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
63% of ED students made satisfactory progress on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.	67% of ED students will make satisfactory progress on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5E.1. Lack of technology, supplies and other resources at home. Lack of additional funds to provide stipends for after school tutoring.	5E.1. Send materials home. Allow students to use computers before and after school. Provide time for homework completion at school. Provide tutoring before and after school. Provide consistent and constant differentiation.	Teachers Administration	5E.1. Disaggregate data from the following: Informal and formal assessments, alternative assessments, benchmarks and FCAT Use data to drive instruction/"next steps"	5E.1. Formal and informal assessments. (FAIR, FCAT, DRAs, Running Records, benchmarks, unit and selection tests.) ection tests.)
2	Parental and teacher scheduling conflicts.	Phone calls, conferences, teacher newsletter	Teachers	Parent Surveys	Analyze Parent Surveys and conference logs.

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
RTI	K-5/All Subjects	RtI Team	School-wide	Monthly	RtI Notebook.	Teachers, Principal, Assistant Principal
Differentiation	K-5/All Subjects	Administration	School-wide	Monthly (PLC-Resource Time)	Administrative walkthroughs to check for implementation	Teachers, District Coach, Principal, Assistant Principal
Essential Questions and Charting	K-5/All Subjects	Administration/Proficient Members of the Staff	School-wide	Quarterly Early Release and Wednesday Training sessions	Administrative walkthroughs to check for implementation	Teachers, Principal, Assistant Principal, District Coach
Common Core Standards	K-5/All Subjects	Administration	School-wide	Monthly (PLC-Resource Time)	Administrative walkthroughs to check for implementation. Grade Level discussions	Teachers, Principal, Assistant Principal, District Coach

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Meet Reading Goals	Accelerated Reader	PTA	$4,200.00
Meet Reading Goals	STAR	PTA	$800.00
			Subtotal: $5,000.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Professional Book Talks	Common Core Curriculum Mapping, Pathways to the Common Core	General Funds	$1,200.00
			Subtotal: $1,200.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Community involvement in learning	Reading Festival	General Funds	$750.00
			Subtotal: $750.00
			Grand Total: $6,950.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.

CELLA Goal #1:	NA		

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	

NA

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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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:	NA

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

NA

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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	In grade 3 28% (43), 4 29% (37), 5 36% (42) of students will achieve mastery, as demonstrated by a level 3, on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grade 3 20% (28), 4 22% (30), 5 29% (41) of students achieved mastery on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test.	In grade 3 28% (43), 4 29% (37), 5 36% (42) of students will achieve mastery, as demonstrated by a level 3, on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test.

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Continued Implementation of two math curricula with fidelity.	1.1. Bi-weekly grade level meetings to discuss learning schedules, student work, analyzing data, and plan lessons.	1.1. Grade level math lead, Principal, Assistant Principal	1.1. Monitoring and disaggregation of data (Benchmarks, Module Tests, DCPS math assessments, common assessments, FCAT 2.0) will be used to guide individualized instruction and help determine if the instruction is effective.	1.1. Focused walk-throughs by administration will be used to ensure all math teachers are implementing the curriculum.
2	1.2. Lack of proper materials and time constraints.	1.2. Utilize online resources (teacher's manuals, children's workbooks, etc.) Collaborative planning.	1.2. Teachers, Assistant Principal	1.2. Focused walkthrough by administration will be used to ensure all math teachers are implementing the curriculum.	1.2. Focused walkthrough by administration will be used to ensure all math teachers are implementing the curriculum.

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:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	NA

	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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	In grade 3 41% (63), 4 61% (78), 5 53% (62) of students will achieve mastery, as demonstrated by a level 4 or higher, on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grade 3 36% (50), 4 60% (82), 5 50% (73) of students achieved mastery, as demonstrated by a level 3 or higher, on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test.	In grade 3 41% (63), 4 61% (78), 5 53% (62) of students will achieve mastery, as demonstrated by a level 4 or higher, on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test.

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement			

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. Not delivering math curriculum with fidelity and rigor.	2.1. Provide continuous professional development support and improve teacher's ability and knowledge of curriculums. Differentiate instruction through the utilization of supplemental extension materials to meet children's unique needs. Create a student led environment.	2.1. Classroom Teachers, Principal, Assistant Principal	2.1. Monitoring and disaggregation of data (Benchmarks, Module Tests, DCPS math assessments, common assessments, FCAT 2.0) will be used to guide individualized instruction and help determine if the instruction is effective.	2.1. Focused walkthrough by administration will be used to ensure all math teachers are implementing the curriculum.

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:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	NA

	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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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

of improvement for the following group:

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	In grades 4-5, 83.8%, 4 (108) and 5 (99) of the students will make learning gains on 2013 Mathematics Test based on DCPS targets.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 4-5 82%, 4 (112), 5 (118) of students made learning gains on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test.	In grades 4-5, 83.8%, 4 (108) and 5 (99) of the students will make learning gains on 2013 Mathematics Test based on DCPS targets.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3.1. Keeping students engaged in the learning process.	3.1. Creative delivery of instruction including use of technology in the classroom.	3.1. Teachers, Principal, Assistant Principal	3.1. Monitoring and disaggregation of data generated from the following: formal and informal assessments, benchmark assessments, DCPS Math Assessments and the FCAT. Use date to drive instruction/"next steps"	3.1. Focused walkthroughs by administration will be used to ensure all math teachers are implementing the curriculum.

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

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

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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	In grades 3-5, 63% (63) of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

In grades 3-5, 59% (62) of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test.	In grades 3-5, 63% (63) of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	4.1. Limited proficiency of grade level material.	4.1. Provide specific differentiated instruction, focused interventions (RTI), material and strategy sharing between grade levels, and tutoring.	4.1. Teachers, Principal, Assistant Principal, district personnel	4.1. Monitoring and disaggregation of data generated from the following: formal and informal assessments, benchmark assessments, DCPS Math Assessments and the FCAT.	4.1. Focused walkthroughs by administration will be used to ensure all math teachers are implementing the curriculum.

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target	
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Elementary School Mathematics Goal # 84% of all students in grades 3-5 will achieve mastery on the 2012-13 Math FCAT. 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	83%	84%	86%	88%	89%	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	In grade 3 58% (11-black), 64%(11-hispanic), 4 (15-black), (14-hispanic), 5 (8-black), (10-hispanic) of the students will achieve mastery on 2013 administration of the FCAT Math Test based on DCPS targets.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: NA Black: 53% Hispanic: 64% Asian: NA American Indian: NA	In grade 3 58% (11-black), 64%(11-hispanic), 4 (15-black), (14-hispanic), 5 (8-black), (10-hispanic) of the students will achieve mastery on 2013 administration of the FCAT Math Test based on DCPS targets.

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	5.B.1 Continued Implementation of two math curricula with fidelity.	5.B.1 Bi-weekly grade level meetings to discuss learning schedules, student work, analyzing data, and plan lessons.	5.B.1 Grade level math lead, Principal, Assistant Principal	5.B.1 Monitoring and disaggregation of data (Benchmarks, Module Tests, DCPS math assessments, common assessments, FCAT 2.0) will be used to guide individualized instruction and help determine if the instruction is effective.	5.B.1 Focused walk-throughs by administration will be used to ensure all math teachers are implementing the curriculum.
	5.B.2 Lack of proper materials and time constraints.	5.B.2 Utilize online resources (teacher's manuals,	5.B.2 Teachers, Assistant Principal	5.B.2 Focused walk-throughs by administration will be	5.B.2 Focused walk-throughs by

2		children's workbooks, etc.) Collaborative planning.		used to ensure all math teachers are implementing the curriculum.	administration will be used to ensure all math teachers are implementing the curriculum.
3	5.B.3 Continued Implementation of two math curricula with fidelity.	5.B.3 Bi-weekly grade level math meetings to discuss learning schedules, student work, analyzing data, and plan lessons.	5.B.3 Grade level math lead, Principal, Assistant Principal	5.B.3 Monitoring and disaggregation of data (Benchmarks, Module Tests, DCPS math assessments, common assessments, FCAT 2.0) will be used to guide individualized instruction and help determine if the instruction is effective.	5.B.3 Focused walk-throughs by administration will be used to ensure all math teachers are implementing the curriculum.

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:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	NA
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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	56% (42) of SWD students will make satisfactory progress on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
51% (38) of SWD students made satisfactory progress on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test.	56% (42) of SWD students will make satisfactory progress on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test.
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	5.D.1. Attendance Inappropriate child behavior New VE Staff	5.D.1. Use of Attendance Intervention Team, administrative support, increased parent communication Mentoring, Support from	5.D.1. ESE Lead Teacher, Administration, District Support Staff	5.D.1. Monitoring and disaggregation of data generated from the following: formal and informal assessments, benchmark assessments, DCPS Math Assessments	5.D.1. Focused walkthrough by administration will be used to ensure all math teachers are implementing the curriculum.

				and the FCAT.	
1	Familiarity of staff with curriculum (Reading Mastery, Calendar Math) Varying abilities of children	Site Coach, Professional Development Detailed lesson plans, District level support, professional development Collaboration with general education teachers to gain a better understanding of needs and expectation			

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	70% of ED students will make satisfactory progress on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67% of ED students made satisfactory progress on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test.	70% of ED students will make satisfactory progress on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5E.1. Lack of technology, supplies and other resources at home. Lack of additional funds to provide stipends for afterschool tutoring.	5E.1. Send materials home. Allow students to use computers before and after school. Provide time for homework completion at school. Provide tutoring before and after school. Provide consistent and constant differentiation.	Teachers Administration	5E.1. Disaggregate data from the following: Informal and formal assessments, alternative assessments, benchmarks and FCAT Use data to drive instruction/"next steps"	5E.1. Formal and informal assessments. (FAIR, FCAT, DRAs, Running Records, benchmarks, unit and selection tests.)
2	Parental and teacher scheduling conflicts.	Phone calls, conferences, teacher newsletter	Teachers Administration	Parent Surveys	Analyze Parent Surveys and conference logs.

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

Blending Math Curriculums	K-5	Math leads, District coaches	K-5	Monthly	Administrative walkthroughs to check for implementation.	Math Leads, District Coach, Principal, Assistant Principal
MTSS	K-5/All Subjects	School-wide MTSS Team	All Teachers	Monthly Meeting	Administrative walkthroughs to check for implementation. Grade Level discussions	Principal and Assistant Principal
Common Core Standards	K-5/All Subjects	Administration	All Teachers	Monthly (PLC Resource Time)	Administrative walkthroughs to check for implementation. Grade Level discussions	Teachers, Principal, Assistant Principal, District Coach
Essential Questions and Charting	K-5/All Subjects	Administration/Proficient Members of the Staff	All Teachers	Quarterly Meeting	Administrative walkthroughs to check for implementation.	Teachers, Principal, Assistant Principal, District Coach
Software trainings	K-5	STCs	K-5	Monthly	Administrative walkthroughs to check for implementation.	STCs, Principal, Assistant Principal

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Meeting Math Goals	IXL – Internet based math intervention	General Funds	$3,400.00
			Subtotal: $3,400.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Community involvement in learning	Math Festival	General Funds	$375.50
			Subtotal: $375.50
			Grand Total: $3,775.50

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	In grade 5 44% (52) of the students will achieve mastery on 2013 administration of the FCAT Science Test based on DCPS targets for level 3.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grade 5 38% (55) of students achieved mastery (level 3) on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Science Test.	In grade 5 44% (52) of the students will achieve mastery on 2013 administration of the FCAT Science Test based on DCPS targets for level 3.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>1.1.
Lack of proficiency with using the 5 E Model

Teacher's lack of content knowledge to reach higher-level science skills.

Lack of familiarity of the new District Science Curriculum</td><td>1.1.
Full implementation of curriculum in all grade levels.

Use Professional Development time to ensure understanding of how to implement the 5 E (Explain, Explore, Engage, Extend, Evaluate) Model</td><td>1.1.
Teachers, Principal, Assistant Principal</td><td>1.1.
Monitoring and disaggregating data generated from the following: formal and informal assessments, 5th Grade FCAT data, Unit Performance Tasks, and benchmarks.</td><td>1.1.
Informal and formal assessments, 5th Grade FCAT data, Unit Performance Tasks, and District Benchmarks.</td></tr>
</table>

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

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>NA</td><td>NA</td><td>NA</td><td>NA</td><td>NA</td></tr>
</table>

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	In grade 5 34% (40) of the students will achieve mastery on 2013 administration of the FCAT Science Test based on DCPS targets for level 4 and above.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grade, 5 27% (39) of students achieved mastery (level 3) on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.	In grade 5 34% (40) of the students will achieve mastery on 2013 administration of the FCAT Science Test based on DCPS targets for level 4 and above.
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. Increasing rigor	2.1. Full implementation of curriculum in all grade levels. Provide enrichment activities indicated in core curriculum and within supplemental materials. Use Professional Development time to ensure understanding of how to implement the 5 E Model Implement Webb's Depth of Knowledge when questioning.	2.1. Teachers, Principal, Assistant Principal	2.1. Monitoring and disaggregating the data generated from the following: formal and informal assessments, 5th Grade FCAT data, Unit Performance Tasks, and benchmarks.	2.1. Informal and formal assessments, FCAT data, Unit Performance Tasks and benchmarks.
2	2.2. Lack of Scientific Inquiry	2.2. Read and utilized the concepts and ideas expressed in the text, Using Science Notebooks.	2.2. Teachers, Principal, Assistant Principal	2.2. Monitoring and disaggregating the data generated from the following: formal and informal assessments, 5th Grade FCAT data, Unit Performance Tasks, benchmark, PMA's.	2.2. Informal and formal assessments, FCAT data, Unit Performance Tasks, benchmarks, PMAs

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:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	NA
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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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
5 E Model and use of Science Notebooks	K-5/All	Administration/Proficient Members of the Staff	All Teachers	Quarterly	Administrative walkthroughs to check for implementation.	Principal and Assistant Principal
RtI	K-5/All	School-wide RtI Team	All Teachers	Monthly	Administrative walkthroughs to check for implementation	Principal and Assistant Principal
Frayer Model	K-5/All Subjects	Administration/Proficient Members of the Staff	School-wide	Quarterly	Administrative walkthroughs to check for implementation. Grade Level discussions	Administration, Teachers

Science Budget:

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	In grade 4, 81% (106) of students will achieve mastery, as measured by a 3.5 or higher, on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Writes Test based on DCPS targets.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

	In grades 4, 79% (108) of students achieved mastery on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Writes Test based on DCPS targets of 3.5 or higher	In grade 4, 81% (106) of students will achieve mastery, as measured by a 3.5 or higher, on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Writes Test based on DCPS targets.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Lack of in-depth knowledge of genres. Writing off-topic or lacking details. Inconsistent/regular attendance	1.1. Practice identifying writing styles. Lessons to increase vocabulary using Frayer Model. Use Quick Writes prompts Use of topical questions to guide writing. Modeling through peers writing Follow district learning schedules with fidelity.	1.1. Teachers, Principal, Assistant Principal Peers Parents Students	1.1. Monitoring and disaggregation of data generated from the following: formal and informal assessments, journals, district writing prompts, Florida Writes!	1.1. Formal and informal assessments, journals, district writing prompts, Florida Writes!

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:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	NA

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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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
Conferencing	K-5/All Subjects	Administration	School-wide	Early Release-Bi-weekly	Administrative walkthroughs to check for implementation.	Teachers, District Coach, Principal, Assistant Principal
Essential Questions	K-5/All Subjects	Administration/Proficient Members of the Staff	School-wide	Early Release-Bi-weekly	Administrative walkthroughs to check for implementation.	Teachers, Principal, Assistant Principal, District Coach
Frayer Model	K-5/All Subjects	Administration/Proficient Members of the Staff	School-wide	Early Release-Bi-weekly, Wednesday Training sessions	Administrative walkthroughs to check for implementation. Grade Level discussions	Administration, Teachers

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	Our goal for improving our attendance rate for 2013 is to reduce the number of students exceeding 10 absences from 21% to 17% (154) of our student population.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
Current 2012 data indicates that 21% (201 of 935) of our student population accumulated 10 or more absences in	Our goal for improving our attendance rate for 2013 is to reduce the number of students exceeding 10 absences

the course of the year	from 21% to 17% (154) of our student population.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
21% (201)	17% (154)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
8% (80)	7% (65)

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Children getting to school on time and daily, when not ill	1.1. Make personal phone calls to tactfully remind children and parents of the attendance policy and discuss solution(s) to their absentee problem. Utilize the Attendance Intervention Team (AIT) more regularly. Use Attendance Awards as incentives.	1.1. Administration Teachers	1.1. We will monitor our attendance records to determine whether averages have decreased	1.1. OnCourse Dowling Douglas Tardy Tracking system

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
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Attendance Budget:

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

			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Quarterly Attendance Awards Certificates		General Budget	$100.00
			Subtotal: $100.00
			Grand Total: $100.00

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:	Decrease suspension rate by 40%.
2012 Total Number of In—School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
1	2
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
5	3
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
5	3
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
5	3

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Bullying Aggressive student behavior defined by level 2 infractions in the Student Code of	1.1. Implement Second Step, CHAMPs, and Foundations with fidelity. Set high behavioral	1.1. Teacher, Principal, Assistant Principal, Foundations Members	1.1. Data analysis by Foundations Team	1.1. Foundations Survey

Conduct	expectation at the beginning of the year

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
Second Step	K-5/All Subjects	Administration	School-wide	Quarterly Early Release Session	Administrative walkthroughs to check for implementation. Genesis Data	Teachers, Principal, Assistant Principal
Foundations	K-5/All Subjects	Foundation Team	School-wide	Monthly Meeting	Genesis Data Parent/Staff surveys	Teachers, Principal, Assistant Principal
CHAMPS	K-5/All Subjects	CHAMPs Trainer	School-wide	Quarterly Early Release Session	Administrative walkthroughs to check for implementation. Grade Level discussions	Teachers, Principal, Assistant Principal

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	Our expected level of parental involvement is to exceed 9000 volunteer hours for the 2012-2013 school year.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
Our estimated volunteer hours for the 2011-2012 school year were 8500, with a student enrollment of 935.	Our expected level of parental involvement is to exceed 9000 volunteer hours for the 2012-2013 school year.

		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement			
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Current economy; due to the slow recovery of the economy, many of our parents have had to return to work to provide for their families.	1.1. Placing access to the online volunteer application on the school's website. Asking that every parent submit an online volunteer application, so when needed, they have the opportunity to volunteer. Provide activities during evenings and weekends when appropriate.	1.1. Assistant Principal Volunteer Coordinator	1.1. Monitor volunteer log and prepare monthly volunteer report.	1.1. Dowling Douglas Volunteer Tracking system Infomart

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
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

NA	NA	NA	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00

Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00

Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $0.00

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

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
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

STEM Budget:

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00

Professional Development

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00

Other

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $0.00

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

NA Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. NA Goal NA Goal #1:	100% of visitors/volunteers on campus will be identified through use of an electronic tracking system and issued a badge.
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
95% of visitors/volunteers on campus were identified and monitored through the use of an electronic tracking system and issued a badge.	100% of visitors/volunteers on campus will be identified through use of an electronic tracking system and issued a badge.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Consistency and ability to monitor all facility entryways and exits	1.1. Outside doors will be locked from the outside as of 8:30 am, daily.	1.1. Custodian, Security Desk personnel	1.1. Effective monitoring and walkthroughs to determine consistency with which the expectations are being adhered to.	1.1. Formal and informal observation by administrators and electronic visitor tracking system.

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
NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Budget:

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

			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
NA	NA	NA	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $0.00

End of NA Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
CELLA	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Mathematics	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Science	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Writing	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Attendance	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Suspension	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Parent Involvement	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
STEM	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
NA	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00

Technology

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Meet Reading Goals	Accelerated Reader	PTA	$4,200.00
Reading	Meet Reading Goals	STAR	PTA	$800.00
CELLA	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Mathematics	Meeting Math Goals	IXL – Internet based math intervention	General Funds	$3,400.00
Science	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Writing	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Attendance	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Suspension	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Parent Involvement	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
STEM	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
NA	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
				Subtotal: $8,400.00

Professional Development

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Professional Book Talks	Common Core Curriculum Mapping, Pathways to the Common Core	General Funds	$1,200.00
CELLA	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Mathematics	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Science	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Writing	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Attendance	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Suspension	NA	v	NA	$0.00
Parent Involvement	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
STEM	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
NA	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
				Subtotal: $1,200.00

Other

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Community involvement in learning	Reading Festival	General Funds	$750.00
CELLA	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Mathematics	Community involvement in learning	Math Festival	General Funds	$375.50
Science	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Writing	NA	NA	NA	$0.00

Attendance	Quarterly Attendance Awards Certificates		General Budget	$100.00
Suspension	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
Parent Involvement	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
STEM	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
NA	NA	NA	NA	$0.00
				Subtotal: $1,225.50
				Grand Total: $10,825.50

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

ꞁ Priority	ꞁ Focus	ꞁ Prevent	ꞁ NA

Are you a reward school: ꞁ Yes ꞁ No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/19/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

✔ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
Yet to be determined	$0.00

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

The School Advisory Council activities will be determined during the next SAC meeting. The items listed below are items that will be up for discussion during the meeting.

Weekly Readers
Technology-purchase of software
Professional development (teachers attending conferences- pay for tuition)

AYP DATA

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2011-2012
Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2010-2011
Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2009-2010

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Duval School District
GREENLAND PINES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	88%	93%	79%	69%	329	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	75%	69%			144	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?	65% (YES)	72% (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					610	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Duval School District
GREENLAND PINES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	89%	92%	81%	66%	328	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	63%	71%			134	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?	54% (YES)	83% (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					599	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested