FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: SMART POPE LIVINGSTON ELEMENTARY

District Name: Duval

Principal: Jennifer L. Brown

SAC Chair: Taurean Sinclair

Superintendent: Ed Pratt-Dannals

Date of School Board Approval: November 1, 2011

Last Modified on: 10/25/2012

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)
					• In 2003 at Sallye B. Mathis Elementary Reading FCAT 2 scores increased from 31% of students in grades 3-5 scoring at a level 3 or above to 51% of students scoring at a level 3 or above. Writing FCAT scores increased by 28% from 2001-2004. • While at Sabal Palm Elementary, Reading FCAT 2004 scores increased from 81% to 84% and Math FCAT 2004 scores increased from 72% to 74%. • As Principal of Ortega Elementary from 2005-2009 we maintained a grade of "B" with gains being made in the areas of reading and math. On average 63% of students identified in the lowest quartile made reading gains. About 71% of students identified in the lowest quartile made math gains. In 2009, the school grade was an "A". There was consistent improvement in students making gains in Reading at 69% and 66% in Math. FCAT data showed an improvement in the percentage of Bottom Quartile Reading Gains to 70%. In Writing, Ortega reached

| Principal | Jennifer Brown | Elementary Education 1-6 Educational Leadership | 4 | 10 | 71% of 4th graders making a 3.5 or higher and 45% making a 4.0 or higher. There were significant gains in Science from 20% making a 3 or higher in 2008 to 50% making a 3 or higher in 2009.
• In 2010, SP Livingston Elementary, moved from an "F" to a "C". FCAT Science scores increased by 8% from 24% to 32% in the percentage of students scoring a 3 and above. Reading gains went up from 51% to 52%. Math gains went up 14% from 53% to 67%. Students in the bottom quartile went up 15% from 37% to 52% in Reading and 32% from 47% to 79% in Math.
• In 2011, we improved our school grade from a "C" to a "B".
We increased the percentage of students meeting high standards in reading from 47% to 55%. The percentage of students making learning gains in reading increased from 52% to 63%. Our students in the lowest quartile improved in reading from 52% to 70%. In math, we increased the percentage of students meeting high standards from 40% to 56%. We increased the percentage of students making learning gains in math from 67% to 71%. In writing, we increased the percentage of students meeting high standards from 68% to 94%. We made the greatest gains in the entire district of Duval county!!! In science, we increased the percentage of students meeting high standards from 32% to 42%. |
| Assis Principal | Megan Byerley | Elementary Education 1-6 Educational Leadership | 3 | 6 | 2006-2007at Annie R. Morgan
• Increase the percentage of students meeting high standards in reading from 50% to 60%
• Increased the percentage of students making reading gains from 53% to 60%
• Increased lowest quartile gains in reading from 53% to60%
2007-2008 at Annie R. Morgan
• Increased students meeting high standards in math from 39% to 55%
• Increased the percentage of students making learning gains in math from 57% to 66%
• Increased lowest quartile gains in math from 77% to 80%
• Increased students making high standards in science from 7% to 13%
2008-2009 at Ft. Caroline Elementary
• Increased the percentage of students making reading gains from 61-67%
• Increased lowest quartile gains in reading from 54%-65%
2009-2010 at Ft. Caroline Elementary
• Increased percentage of students meeting high standards in science from 28% to 37%
2010-2011 at S.P. Livingston Elementary
• Increased the percentage of students meeting high standards in reading from 47% to 55%
• Increased the percentage of student making learning gains in reading from 52% to 63%
• Increased lowest quartile gains in reading from 52% to 70%
• Increased the percentage of students meeting high standards in math from 40% to 56%
• Increased the percentage of student making learning gains in math from 67% to 71%
• Increased the percentage of students meeting high standards in writing from 68% to 94%
• Increases the percentage of students meeting high standards in science from 32% to 42%
• Increased school grade from a C to a B
2010-2011 at S.P. Livingston Elementary
• Increased the percentage of students meeting high standards in reading from 47% to 55%
• Increased the percentage of student making learning gains in reading from 52% to 63%
• Increased lowest quartile gains in reading from 52% to 70%
• Increased the percentage of students |

					meeting high standards in math from 40% to 56%
					• Increased the percentage of student making learning gains in math from 67% to 71%
					• Increased the percentage of students meeting high standards in writing from 68% to 94%
					• Increases the percentage of students meeting high standards in science from 32% to 42%
					• Increased school grade from a C to a B

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)
Science Coach	Lacole Dorrell	Bachelors of Arts in Education K-6, ESOL	3	3	• In 2008-09 at Ortega Elementary- Increased High Standards in Mathematics from 43% to 71% Maintained Mathematics gains at 78% Increased Mathematics Lowest quartile learning gains from 47% to 79% • In 2008-09 at Ortega Elementary- Increased High Standards in Science from 20% to 50%. • In 2009-2010 at Ortega Elementary- Increased High Standards in Mathematics from 77% to 90% Increased Mathematics Gains from 51% to 76% • In 2010-2011 at S.P. Livingston Elementary- Increased High Standards in Science from 32% to 42%
Reading Coach	Susan Ruffett	B.A. Education/Sociology FL Professional Educators Certificate Grades 1-6	8	8	• School Grades 2006-2011: C, D, F, C, B • Reading Proficiency FCAT: 55%, 50%, 55%, 47%, 55% • Learning Gains in Reading: 65%, 62%, 53%, 67%, 63% • FAIR PRS: K 80%, 1st 54%, 2nd 28%
Math Coach	Christine Schermann	Bachelors of Science Elementary ED K-6, ESOL Endorsement	1	1	• In 2008-2009 at Sheffield Elementary- School Grade A Map Money awarded for top 25% FCAT scores "At or Above Standard" Learning Gains • In 2009-2010 at Sheffield Elementary- School Grade A Map Money awarded for top 25% FCAT scores. • 86% "At or Above Standard" Learning Gains • In 20010-2011 at Sheffield Elementary- School Grade A Map Money awarded for top 25% FCAT scores "At or Above Standard" Learning Gains • In 2011-2012 at Sheffield Elementary- School Grade A; Achievement Level - 84% "At or Above Standard" Non ESE, 74% "At or Above Standard" to include ESE; Learning Gains 85% non-ESE students to include lowest 25%, 70.8% of ESE made learning gains.

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)
		District HR Principal, Assistant Principal		

| 1 | 1. Referrals from District for HQ teachers
2. Common planning time for grade levels
3. In-service curriculum instructional training for teachers during planning by instructional coaches
4. Opportunities for teachers to earn free graduate degrees from Lastinger/ University of Florida
5. Saturday Professional Development
6. Vertical planning
7. Data Digging
8. Professional Learning Communities
9. Lesson Studies | Instructional Coaches University of Florida District Instructional Coaches and Grade Level Chairs Principal/Assistant Principal and Grade levels Instructional Coaches Instructional Coaches | 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
1 EBD Day Treatment Teacher 1st-2nd 1 EBD Day Treatment Teacher 4th 1 Varying Exceptionalities Teacher 7% (3) out of 40 teachers are not highly-qualified	-All teachers were provided with resources to take the SAE Test and information to attain certification on their FL Certificate. -All teachers have been afforded the opportunities to attend professional development workshops at school and district provided

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
40	15.0%(6)	25.0%(10)	35.0%(14)	20.0%(8)	12.5%(5)	92.5%(37)	7.5%(3)	0.0%(0)	27.5%(11)

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
Simeon Golden	Stephanie Holdridge	-Instructional delivery -Integrated reading strategies -Engagement Strategies/Classroom Mgmt. -Coaching through planning	-Plan instruction weekly -Observe lessons being taught -Data Chats
		-Instructional delivery -Integrated	

		reading strategies -Engagement Strategies/Classroom Mgmt. -Coaching through planning	-Plan instruction weekly -Observe lessons being taught -Data Chats weekly
Demetrice Sapp	Stephanie Jones	reading strategies -Engagement Strategies/Classroom Mgmt. -Coaching through planning	-Plan instruction weekly -Observe lessons being taught -Data Chats weekly
Stephanie Brown	Miya Yates	-Instructional delivery -Integrated reading strategies -Engagement Strategies/Classroom Mgmt. -Coaching through planning	-Assist in planning instruction, offer teaching strategies for math 1st-2nd grade as needed -Observe lessons being taught -Data Chats weekly
Lacole Rudin	Barika Andrews	-Science Instructional Delivery -Engagement strategies (Kagan)/Classroom Management -Coaching	-Weekly meetings -Observe lessons being taught -Data Chats weekly
Samantha Deffes	Lauren Ashley	-Instructional delivery -Integrated reading strategies -Engagement Strategies/Classroom Mgmt. -Coaching through planning	-Plan instruction weekly -Observe lessons being taught -Data Chats weekly -Model teaching RW, Behavior Mgmt.
Kasana Griffin	Lauren Prashad	-Provide additional support wherever needed -Maintain engagement strategies	-Observe lessons being taught -Provide Classroom Management and Behavior Strategies to support students -Assistance in development of IEPS, etc.
Earline Washington	Regina Fields	-Provide additional support wherever needed -Maintain engagement strategies	-Observe lessons being taught -Consulting about IEP Goals, etc. -Support in preparing for MRT, TARGET Meetings

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

To ensure students are provided the additional remediation and safety nets needed, Title I funds are used to fund 6 teacher salaries. The teachers are 2 Instructional Coaches, 1 Math Coach, and 3 VE teachers.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Livingston will use district Turnaround funds, combined with School Improvement, SAI funds for our comprehensive internal safety net program for instructional salaries, safety net materials and instructional resources, student incentives and for student transportation

Violence Prevention Programs

Second Step Bullying Prevention Program

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

S. P. Livingston will use district Turnaround funds, combined with School Improvement and SAI funds for our comprehensive internal safety net program. The funds will be used to pay for instructional salaries, materials, resources, student incentives and student transportation to and from Saturday School.

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Jennifer Brown, Megan Byerley, Regina Fields, Samantha Deffes, Andrea Phillips, Lacole Rudin, Christine Schermann, Earline Washington, Barbara Gumapas, Samantha Hilliker, Shannon Green, Donna Free, Susan Ruffett, Michelle Fendenheim, Shari Phillips, Mrs.Train-Marsh

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?

Weekly meetings focused around academic and behavioral issues including: what we expect students to learn, how we will know what they have learned or not learned, what strategies will be implemented, and what evidence we have to support our efforts. The team meetings focus around academic and behavioral issues including: what we expect the students to learn, how we will know what they have or have not learned, what we will do when they do or don't learn and what evidence we have to support our actions. The team will review data and information from teachers to assist with instructional decisions and will review progress monitoring data to identify students who are meeting benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. The team will collaborate with teachers to recommend professional development and resources. The team will meet regularly to share, evaluate data, problem solve and promote effective practices.

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 school-based RtI Leadership Team leads the faculty in a review of the data and, with input from building instructional teams, develops the initial draft of the School Improvement Plan utilizing the template provided by the Department of Education. The draft SIP is then presented to the School Advisory Council for review and recommendations. The Building Leadership Team finalizes the plan.

The School Improvement Plan becomes the guiding document for the work of the school. The Building Leadership Team should regularly revise and update the plan as the needs of students change throughout the school year. The plan includes a formal review process which demonstrates how the school has used RtI to inform instruction and made adjustments as data are analyzed.

MTSS Implementation

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

The team will utilize the following data sources: Genesis (behavior), Pearson Limelight and Inform, FAIR (PMRN),

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

RtI Training-Will be on-going throughout the year

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Demetrice Sapp, April McRae, Andrea Phillips, Kasana Griffin, Comfort Mwangi, Tasura Davis, Earline Washington, Susan Ruffett

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

The Building Leadership Team should focus meetings around the following academic and behavioral questions:
1. What do we expect the students to learn?
2. How do we know they have or have not learned what was expected?
3. What will we do when they do or don't learn?
4. What evidence do we have to support our responses to these questions?

The team should meet 4 times per month (weekly meetings recommended) to engage in the following activities: Review universal screening data and link to instructional decisions; review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development and resources. The team will also collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skills. The team will facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation.

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

• Train using best practices to improve reading and writing performance of all students
• Facilitates meetings to address student achievement and best practices based on student data, programs, and activities
• Facilitates professional development workshop during Early Dismissal Days

• School-wide Reading Celebration

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
View uploaded file (Uploaded on 10/18/2012)

*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.

Students are prepared for the transition from early childhood to elementary school in a variety of ways in this program:
• Students are given criterion referenced tests and letter recognition tests at the beginning, middle, and end of the school year
• Students participate in literacy activities
• Parent workshops are provided 4 times per year at the Title 1 Parent Resource Center
• Parents are encouraged to participate in Parent Advisory Council
• Superintendent Academy for Pre-kindergarten
• Use of FLKRS testing protocol
• Family Involvement Center and trainings

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	Students scoring at achievement level 3 on the 2013 Reading FCAT will increase by 11% from last year, taking the percentage from 14% to 25% of student scoring a level 3.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
14% (27)	25% (47)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of fidelity using Guided Reading	1A.1. Increase PD on Guided Reading	1A.1. ELA teachers Administration District Reading Coach	1A.1. Monitor lesson plans and grade level discussion Data dig discussion Observation	1A.1. Anecdotal notes of teachers Meeting minutes FAIR DRA FCAT Benchmark
2	Lack of parental support	1A.2 Parent workshops Building relationships through family activity nights	1A.2. ELA teachers Administration District Reading Coach PTA PIC BOLD	1A.2. Parent survey Increase in homework Return increased parent communication	1A.2. Agendas FAIR DRA FCAT Benchmark
3	Students enter 1-2 years below grade level	1A.3. Program that target decoding strategies BOLD Tutoring (SES) Reading Intervention	1A.3. ELA teachers Administration District Reading Coach	1A.3. Continuous data analysis to guide instruction	1A.3. Anecdotal notes of teachers Meeting minutes FAIR DRA FCAT

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:	Students scoring at achievement level 4 or 5on the 2013 Reading FCAT will increase by 10% from last year, taking the percentage from 11% to 22% of student scoring a level 3.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
11% (21)	20% (42)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
---	---	---	---	---	---
1	Inability to use differentiated instruction to include higher complexity questioning and tasks demonstration	2A.1. 2A.1 Attend PD for differentiated instruction, rigor, and or effective questioning and follow-up Grade level collaboration	2A.1 ELA teachers Administration District Reading Coach	2A.1. Student conferencing Focus walks Teacher/Admin conferences Observation	2A.1. Grade Level Meeting minutes FAIR DRA FCAT Benchmark
2	Lack of reading rigor/fluency	2A.2. PD on fluency strategies Explicit mini-lesson instruction and teacher modeling various strategies	2A.2. ELA teachers Administration District Reading Coach	2A.2. Student conferencing Focus walks Teacher/Admin conferences Observation	2A.2. FAIR DRA FCAT Benchmark
3	Lack of reading comprehension	2A.3. PD on comprehension strategies Explicit mini-lesson instruction and teacher modeling various strategies	2A.3. ELA teachers Administration District Reading Coach	2A.3. Student conferencing Focus walks Teacher/Admin conferences Observation	2A.3. FAIR DRA FCAT Benchmark

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:	Students making learning gains on the 2013 reading FCAT will increase by 18%. from last year, taking the percentage from 55% to 73%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
55% (104)	73% (138)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of materials to prepare for FCAT 2.0	3A.1. Allowing students to utilize technology based programs such as Destination Success, Limelight, and FCAT Achieves Grade Level Collaboration	3A.1. ELA teachers Administration District Reading Coach	3A.1. Monitor charts and graphs generated by programs Grade Level Minutes	3A.1. Grade Level Meeting minutes FAIR DRA FCAT Benchmark
2	Students with low stamina	3A.2. Build stamina with daily independent reading	3A.2. ELA teachers Administration District Reading Coach	3A.2. Monitor with DRA assessments	3A.2. FAIR DRA FCAT Benchmark
3	Student lack of knowledge of test taking strategies	3A.3. Explicit mini-lessons and small group instruction on testing taking strategies	3A.3. ELA teachers Administration District Reading Coach Guidance	3A.3. Pre and Post Assessments	3A.3. FAIR DRA FCAT Benchmark

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:	Students making learning gains on the 2013 reading FCAT will increase by 18%. from last year, taking the percentage from 55% to 73%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
61% (115)	79% (149)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
---	---	---	---	---	---
1	Students need additional interventions to make 1 years growth	4A.1 Teachers will use data to differentiate instruction based on students individual needs Grade level collaboration	4A.1 ELA teachers Administrators District Reading Coach	4A.1. Monitor RtI Data Lesson Plans showing documenting differentiated instruction	4A.1. Grade Level Meeting minutes FAIR DRA FCAT Benchmark Lesson Plans
2	Lack of Differentiated small group instruction	4A.2. Guided reading	4A.2. ELA teachers Administrators District Reading Coach	4A.2. Lesson Plans showing documenting differentiated instruction Grade Level Minutes	4A.2 Grade Level Meeting minutes FAIR DRA FCAT Benchmark Lesson Plans

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target	
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal # 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	26	44	50	55	61	

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:	46% (87) of the Black students in grades 3-5 will achieve proficiency (Level 3 or higher) on the FCAT

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27% (51)	46% (87)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	High numbers of students reading below grade level	Differenciated small group instruction Additional hour of RtI in Reading	Classroom teachers Principal Assistant Principal Coaches both school based and district	Conduct teacher - student conferences with goal setting Student data notebooks Teacher data notebooks	RtI lesson plans Classroom lesson plans Formal and informal observations Data Notebooks

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

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

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	23% (13)of the ESE students will reach proficiency (level 3 or better)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
9%(5)	23% (13)

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

| 1 | High number of students reading below grade level | Differenciated small group instruction

Additional Reading RtI hour | Classroom teachers

Principal
Assistant Principal
Coaches both school based and district | Conduct student-teacher conferences with goal setting

Student data notebooks

Teacher Data Notebooks | RtI lesson plans and classroom lesson plans

Formal and Informal observations

Data notebooks

State and district 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:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	45% (74) of the students who are economically disadvantaged will reach proficiency (level 3 or higher) on the FCAT
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
25% (41)	45% (74)

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	High numbers of students reading below grade level	Differenciated small group instruction Additional RtI Reading hour	Classroom teachers Principal Assistant principal Coaches both school and district based	Conduct student-teacher conferences with goal setting Teacher observation both formal and informal	Data notebooks State and district tests

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						

Reading Budget:

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
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 Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

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

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

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:	
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	

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

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

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

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

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

CELLA Budget:

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	Students scoring at level 3 on the 2013 Math FCAT will increase by 11% (56)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
19% (36)	30% (56)

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. Inability to use differentiated instruction to include higher complexity questioning and task demonstration	2A.1. Professional development Bring back to school house and Train the faculty	2A.1. Math Teachers Administration	2A.1. Student journals Critical thinking practice activities Journal conferences Viewing Essential Questions Observation	2A.1. Teacher made tests Benchmark Data FCAT Lesson Plans IPDP
2	2A.2. Lack of student motivation.	2A.2. Teacher motivation: Enrichment activities: Hands-on Classroom and school-wide incentives	2A.2. Math Teachers Coaches	2A.2. Informal Assessments Student Math journals Conferencing	2A.2. Teacher made tests Inform assessments, Illuminationsmath k-2 CCSS k-2 Test Benchmark Data FCAT
3	1A.3. Lack of student engagement	1A.3. Kagan Strategies: training and implementation. Enrichment activities: Hands on Differentiated Instruction	1A.3. Math teachers	1A.3 On-line charts and graphs Monitor Data/Assessment Notebook	1A.3. Common Assessments Benchmark FCAT Informal Assessment Walk-Throughs

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	30% or 50 students will achieve above proficiency in mathematics
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
18% or (30)students	30% or (50) students

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1 1A.1. Lack of teacher understanding of the NGSS and CCSS leading to rigor.	1A.1. Training on unpacking the standards Professional development	1A.1. Math Teachers Administration	1A.1. Monitor assessment results. Data talks in Grade Level and PLC meetings. Observations Focus Walks	1A.1. Common Assessments Formatives Benchmark FCAT Teacher made assessments Informal assessments Performance Tasks
2 1A.2. High number of students below grade level in Math.	1A.2. Group tutoring Tiered instruction. Implicit instruction.	1A.2. Math Teachers Administration Math Intervention specialists	1A.2. Conferencing with students and examining written responses	1A.2. Common Assessments Benchmark FCAT Informal Assessment Math journals
3 1A.3. Lack of student engagement	1A.3. Kagan Strategies: training and implementation. Enrichment activities: Hands on Differentiated Instruction	1A.3. Math teachers	1A.3 On-line charts and graphs Monitor Data/Assessment Notebook	1A.3. Common Assessments Benchmark FCAT Informal Assessment Walk-Throughs

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

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	75% (125) of the students will make learning gains in mathematics
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71% (118)	75% (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	3A.1. Teacher reluctance to change instructional practices	3A.1. Develop a mentoring program in which teachers can observe what instruction looks like in a "student-centered" classroom versus "teacher-centered".	3A.1. Math Teachers/Coach Administration	3A.1. Monitor lesson plans Observe activities	3A.1. Teacher made tests Benchmark Data FCAT
2	3.A.2. High number of students below grade level in Math.	3A.2. Group tutoring Tiered instruction. Implicit instruction.	3A.2. Math Teachers Math Intervention specialists Administration	3A.2. Monitor lesson plans Classroom observations	3A.2. Teacher made assessments, Inform assessments, Illuminationsmath k-2 C-Palms k-2 Benchmarks FCAT
3	3.A.3. Lack Basic math foundational skills	3A.3. Remedial Intervention Tiered Instruction Incorporate different learning styles	3A.3. Math Teacher Math Intervention specialists Administration	3A.2. Informal Assessments Student Math journals Conferencing	3A.2. Teacher made tests Inform assessments, Illuminationsmath k-2 CCSS k-2 Test Benchmark Data FCAT

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:	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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	Students scoring at level 3 on the 2013 Math FCAT will increase by 11% (56
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
19% (36)	30% (56)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2A.1. Lack of student motivation.	2A.1. Classroom and school-wide incentives: Implement rewards program and incentives for those students who show effort.	2A.1. Math Teachers Administration	2A.1. Informal Assessments Student Math journals Conferencing	2A.1. Teacher made tests Inform assessments, Illuminationsmath k-2 CCSS k-2 Test Benchmark Data FCAT
2	2A.2 Lacks basic foundational skills.	2A.2. Remedial intervention. Tiered instruction. Incorporate different learning styles	2A.2. Administration Math Teacher Math Intervention Specialist	2A.2. Informal Assessments Student Math journals Conferencing	3A.2 Teacher made tests Inform assessments Illuminationsmath k-2 C-Palms k-2 Benchmark Data FCAT
3	3A.3 Low reading levels problematic when reading math word problems	3A.3 (RTI)using word problems Reading Intervention Continuous data analysis to guide instruction	3A.3 Math Teacher Math Intervention Specialist Administration	3A.3 Conferencing with students and examining computation and written responses to word problems	3A.3 Common Assessments Benchmark FCAT Informal Assessment

					Math journals to answer Essential Questions

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

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

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	31	43	49	55	60	

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:	45%(62) of the black students will make AYP in mathematics
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
32%(44)	45% (62)

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	High numbers of students performing below grade level	Differentiated small group instruction	Classroom teachers Principal Asst. Principal Coaches (school-based and district)	Conduct teacher-student conferences wtih goal setting Student data notebooks Teacher data notebooks	Classroom lesson plant Formal and informal observations Data notebooks

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	28% (16)of the students with disabilities will make adequate yearly progress
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
9% (5)	28% (16)

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	High number of students performing below grade level	Differentiated small group instruction	Classroom teachers Principal Assistant Principal Coaches (school-based and district)	Conduct teacher-student conferences with goal setting Student data notebooks Teacher data notebooks	Clasrrom lesson plans formal and informal observations data notebooks

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:	43% (59) of the economically disadvantaged students will make AYP
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
30% (41)	43% (59)

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	High number of students performing below grade level	Differentiated small group instruction	Classroom teachers Principal Assistant Principal Coaches (school-based and district)	Conduct teacher-student ocnferences with goal setting Student data notebooks Teacher data notebooks	Classroom lesson plans Formal and informal observations Data notebooks

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
No Data Submitted						

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
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 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:	Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science will increase by 20%, taking the percentage of students scoring at Achievement Level 3 from 30% to 50%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
30% (15)	50% (25)
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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Retention of critical information from years prior to 5th grade science	1A.1. Use science centers in 5th grade that focus on previous science standards. Parent Link for activities at home, providing at home resources for parents to continue learning at home. Emphasize instruction on parent benchmark found in lower grades	1A.1. Classroom teachers, science coach, administrators	1A.1 Analysis of pre and post assessments focusing on the parent benchmarks that are found in grades under 5th grade.	1A.1. 5 Questions Analysis found on Limelight
2	Teachers' willingness to take the time to allow students to conduct experiments following the learning schedule in grades K-5.	1A.2 Teachers will adhere to science times in their daily schedule. Cross curricular science (through reading & writing lessons)	1A.2 Classroom teachers, science coach, administrators	1A.2. Performance tasks completed at the end of each science unit. Focus Walk-Throughs	1A.2. Performance Task scores with rubric
3	Students lack of science background knowledge	1A.3. Guided Reading lessons using the Science Leveled Readers in all grade levels. Incorporating the current science topic during "Report Writing" in writing time K-5th Scientist of the month Grade Level Field trips as outlined in learning schedule and bring in groups to conduct assemblies (JEA, St. Johns River Water Management, Zoo, 4H, ect.)	1A.3. Reading teachers, science teachers, science coach, administrators	1A.3. Guided Reading lesson plans Report Writing lesson plans	1A.3. Student responses to the guided reading comprehension questions found at the end of each leveled reader.

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	Students scoring at Achievement Level 4 or 5 in science will increase by 12%, taking the percentage of students scoring at Achievement Level 4 or 5 from 8% to 20%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
8% (4)	20% (10)

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' ability to understand what the FCAT questions are asking them to do.	2A.1. Use FCAT scenarios after the performance task is given to teach students how to read through the information and answer questions	2A.1. Sciences teacher and science coach	2A.1. Student performance on answering FCAT type questions from Florida Achieves and benchmark scores	2A.1. Benchmark scores
2	Students have difficulty making a connection between classroom investigations and transferring concepts being taught when answering FCAT like questions	2A.2. Full implementation of science instruction via the learning schedule, and focusing on connecting the data collected during essential explorations to understanding the concept at hand. Following essential explorations with written questions provided from the district and state.	2A.2. Science teachers and science coach	2A.2. Classroom observations and student journals	2A.2. Student performance on District Performance Monitoring Assessments Florida Achieves FCAT Explorer
3	Students lack of real world experiences with science information	2A.3. Relating real life experiences to our students. (Kirby/Darnell) Science Night Scientist of the month Field trips outlined in the learning schedule	2A.3. Science Committee		Stat and district assessments

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

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

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

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

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

Science Budget:

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	Students scoring at a 3.0 achievement level will increase by 11%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
59% (36)	70% (43)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1A.1. Students need a better understanding of the organization of the writing process.	1A.1. Provide step-up to writing instruction Grade Level Collaboration	1A.1. ELA teachers Administration	1A.1. Evidence in the writing portfolios of organization in students completed pieces. K-5	1A.1. Monitoring of writing portfolios K-5 Grade Level Meeting Minutes FCAT results
2	1A.2. Students lack proficiency in grammar usage and conventions of writing	1A.2. Provide explicit mini-lessons Grade Level Collaboration	1A.2. ELA teachers Administration	1A.2. Evidence in lesson plans. Evidence in writing portfolios K-5	1A.2. Monitoring of writing portfolios K-5 Grade Level Meeting Minutes FCAT 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 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Step up to Writing	K-5	FLKRS	New Teachers	Scheduled through FLkRS. Target dates: February	Teacher plans Evidence of artifacts	Principal Assistant Principal Coaches (school-based and district)

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	Increase the average daily attendance rate by 1.2% points making it 95.00%
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
93.8%	95.00%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)

215	193
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
97	70

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Absenteeism/ Tardiness	Training for teachers in Oncourse Link Grade books for ease of use by the teachers Academic recognition celebrations, school-wide incentives, communication with parents/guardians. Mandatory Parent Conferences Monthly AIT meetings	Coaches Guidance Counselor, District Attendance and Social Worker	Monitoring Attendance monthly	Oncourse reports, SIT Agreements

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	To decrease the number of suspensions and the number of students suspended by 10%
2012 Total Number of In—School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
3	2
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
3	0
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
181	166
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
116	104

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	8-EBD day Treatment Units School wide Behavior Modification	Assistant Principal will assist and support Ms. Washington in meeting the needs of the EBD students, by assisting with discipline issues, conferences, and understanding interpreting the District's Code of	Principal, Assistant Principal, Site Coach, and Therapists	Monthly check of data from Genesis	Discipline data in Genesis, conference logs, bi-weekly ESE meetings.

Conduct. The District provided therapists will be utilized for additional support for the Day Treatment Unit.	

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						

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1:	

Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.	Increase by 10% the amount of parent involvement

2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
300 hours	330 hours

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	Parents do not have the time to be ivolved	PTA Meetings/Parent Involvement Parent Portal	Parent Liaison, Principal, Assistant Principal	Parent Sign In Sheets Volunteer Hour logs Monitoring parent Portal Usage by parents	Number of parent Volunteer Hours a month

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

	Subtotal: $0.00
	Grand Total: $0.00

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

Safety Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1. Safety Goal Safety Goal #1:	To develop Fire, Sever Weather, and Evacuation of Campus plans for S.P. Livingston Elementary
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
We currently have a Fire Drill Plan, however it needs to be revised.	Complete all 3 plans
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	Changing Faculty and Staff	Publishing the plans for all stakeholders	Principal, Assistant Principal	Publishing the plans	The 3 complete plans.

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

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

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

Budget:

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

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

End of Safety Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

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

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00

Technology

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00

Professional Development

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00

Other

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

j▢ Priority	j▢ Focus	j▢ Prevent	j▢ NA

Are you a reward school: j▢ Yes j▢ No

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

View uploaded file (Uploaded on 10/22/2012)

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.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

-Continue to provide community resources and support to parents, students and teachers.
-Ensure academic goals are met with support of team
-Conduct parent workshops

-Build parent community through school programs
-Provide Faith-Based partnership to get Volunteers in the school for various projects
-Provide United Way support to students and parents

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Duval School District
SMART POPE LIVINGSTON ELEMENTARY
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	55%	56%	94%	42%	247	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?	70% (YES)	53% (YES)			123	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					504	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Duval School District
SMART POPE LIVINGSTON ELEMENTARY
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	47%	40%	68%	32%	187	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	52%	67%			119	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?	52% (YES)	79% (YES)			131	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					437	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested