FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: JOHN E. FORD K-8 SCHOOL

District Name: Duval

Principal: LaTonya Parker

SAC Chair: Jonathan Bishop

Superintendent: Ed Pratt Dannals

Date of School Board Approval: November 5, 2012

Last Modified on: 11/6/2012

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)
Assis Principal	Tina Bennett	Masters Degree Education Elementary Education 1-6; Educational Leadership	7	3	Assistant Principal of John E.Ford K – 8 2011-12 Grade C 548 Reading Mastery 53%; Math Mastery 47%; Science Mastery 29%; 83% met the writing criteria. 2010-2011 Grade C 472 Reading Mastery 72%; Math Mastery 61%; Science Mastery 25%; 69% met the writing criteria; African American students did not meet AYP in math. Economically disadvantaged students did not make AYP in Reading or Math; did not make AYP met 87% of the criteria 2009-2010 Grade B 501 Reading Mastery 68%; Math Mastery 60%; Science Mastery 27%; 85% met the writing criteria; African American students did not meet AYP in reading or math. Economically disadvantaged students did not make AYP in Reading or Math; did not make AYP 85% criteria met
Assis Principal	LaTatia Ray	B.A. in Early Childhood and an M.A. in		5	Prior Assistant Principal at Annie R Morgan 2011-12 Grade C 442 Reading Mastery 35%; Math Mastery 54%;

					Science Mastery 18%; 84% met writing criteria
Principal	LaTonya Parker	K-6 Elementary Ed, ESOL Endorsement, Reading Endorsement, Ed Leadership	3	4	Principal of John E.Ford K-8 School 2011-12 Grade C 548 Reading Mastery 53%; Math Mastery 47%; Science Mastery 29%; 83% met the writing criteria. 2010-2011 Grade C 472 Reading Mastery 72%; Math Mastery 61%; Science Mastery 25%; 69% met the writing criteria; African American students did not meet AYP in math. Economically disadvantaged students did not make AYP in Reading or Math; did not make AYP met 87% of the criteria 2009-2010 Grade B 501 Reading Mastery 68%; Math Mastery 60%; Science Mastery 27%; 85% met the writing criteria; African American students did not meet AYP in reading or math. Economically disadvantaged students did not make AYP in Reading or Math; did not make AYP 85% criteria 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)
Instructional	Stacy Avera	Bachelor's Degree: Elementary Education Master's Degree: Curriculum & Instruction Certifications:Varying Exceptionalities K-12, Elementary Education 1-6	7	2	Instructional Coach of John E.Ford K – 8 2011-12 Grade C 548 Reading Mastery 53%; Math Mastery 47%; Science Mastery 29%; 83% met the writing criteria. 2010-2011 Grade C 472 Reading Mastery 72%; Math Mastery 61%; Science Mastery 25%; 69% met the writing criteria; African American students did not meet AYP in math. Economically disadvantaged students did not make AYP in Reading or Math; did not make AYP met 87% of the criteria 2009-2010 Grade B 501 Reading Mastery 68%; Math Mastery 60%; Science Mastery 27%; 85% met the writing criteria; African American students did not meet AYP in reading or math. Economically disadvantaged students did not make AYP in Reading or Math; did not make AYP 85% criteria met
Reading	Allyson Popp	Master's Degree of Education; Certification: Elementary Education K-6		4	Reading Coach of John E.Ford K-8 School. Prior to joining John E. Ford Allyson was a District Reading Coach.

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	Providing mentors and district cadre support for all first year teachers. Providing teacher buddies and district cadre support to all second year teachers. Principal providing first and second year teachers professional development opportunities, district coaches and school coach support.	Professional Development Facilitator	On-going	
2	Leadership Team is mentoring teachers with three years or less teaching experience and new teachers to John E. Ford K-8.	Principal and Leadership Team	On-going	
3	Administration is working with Human Resources and Duval County Magnet Programs to recruit and find teacher's with Montessori Training and native speaking Spanish teachers.	Principal and Assistant Principals	As needed	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

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

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
55	10.9%(6)	10.9%(6)	47.3%(26)	30.9%(17)	45.5%(25)	80.0%(44)	3.6%(2)	3.6%(2)	25.5%(14)

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
Joc'Lene Alston	Allyson Popp	Prior to joining John E Ford District Middle School Reading Coach	Lesson planning and curriculum enrichment
Eluimable Baptiste	Madelyn Morales	Same content	Lesson planning and curriculum enrichment
Desiree DelValle	Wanda Hernandez	Master Spanish Immersion teacher	Lesson planning and curriculum enrichment
Illeana Gelinek	Sandra Cruz	Master Spanish Immersion teacher	Lesson planning and curriculum enrichment
Katie Jackson	Melissa Blackmon	Master Montessori teacher, same grade content	Lesson planning, curriculum enrichment, and Montessori training
Sara Ehlers	Shana Ingram	Master Montessori teacher, same grade content	Lesson planning, curriculum enrichment, and Montessori training
Meliniqua Johnson	Amanda Confiado	Master Montessori teacher, same grade content	Lesson planning, curriculum enrichment, and Montessori training
Alexandria DeBever	Stacy Avera	Coach	Middle School scheduling and curriculum content.

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

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

We will work with the District Title I office to coordinate Montessori Training for novice teachers to ensure teachers have the skills needed to provide the Montessori instruction to students participating in the program.

Workshops will also be offered to our parents to ensure they have the tools they need in the home environment to support student learning.

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)

We will offer Writing Camp after school twice a week starting October 2012. The Reading Coach and selected teachers will provide the writing instruction to our 4th grade students.

Science Camp will also start October 2012. The Math Coach and selected teachers will provide instructional support to students that will participate in the camp.

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.

> Identify the school-based RtI Leadership Team.
>
> Tiara Walcott – Guidance Counselor, RTI Facilitator/Coordinator
> Stacy Avera – Math Coach
> Mary Green – Guidance Counselor
> Shawna Leu – ESE Team Leader
> Crystal Nnoducci – ESE Teacher
> Jillyan St. Laurent– Speech
> Shirley Haigler – Foundations/ISSP
> Staci Routman – School Psychologist

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?

> Describe how the school-based RtI Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate RtI efforts?
>
> • Attend all District lead RTI trainings;
> • Provide presentations to school faculty and staff on RtI practices;
> • Facilitate grade level teams with RtI processes in PLCs and how this should look;
> • Review school wide student performance data, identifying large scale needs and problems at particular grade levels; and
> • Monitor the implementation of the three-tiered Response to Intervention model in the school.

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?

> Describe the role of the school-based RtI 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 John E. Ford RTI Leadership Team will actively be involved by using the problem solving strategy to analyze student data, develop hypotheses to identify the cause of the problem, and generate interventions and strategies to achieve the goals of the School Improvement Plan.

MTSS Implementation

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

> 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 RTI Leadership Team will use data from FCAT, FAIR, Reading, Math and Science Benchmark testing, LSAs and curriculum based measures (CBM) and any other data collected from informal assessment by the classroom teachers. This data will provide an indication of performance and progress of individual students compared to the grade level/peer group. Data on absenteeism, referrals, and suspensions from Genesis will be utilized for behavior. Data will be managed by Pearson Inform as soon as available.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

> Describe the plan to train staff on RtI.
>
> The John E. Ford RTI Leadership Team will utilize training materials provided by the District RTI Team to train staff in our school.
>
> September 5, 2012 Training:
> Explained the data collection folders and checklist tool to teachers and explained our new way of work for RtI for 2012-2013.
> Ongoing Training:

PLC meetings to update new RtI information and see what support we can offer.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

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

> Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).
>
> Allyson Popp – Reading Coach
> Tanya O'Connor – Pre-K, K, & 1st grades –Montessori Teacher
> Shana Ingram – 2/3 grades - Montessori Teacher
> Chasity Cintron-3rd -5th grade - Spanish/Montessori Teacher
> Milka Lagares – 4th/5th grade Spanish Teacher
> Lisa Paul – 4th/5th Grade Montessori Teacher
> Sherry Wolfe – Middle School ELA Teacher
> Gail Fletcher – EDGE/Read 180 Middle School Teacher

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

> Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions).
>
> In support of the district's reading goals and our school based reading goals, we have established a monthly literacy team data review meeting to assist us in aligning with DCPS Comprehensive K-12 Reading Plan. Team members, review current and longitudinal data to ensure the successful implementation of the core reading series and research based strategies for supporting students in the core curriculum. This special team of teachers will consider doing a professional book study on Literacy and support specific grade level teams with instructional strategies that relate to teaching reading across content areas. This team will begin to look at the implementation of the new Common Core Standards. This team will also meet to review, discuss and calibrate the Reading portion of the SIP document to make sure that targeted goals are being met.

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

> What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year?
>
> . To support districts reading initiative in all classrooms: Read It Forward Jax
> • To have a model classroom of teaching reading across the content areas
> • To unpack the standards with grade level teams
> • Work towards implementing the Common Core Standards
> . Use the K-12 Reading Plan to guide best practices in teaching reading

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.

> As a part of the Magnet process, we invite local Pre-schools to tour our school during the Magnet school visits as well as offer to schedule a date for the pre-schooler to visit the classroom with their parent or with the pre-school provider.

*Grades 6-12 Only

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

Instructional skills are the most specific category of teaching behaviors. They are necessary for procedural purposes and for structuring appropriate learning experiences for students. Teachers engage in ongoing, intense collaborative work to develop units, lessons and instructional strategies focused on the district's essential benchmarks. Lessons and units are developed using a backwards design process, i.e., beginning with the end (learning objective or target) in mind along with a defined method or assessment for students to demonstrate what they have learned. Instruction is continually informed by assessment of student learning through the use of multiple formative assessments (assessments for learning). Instruction supports equity with multiple opportunities to learn through individualization and differentiation.

Ongoing training, coaching, monitoring and feedback regarding instructional practices are provided to teachers to ensure effectiveness in teaching standards and benchmarks.

*High Schools Only

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

NA

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?

NA

Postsecondary Transition

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

NA

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 grades 3 -8, 37% (130) of the students will achieve mastery on the Reading portion of the 2013 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
32%(123) of the students achieved mastery on the Reading portion of the 2012 FCAT.	37%(130)of the students will be be proficient on the 2013 Reading portion of the FCAT.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Students not receiving solid foundationalo reading skills/strategies for vocabulary development	1.1. Sight word works, Word Generation, Cognates (Spanish), Janet Allen and Isabel Beck vocabulary strategies, phonological/morphological/orthographic studies Marzano's 6 strategies	1.1. Teachers, Coaches, Reading Interventionist Administration	1.1. Effectiveness will be determined through word walls, student composition books for vocabulary, writing samples, lesson plans	1.1. FAIR results, vocabulary exit slips
2	1.2. Explicit Instruction	1.2. Higher ordering questions using Webb's Depth of Knowledge	1.2. Teachers, Coaches, & Administration	1.2. Effectiveness will be determined through observation, mini assessments, & exit slips	1.2. Lesson plans, Mini Assessments
3	1.3. Teacher provide timely feedback	1.3. Teacher & student data chats & conferencing	1.3. Teachers, Coaches, & Administration	1.3. Effectiveness will be determined through student outcomes on assessments, homework, and activities	1.3. Portfolio review, Observation Chechlist

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:	In grades 3-5 10% (3) of the students will achieve mastery on the Reading portion of the 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
5% (1)	10% (3)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
			Person or	Process Used to	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Listening Comprehension	Use visual cues	ESE Teachers and Administrators	Student class work & portfolios	IEP's and lesson plans
2					

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 grades 3-8 33%(65) of the students will achieve mastery on the 2013 FCAT Reading
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28%(54) of the students achieved above proficiency(FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in 2012	33%(65)of the students will achieve above proficiency levels 4 and 5 in 2013

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.Teacher knowledge on how to develop & deliver rigorous explicit instruction that challenges high achievers	2.1.Differentiation by content, process and product according to readiness, interests, and learning profiles. Incorporate rigorous extended activities.	2.1.Teachers, Coaches, Reading Interventionist, & Administration	2.1.Effectiveness will be determined through student grouping, data, and lesson plans	2.1.Use various assessments to ensure growth at every level (Inform)

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	In grades 3-5 6% (2) of the students will achieve level 7 mastery on the Reading portion of the 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
5% (1)	6% (2)

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning	

gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	In grades 3-8, 54% (102) of students will make learning gains on the Reading portion of the 2013 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
49%(94) for the students achieved learning gains in 2012.	54%(102) of the students will achieve learning gains in 2013

<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>3.1.Lack of consistent time for differentiation to continue in group instruction</td>
<td>3.1.Develop and implement a daily schedule that allows for teachers to Target individual student needs</td>
<td>3.1.Teacher, Coaches, Reading Interventionists</td>
<td>3.1.Lesson plans, observations, and delivery of instruction</td>
<td>3.1.FCAT 2.0 Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2.Lack of teacher knowledge of curriculum and Montessori practices</td>
<td>3.2.Train novice teachers in current curriculum and effective Montessori practices. Teachers will use PLC time to collaborate</td>
<td>3.2.Teachers, Coaches,Reading Interventionists, & Administration</td>
<td>3.2.Effectiveness will be determined through lesson plans, student work, observations, and PLC results sheet.</td>
<td>3.2.FCAT 2.0 Assessment</td>
</tr>
</table>

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	In grades 3-5 6% (2) of the students will make gains on the Reading portion of the 2013 Florida Alternate Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
5% (1)	6% (2)

<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>Listening Comprehension</td>
<td>Visual cues</td>
<td>ESE Teachers and Administration</td>
<td>Student class work, portfolios</td>
<td>IEP's progress reports</td>
</tr>
</table>

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	In grades 3-8, 68%(216) of the students in the lowest 25% will make gains on the Reading portion of the 2013 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
54%(196) of the students in the Lowest 25% made learning gains in 2012	68%(216)of the students in the Lowest 25% will make gains in 2013

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 not receiving solid foundational reading skills/strategies for vocabulary development	4.1. Sight word work, Word Generation, Cognates (Spanish), Janet Allen and Isabel Beck vocabulary strategies, phonological/morphological/orthographic studies	4.1. Teachers, Coaches, Reading Interventionist, & Administration	4.1. Word walls, student composition books for vocabulary, writing samples, lesson plan	4.1. FAIR (Word Analysis) vocabulary exit slips
2	4.2. Lack of Differentiation for students and use of small group instruction	4.2. Multiple types of materials utilized, Montessori work plans done to fidelity, Differentiation by content, process and product according to readiness, interest and learning profiles. Develop and implement a daily schedule that allows for teachers/Interventionists to target individual student needs.	4.2. Teacher & Coaches, Reading Interventionist, Administration	4.2. Effectiveness will be determined through small grouping, data, and lesson plans	4.2. Use various assessments to ensure growth at every student level (Inform)

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

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

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	In grades 3-8, 91% (16) of the white students will achieve mastery; 53% (92) of the black students; and 69% (7) of the Hispanic students.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 86% (19) Black: 48% (71) Hispanic: 64% (9) Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A Indian: N/A	White: 91% (16) Black: 53% (92) Hispanic: 69% (7) Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A Indian: N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	5A.1. White:Lack ability to ask and answer higher order questions Black: Lack of critical thinking skills and synthesizing Hispanic:Lack of academic vocabulary Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A	5A.1. White: Work with Webb's Depth of Knowledge Black: Making Connections using Duval Super Six Reading Strategies Hispanic: Differentiated Vocabulary Strategies	5A.1. Teachers, Coaches, Reading Interventionist, & Administration	5A.1. Effectiveness will be determined through student portfolios	5A.1. Lesson plans and assessments
2	5A.2. Student background knowledge	5A.2. Assess comprehension with questioning and make real world connections	5A.2. Teacher, Coaches, Reading Interventionist, & Administration	5A.2. Effectiveness will be determined through observation of lesson	5A.2. Walk through checklist, Lesson plans,

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:	In grades 3-8, 49% (109) of the students will achieve mastery in 2013 on the Reading portion of the FCAT
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41% (91) of the students achieved mastery in 2012	49% (109) of the students will achieve mastery in 2013

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5D.1. Fluency	5D.1. Differentiated Guided Reading, Read alouds, Readers' Theatre	5D.1. ESE teachers,Gen Ed Teachers, Reading Interventionist, & Administration	5D.1. Student work	5D.1. Running Records, DRA, Lesson plans, and IEP's

	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:	In grades 3-8, 53% (101) of the students will achieve mastery on the 2013 FCAT Reading
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
48% (92) of the students did not make progress in 2012	53% (101) of the students will make satisfactory progress in 2013.

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 teacher ability to appropriately use various forms of data to drive instruction	Data Chats with administration, data training, During PLC review and analyze data	Instructional Leadership Team, Reading Interventionist	Observations, teacher conversations, lesson plans	Data Notebooks
2	Appropriate teacher training in reading for all teachers, including new teachers.	All teachers will prescriptively teach reading strategies to students to improve reading fluency and comprehension by engaging in guided reading sessions and the use of leveled books. Continue Book of the Month focusing each book on a specific teaching target.	Instructional Leadership Team, Reading Interventionist	Classroom Observations Lesson Plans that include Differentiate Instructional Practices Data Collection Notebook	Observation documents Lesson Plans Data Notebooks

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
Literature 101	K-5 Reading	District	Novice Reading Teachers	January-March	Lesson plans, observations and student work	Coaches, Reading Interventionist, Administrators
Inform/Insight Training	K-8	District	School-wide	By November	Use data to drive instruction, lesson plans, and data chats	Coaches, Reading Interventionist, Administrators

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:	In grades 3-5, 32%(60) of the students will achieve mastery on the Mathematics portion of the 2013 FCAT
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27% (52) of the students achieved mastery in 2012	32% (60) of the students will achieve mastery in 2013.

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 Extended math vocabulary	1.1 Making Connections using Marzano's 6 step vocabulary strategy	1.1 Teachers, Coaches, Math Interventionist, and Administration	1.1 Interactive word walls and notebooks Portfolio reviews	1.1 Walkthrough observation tool
2	1.2 Rigourous Explicit Instruction	1.2 Higher order questioning using Webb's Depth of Knowledge	1.2 Teachers, Coaches, Math Interventionist, and Administration	1.2 Mini assessments and exit slips, CCSS	1.2 Lesson plans, Anchor charts

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	In grades 3-5, 20% (5) of the students will achieve level 4, 5, or 6 on the Florida Alternative Assessment in 2013
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
15% (3) of the students achieved levels 4, 5, or 6 in 2012	20% (5) of the students will achieve level 4, 5, or 6 in 2013

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	Word problem solving	Break problems into smaller steps	ESE Teacher, Administrators	Student work, portfolios	Lesson plans, IEP's

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 grades 3-5, 28%(54) of the students will achieve Levels 4 and 5 on the 2013 FCAT

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
21%(68)of the students acheived mastery on the 2012 FCAT	28%(54)of the students will achieve mastery on the 2013 FCAT

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. Teacher knowledge on how to develop and deliver rigorous explicit instruction that challenges high achievers	2.1. Making connection to background knowledge, and higher order questioning.	2.1. Teachers, Coaches, Math Interventionist and Administration	2.1. Lesson plans, walk through observation	2.1. Checklist, Lesson plans
2	2.2 Extension and enrichment activities	2.2 Students teaching peers lessons on works they have mastered. Incorporate technology enrichment activiites(ie FCAT Explorers, Compass Odyssey, Gizmo, ETC) To extend the mastery of appropriate benchmark in Mathematics	2.2. Teachers, Coaches, Math Interventionist, and Administration	2.2 Learning Schedule Assessments, teacher made assessments, exit tickets and observations	2.2 Walk through checklist,lesson plans

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:	In grades 3-5, 62% (15) of the students will receivea level 7 or higher on the Florida Alternative Assessmentin 2013
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
57% (11) of the students achieved mastery in 2012	62% (15) of the students will achieve mastery in 2013

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	Foundation of math	Use hands on materials and repetition of facts	ESE Teachers & Administrator	Student work and student portfolios	IEP's and Lesson plans

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 3-5, 62%(15)of students will make learning gains on the Math portion of the 2013 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

	57%(11)of the students made learning gains on 2012	62%(15)of the students will make learning gains on the 2103 FCAT

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 Detemining indvidual student needs	3.1 Based on student data, target students needs for designated RTI time	3.1 Teachers, Math Interventionist, Coaches and Administration	3.1 Mini Assessments, District Test, and exit tickets.	3.1 District assessment results,lesson plans
2	3.2 Finding consistent time for small group instruction	3.2 Small group instruction using teacher teams during RTI time	3.2 Teachers, Math Interventionist, Coaches and Adminstrators	3.2 Mini Assessments, exit tickets	3.2 RTI Plan,lesson plans

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:	In grades 3-5, 62% (15) of the students will make learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
57% (11) of the students made learning gains on the 2012 Assessment	62% (15) of the the students will make learning gains on the 2013 Assessment.

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	Math Foundation	Use hands on materials and repetition	ESE Teachers and Administrators	Student work and portfolios	IEP's and lesson plans

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, 73%(25) of students in the lowest 25% will make gains on the Math portion of the 2013 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
68%(23)of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains	73%(25)of the students in the lowest 25% will make gains.

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 Math Vocabulary	4.1 Making hands on connections to Math using academic vocabulary	4.1 Teachers, Coaches, Math Interventionist, and Administration	4.1 Interactive notebooks Word Walls Portfolio reviews Vocabulary works	4.1 Walkthrough checklist Lesson Plans
2	4.2 Background knowledge of math	4.2 Boost Fact fluency	4.2 Teachers, Coaches, Math Interventionist, and Administrators	4.2 Coach's Challenge	4.2 Assessment, Checklist
3	4.3 Lack of Differentiation	4.3 Differentiated instruction targeting individual needs	4.3 Teachers, Coaches, Math Interventionist and Administration	4.3 Student grouping based on specific student needs	4.3 Lesson Plans Differentiation Notebook

---

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

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

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	Identify the students in the 3-5 that will impact the overall gains and give targeted instructional support to reach all goals.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White 77% (17); Black 41%(61); Hispanic 64% (9); Asian N/A; American Indian N/A	White 82% (13); Black 46%(80); Hispanic 69% (7); Asian N/A; American Indian 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	5A.1 White: Word problem solving Black: Background knowledge Hispanic: Math Vocabulary Asian: NA American Indian: NA	5A.1 White: Problem solving strategies Black: Hands on explicit instruction of math concepts. Individualizing benchmark needs Hispanic: Pre teach math vocabulary, model vocabulary in daily lessons	5A.1 Teachers, Coaches, Math Interventionist and Administration	5A.1 Interactive Notebooks, Data chats with students, mini assessments and district assessments	Data chats; notebooks, assessment results

---

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	NA

Mathematics Goal #5C:	
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:	In grades 3-5, 49% (13) of the students with disabilities will make satisfactory progress on the 2013 FCAT
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
44% (12) of the SWD made progress in 2012	49% (13) of the SWD will make progress in 2013

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	Basic Math Vocabulary	Preteach vocabulary with explicit vocabulary instruction	ESE Teachers, Gen Ed Teachers, Coaches, and Administrators	Portfolios and interactive notebooks	IEP progress reports, portfolios
2	Word problem solving	Step by step problem solving strategies that break the process into smaller parts	ESE Teachers, Gen Ed Teachers, Coaches, and Administrators	Portfolios and interactive notebooks	IEP progress reports and portfolios.

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

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:	In grades 3-5, 46% (65) of the students who are economically disadvantaged will make satisfactory progress on the 2013 Mathematics FCAT
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41% (59) of the economically disadvantaged students made progress in 2012	46% (65) of the economically disadvantage students will make progress in 2013.

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

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	5D.1. Making connections with Math Vocabulary	5D.1. Vocabulary strategies, modeling and word mapping	5D.1. Teachers, Coaches, Math Interventionist, and Administration	5D.1. Interactive notebooks Word Walls Portfolio reviews	5D.1. Walkthrough Checklist, interactive word wall, Lesson Plans
2	5D.2. Word problem solving	5D.2.Problem solving strategies using steps	5D.2. Teachers, Math Interventionist, Coaches and Administration	5D.2.Data chats with students Portfolios, Interactive Notebooks	5D.2. Lesson Plans, Strategy Charts Data chats with Administration

Middle 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 grades 6-8, 27% (30) of the students will achieve mastery on the 2013 Mathemathics FCAT
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
22% (24) students achieved mastery in 2012	27% (30) students will achieve mastery in 2013

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	Making connections with math vocabulary	Vocabulary strategies, model and word mapping	Teacher, Coaches, Administration	Interactive student notebooks, Portfolio, results from assessments	Lesson plan, assessments, observation checklist

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	
No Data Submitted					

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	In grades 6-8, 21% (21) of the students will achieve mastery at level 4 on the 2013 mathematics FCAT
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
16% (17) of the students achieved mastery at level 4 or 5 on the 2012 Mathemathics FCAT	21% (21) of the students will achieve mastery at level 4 or 5 on the 2013 Mathematics FCAT

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 enrichment activities to maintain or increase their current level of performance	Extra support by resources and math coach, utilizing small group instruction	Math Coach, Teachers	Classroom Walkthrough	LSA District assessments Benchmark Assessments

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in 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
No Data Submitted				

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	In grades 6-8, 80% (87) of the students will make learning gains on the 2013 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
75% (82) of the students made learning gains on the 2012	80% (87) of the students will make learning gains on the

FCAT Assessment	2013 FCAT Assessment

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	Finding consistent time for small group instruction	Incorporate Math into RtI time	Math Coaches, Teachers, and Administrators	Warm-up problems, Mini Assessments	Walk-through checklist, Lesson plan
2	Teacher knowledge of math curriculum	Math professional development (Math Foundations, Content Knowledge, School and district training	Math Coaches, Teacher, and Administrator	Utilization of professional development, school based training	Walk-through checklist

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
No Data Submitted				

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	In grades 6-8, 67% (15) of the students in the lowest 25% will make gains on the 2013 Mathematics FCAT
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
62% (13) of studnts in the lowest 25% made gains in 2012	67% (15) of the students in the lowest 25% will make gains

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Students lack of prior math knowledge	Extra support provided by teacher in small group	Teacher, Math Coach	Classroom Walk-through	Benchmark Assessment

1		setting Differentiated Instruction			Teacher Assessment District LSA Assessments

---

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

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

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	Identify the students in grades 6-8 that will impact the overall gains and give targeted instructional support to reach all goals.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White NA; Black 34%(31); Hispanic NA; Asian N/A; American Indian N/A	White NA; Black 40%(38); Hispanic NA; Asian N/A; American Indian 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	Students lack of answering high order questions	Focus lessons	Math Teacher, Math Coach	Teacher assessments	Results from Benchmark Assessments & LSA Assessments

---

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in 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

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:	In grades 6-8, 11% (2) of the students with disabilities will make satisfactory progress on the 2013 FCAT
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
6% (2) of the SWD made progress in 2012	11% (2) of the SWD will make progress in 2013

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 lack of answering high order questions	Focus Lessons	Math Teacher, Math Coach, VE Resource Teacher	Classroom Walk-through, Teacher data chats with students	Lesson plans, Results from Assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:	In grades 6-8, 41% (34) of the students who are economically disadvantaged will make satisfactory progress on the 2013 Mathematics FCAT
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
36% (30) of the economically disadvantaged students made progress in 2012	41% (34)of the economically disadvantaged students will make progress in 2013

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 lack of basic skills	Push-in/pull out Teacher use centers Use of technology and manipulatives	Teacher, Math Coach, VE Resource Teacher	Teacher Assessments Focus Lessons	Classroom Walk-through Results from Assessments

End of Middle School Mathematics Goals

Algebra End-of-Course (EOC) 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:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #1:	Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra will increase from 41% to 46%.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41% (7) of the students achieved level 3 mastery on the 2012 EOC	46% (10) will achieve level 3 mastery on the 2013 EOC

	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 foundational skills to understand Algebraic concepts	Focus Lessons Differentiated Instruction Small group instruction to address student misunderstanding	Algebra Teacher Math Coach	Benchmark Assessments District LSA Assessments	PLC Collaboration Data Chats

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:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Algebra. Algebra Goal #2:	Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Algebra will increase from 35% to 40%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
35% (6) of the students achieved level 4 mastery	40% (8) of the students will achieve level 4 mastery

	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	Need of enrichment activities	Use of computer technology: Compass Odyssey, Gizmos and internet based resources to use in small groups	Teacher, Math Coaches	PLC Collaboration Data Chats	Classroom Walk-through, Lesson Plan

End of Algebra EOC Goals

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) 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:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #1:	
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:	
2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Geometry. Geometry Goal #2:	
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				

End of Geometry EOC 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
Early Release Training: Data review, RTI, DifferentiatedInstru	All grade levels	PDF, Math Coach	Math Team - all faculty	Every other Wednesday through out year	Classroom Walk-Throughs Administrator observations	Math Coach Administrators
Content knowledge	All Math	District Coaches	Teachers in need of content knowledge	As given at the Schultz	Classroom Walkthroughs and lesson plans	Administration

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:	In Science, grades 5 and 8, 30% (29) will achieve a score of 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science administration.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 5 and 8, 25% (25) achieved a score of 3 or higher on the 2012 FCAT Science administration.	In grades 5 and 8, 30% (28) will achieve a score of 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Science administration.

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 Professional Development for teachers around the 5E model, especially at grades K-2	1.1 Utilize the 5E Model for instruction. Implement science experiments weekly to enhance the instruction.	1.1 Instructional Coach,Teachers and Administration	1.1 District Assessments,Student notebooks, Portfolio reviews Observations	1.1 Assessment data, Classroom Walkthroughs, Data Chats
2	1.2 Teacher and student absences/tardies	1.2 Departmentalize science instruction in grades 4-8	1.2 Instructional Coach,Teachers and Administration	1.2 District Assessments, Mini Assessments, Teacher Assessments, Walkthroughs	1.2Walkthrough Checklist, District Assessment results

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b:	In grades 5, 20% (5) of the students will achieve level 4, 5, or 6 on the Florida Alternative Assessment in 2013

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
15% (2)	20% (5)

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	Science vocabulary	Continuous repetition with picture cues.	ESE teacher, administration	Student portfolios, word wall	Lesson plans, IEPs

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:	10% (9) of all 5th and 8th grade students will score a 4 or a 5 on the 2013 FCAT Science administration.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
4% (4) of all 5th and 8th grade students scored a 4 or a 5 on the 2012 FCAT Science administration.	10% (9) of all 5th and 8th grade students will score a 4 or a 5 on the 2013 FCAT Science administration.

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 Computers that work consistently for students use.	2.1 Extend student learning in Science through use of Gizmos, Florida Achieves and Compass Odyssey.	2.1 Instructional Coach, Teachers, and Administration	2.1 Lesson Plans, Classroom Walkthroughs, review of computer logs	2.1 Walkthrough Checklist, Lesson Plans, Computer Logs
2	2.3 Parent participation at events.	2.3 Parent nights related to science curriculum. Share experiments and ideas from science curriculum that can be reproduced at home	2.3 Instructional Coach, Teachers, and Administration	2.3 Parents sign in sheets, participation in parent response inventories, participation in student interest surveys	2.3 Parent logs, parent response inventories, student interest surveys

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
NGSSS Review	5th & 8th	District Science Coach	5th & 8th Grade	Monthly 6 x a year	Lesson Plan Review Data Notebooks	Principal/Designee Science Coach

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.	Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 and higher will

Writing Goal #1a:	increase from 83% to 90% for the 2013 school year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
83% (62) received a 4 or above in FCAT writing for 2012	In Grades 4 and 8 students 90% (70) will achieve a 4 or above on FCAT writes 2013

	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 background knowledge, organizational skills, basic writing skills (grammar, spelling, transitional words, vocabulary)	1.1. Students will use the writing process in their daily writing using Step up to Writing program and/or graphic organizers	1.1 Teachers & Coaches	1.1. Effectiveness will be determined through write score & district writing prompts	1.1 Portfolios, Data from Write Score & Writing Prompt assessments
2	1.2. Teacher knowledge on how to develop & deliver rigorous explicit instruction that challenges high achievers	1.2. Instruction will be systematic, direct, & engaging	1.2. Teacher, Coaches, & Administration	1.2. Effectiveness will be determined through lesson plan and observations	1.2. Portfolios, Data from Write Score & Writing prompts

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
No Data Submitted						

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

Civics End-of-Course (EOC) 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:	
1. Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Civics. Civics Goal #1:	
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:

2. Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Civics. Civics Goal #2:	
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						

Civics 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 Civics 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:	Raise regular daily attendance to increase student achievement & learning
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
Avg. daily attendance rate is 95% (740)	Increase the avg. daily attendance to 98% (746)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
138	120
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
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	Family factors: lack of familiarity with school attendance laws & education priorities	Parent Workshop on state, district, and school attendance guidelines & policies	Parent Involvement Coordinator, CRT Operator	Monitor student attendance using the Oncourse Attendance Portal	Workshop sign-in sheet & Oncourse Attendance Portal
2	Parents that do not have access to technology	Will send parent-link messages letting parents know that we have a parent computer that they may access on site to view thier child's grades.	Parent Involvement Coordinator, Administration	Parent Sign In sheet to track computer usage at JEF.	Parent Sign In sheet to track computer usage at JEF.

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
Oncourse System	K-8	Oncourse Systems Manager	School-wide	Ongoing	Monitor Attendance using Oncourse System	CRT & Oncourse Systems Manager

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 students placed in In School Suspension Program(ISSP)and Out of School Suspension (OSSP)
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
146 students were placed in ISSP.	126 students expected to be placed in ISSP.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
146	126
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions

82 students were suspended.	70 students are expected to be suspended.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
82	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	Lack of parental involvement	To increase parental involvement by sharing alternatives to out of school suspension	Assistant Principal(s)	Monthly Genesis Report	Monthly Genesis Report of ISSP,ATOSS and out of school suspensions
2	Time, students lack of motivation	Support students with chronic behavior problems by pairing students with YMCA/CIS/Americorp mentor/tutors/schedule change/Assistant Principal(s).	Administration, Coaches	Student Assessments: Benchmark, DRA's,mini-assessments	Progress Reports and Report Cards
3	Transportation	All middle school student will be placed in ATOSS as an alternative to Out of School Suspension.	Assistant Principal(s)	Monthly discipline report tracking ATOSS numbers	Monthly Genesis Report of ISSP,ATOSS and out of school suspensions

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 the amount of Parent Involvement by 30% (224) in PTA/Parent Night/Activities
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
Current 20% (149) Parental Involvement	Expected level of Parent Involvement is 25% (187)

	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	Distance, Child Care	Provide summary overview of all events on website	Parental Involvement Coordinator and PTA	Monitoring the number of visits on the website	Log from visits to website
2	Large population of working parents difficult to come to events in the evenings.	Encourage active communication to increase parent parental awareness Parent-Link	Parental Involvement Coordinator and PTA	Parent signature of receiving written communication	Signed sheets from parents receipt the information
3	Activities/Information not meeting the needs of Parents to support the success of their children.	Survey parents for needs assessment twice a school year in May 2013. Use for planning events for upcoming school year.	Parental Involvement Coordinator	Parent sign in sheets	Parent Survey May 2013
4	Distance, Child Care, Evening Activity	Four parent-nights once a quarter to discuss academic learning * Resources for Parents/FAIR * Writing/Science * Math * Family Fun Night	Administration, Coaches, Teachers	Parent Sign In sheets	Parent Survey May 2013

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)

Career and Technical Education (CTE) 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. CTE	

CTE 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						

CTE 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 CTE Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

To ensure that safety and security procedures are clear and comprehensive for all stakeholders. Measured by the Annual School Climate Survey to imporve from 63% to 70%. 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. To ensure that safety and security procedures are clear and comprehensive for all stakeholders. Measured by the Annual School Climate Survey to imporve from 63% to 70%. Goal To ensure that safety and security procedures are clear and comprehensive for all stakeholders. Measured by the Annual School Climate Survey to imporve from 63% to 70%. Goal #1:	Clearly state safety goals and outcome for securing a safe learning environment for all stakeholders.
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
63%	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	Implementation with fidelity.	Promote school safety activities that engage both students and parents in a non-threatening manner.	Foundations Team, School Resource Officer	Parent workshops and Grade Level Assemblies	School Climate Survey, Foundation Survey

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 To ensure that safety and security procedures are clear and comprehensive for all stakeholders. Measured by the Annual School Climate Survey to imporve from 63% to 70% . Goal(s)

Goal:

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 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

☐ Priority	☐ Focus	☐ Prevent	☐ NA

Are you a reward school: ☐ Yes ☐ No

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

View uploaded file (Uploaded on 10/25/2012)

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

The School Advisory Council will participate in the planning and monitoring of the school building and support various educational opportunities to ensure student learning. The Council will conduct monthly meetings and provide input regarding school improvement.

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Duval School District
JOHN E. FORD K-8 SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	72%	61%	69%	25%	227	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	60%	59%			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?	62% (YES)	64% (YES)			126	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					472	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Duval School District
JOHN E. FORD K-8 SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	68%	60%	87%	27%	242	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	65%	65%			130	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?	61% (YES)	68% (YES)			129	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					501	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested