

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

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

School Name: RUFUS E. PAYNE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Duval

Principal: Weisha Day-Killette

SAC Chair: Parthenia Williams

Superintendent: Ed Pratt-Dannals

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/25/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

| Position | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | # of Years at Current School | # of Years as an Administrator | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year) |
|-----------|---------------------|---|------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|
| Principal | Weisha Day-Killette | M.Ed. Education Leadership B.S. Business Administration | 2 | 7 | Mayport Middle 2012 Grade B 2011 Grade C High Standards Reading 67% High Standards Math 55% Lowest 25% Gains Reading 58% Lowest 25% Gains Math 50% 2010 Grade C 2009 Grade C 2008 Grade: B |

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide assessment performance (Percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

| Subject Area | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | # of Years at Current School | # of Years as an Instructional Coach | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year) |
|----------------------------|---------------|--|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| Magnet Instructional Coach | Carrie Warren | Educational Leadership, Jacksonville University State of Florida Professional Educators Certification in Educational Leadership, Elementary Education 1-6, Gifted Endorsed. | 5 | 5 | 2011 – 2012 Grade C Grade C Reading Mastery 40% , Math Mastery 44% Writing Mastery 96% and Science Mastery 30% 2010-2011 Instructional Coach of Rufus E. Payne Elementary Grade B, Reading Mastery 53%, Math Mastery 70%, Writing Mastery 94%, and Science Mastery 31%. Did not meet AYP 2009-2010 Curriculum Specialist at Rufus E. Payne Elementary Grade C, Reading Mastery 58%, Math Mastery 64%, Writing 89%, and Science Mastery 48%. Did not meet AYP 2008-2009: Gifted Resource/Curriculum Integration Specialist at Rufus E. Payne Elementary; Grade A, Reading Mastery 53%, Math Mastery 73%, and Science Mastery 46% and Writing Mastery 98%. |
| Math Coach | Angela Rochay | Bachelor of Arts in Elementary Education, University of North Florida State of Florida Professional Educators Certification in , Elementary Ed 1-6 | 2 | 5 | 2011-2012 Math Coach Grade C Reading Mastery 40% , Math Mastery 44% Writing Mastery 96% and Science Mastery 30% 2010-2011 Math Coach Grade B Reading Mastery 53%, Math Master 70%, Writing Mastery 94% and Science Mastery 31% Met Math AYP Safe Harbor |

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

| | Description of Strategy | Person Responsible | Projected Completion Date | Not Applicable (If not, please explain why) |
|---|--|--|-------------------------------------|---|
| 1 | 1. Partnering new teachers with veteran staff | Principal , Professional Development Facilitator | On-going (September 2012-June 2013) | |
| 2 | 2. Monthly professional development with Payne's on-site instructional coaches. | Math Coach, Magnet Instructional Coach | June 2013 | |
| 3 | 3. Instructional coaches model instructional strategies for First year teachers or teachers in need of extra instructional support due to low classroom performance. | Math Coach, Magnet Instructional Coach | June 2013 | |
| 4 | 4. Screen all resumes and referrals for teachers with classroom experience and proven classroom performance. | Principal | Ongoing | |

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 |
| No data submitted | |

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 |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 39 | 12.8%(5) | 97.4%(38) | 125.6%(49) | 20.5%(8) | 71.8%(28) | 230.8%(90) | 12.8%(5) | 0.0%(0) | 84.6%(33) |

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 |
|---------------|-----------------|---|---|
| Carrie Warren | Ms. Alexander | Ms. Alexander is a veteran teacher new to the 3rd grade curriculum. Ms. Warren's experience as an Instructional Coach will help to ensure Ms. Alexander's success in delivery of instruction, which will lead to student proficiency. | Quarterly Lesson Planning Data analyzing Curriculum mapping. Modeling and instructional delivery assistance Partnering in alike PLC's |
| Angela Rochay | Ms. Shellman | Ms. Shellman is a veteran teacher new to the 3rd grade curriculum. Ms. Rochay's experience as an Instructional Coach will help to ensure Ms. Shellman's success in delivery of instruction, which will lead to student proficiency. | Quarterly Lesson Planning Data analyzing Curriculum mapping. Modeling and instructional delivery assistance Partnering in alike PLC's |
| Angela Rochay | Morenike Mincey | Ms. Mincey is a ten year veteran teacher new to Florida Science Curriculum and Standards. Mrs. Rochay's experience with Florida student standards and expectations will insure increasing student achievement in 5th grade | Quarterly Lesson Planning Data analyzing Curriculum mapping |
| | | Mrs. Ulmer is a 4th year teacher. Ms. Warren's experience | Quarterly Lesson Planning |

| | | | |
|---|--------------|---|--|
| Carrie Warren | Sheryl Ulmer | with increasing student achievement will help ensure Mrs. Ulmer's students will achieve in Reading. | Data analyzing Curriculum mapping. Modeling and instructional delivery assistance |
| Angela Rochay Carrie Warren Kimberly York Kristi Simpson STAR Liaison | Ms. Griffin | As a first year teacher, Ms. Griffin will need mentoring and support in all academic and behavioral areas of instruction. This process will encompass various aspects of implementing best practices for becoming an effective teacher. | Quarterly Lesson Planning Data analyzing Curriculum mapping Modeling and instructional delivery assistance Partnering in alike PLC's |

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

Please describe how federal, state, and local services and programs will be coordinated and integrated in the school. Include other Title programs, Migrant and Homeless, Supplemental Academic Instruction funds, as well as violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, career and technical education, and/or job training, as applicable.

Title I, Part A

Varied instructional support is provided to ensure remediation to the low quartile students such as Interventionists, scheduled Response to Intervention time.. These programs offer additional instruction based on data in both reading and math. The Math and Reading Interventionist remediate through small group sessions. Scheduled RtI time is utilized to ensure that each teacher has the allotted time for implementation.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

District Social Worker provides resources and support to migrant students and parents.

Title I, Part D

Rufus E. Payne receives funds to support the Educational Alternative Outreach program which funds Payne's 2/3rd & 4/5th grade STAR program. STAR is a program designed for students who have been retained at least one year in hope to reduce the District Drop-out rate.

Title II

N/A

Title III

Throughout the 2011-2012 school year there were no ELL students enrolled in Rufus E. Payne Elementary School. However, services are provided through the district for education materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners.

Title X- Homeless

Rufus E. Payne's full-time guidance counselor will contact the district Homeless Social Worker. If needed, resources such as clothing and school supplies will be provided. Social Service referrals are given to students identified as homeless to eliminate possible barriers.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I to provide Saturday School for students not meeting proficiency in content areas for

grades 3, 4, and 5. Tutoring services will be offered on Saturdays for three hours per session. The Tutoring Instructors will collect data monthly to monitor and determine academic gains.

Violence Prevention Programs

In support of the Superintendants Goal to establish Safe and Secure schools the district provides Foundations and Champs training to our schools Foundation team of teachers. Through this training Rufus E. Payne Elementary established core beliefs and systems that reduced and eliminated school violence.

Nutrition Programs

92% of students receive Free or Reduced breakfast and Lunch through the contracted Chartwell Company.

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

Payne holds at least four tours per year for the East Springfield Head Start to acclimate their pre-k students to the elementary setting.

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Weisha Day-Killette, Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing RtI, conducts assessment (quarterly status reports) of RtI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities.

Carrie Warren, Magnet/Instructional Coach: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team, conducts assessment of RtI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities.

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

Reading Interventionist: Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/ programs interventions; identifies and analyzes math data to build intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with School Based RtI team to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk;" assists in the design

and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.

Morenike Mincey, Math Interventionist: Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/ programs interventions; identifies and analyzes reading data to build intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with School Based RtI team to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with

whole

school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk;" assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.

Kristi Simpson, Guidance Counselor: Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students; links community agencies to schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success; provides consultation services to general and special education teachers, parents, and administrators; provides group and individual student interventions; and conducts direct observation of student behavior.

Linda Copeland, Varying Exceptionalities (ESE) Teacher: Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching. Guides teachers through the RtI documentation process.

Kristi Simpson/ Linda Copeland, Foundations Leads: Provides information about school wide and class wide behavior curriculum and instruction; participates in behavioral data collection; provides professional development principles of Foundations to faculty and staff; and collaborates with staff to implement behavioral interventions.

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

The school-based RtI Team will focus meeting around the following academic and behavioral questions:

1. What do we expect the students to learn?
2. How do we know they have or have not learned it?
3. What will we do when they do or don't learn?
4. What evidence do we have to support our responses to these questions?

The school-based RtI Leadership Team will meet regularly to review universal screening data, diagnostic data, and progress monitoring data. Based on this information, the team will identify the professional development activities needed to create effective learning environments. After determining that effective Tier 1- Core Instruction is in place, the team will identify students who are not meeting identified academic targets. The identified students will be referred to the school-based RtI Leadership Team. The school-based RtI Team will use the Problem Solving Model to conduct all meetings. Based on data and discussion, the team will identify students who are in need of additional academic and/or behavioral support (supplemental or intensive). An intervention plan will be developed which identifies a student's specific areas of deficiencies and appropriate research-based interventions to address these deficiencies. The team will ensure the necessary resources are available and the intervention is implemented with fidelity. Each case will be assigned a case liaison to support the interventionist (e.g., teacher, RtI/Inclusion Facilitator, guidance counselor) and report back on all data collected for further discussion at future meetings.

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

MTSS will meet monthly to analyze student data from targeted Tier 2 and Tier 3 student groups. Meetings will consist of the problem solving process involving implementing efficient interventions. MTSS will utilize the School Improvement Plan to adequately deliver effective interventions through RtI. The School Improvement Plan becomes the guiding document for the work of the school.

MTSS Implementation

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

Baseline Data:

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT 2.0)
Curriculum Based Baseline Assessments in Math & Reading
Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR)
Duval County Interim Benchmarks in Reading, Math & Science
Duval County Timed Writing Assessments
Diagnostic Reading Assessment (DRA2)
Office Discipline Referrals
Previous Year Retention DATA
Previous Year Absentee DATA
Write Score (4th Grade Writing)

Common Core Math Assessment (K-2)

Midyear data:

Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR)

Diagnostic Reading Assessment (DRA2)

Duval County Interim Benchmarks in Reading, Math & Science

Duval County Timed Writing Assessments

Duval County Math/Science Formatives/Summatives

Write Score (4th Grade Writing)

Write Score (5th Grade Science)

Common Core Math Assessment (K-2)

End of year data:

Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR)

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT 2.0)

FCAT Writes

Diagnostic Reading Assessment (DRA2)

Frequency of required Data Analysis and Action Planning Days:

School Instructional Support Team analyzes classroom student data once a month.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The school-based RtI Facilitator will provide in-service to the faculty during teachers' weekly 2.5 hours of common professional development time. Also, on designated professional development days (i.e. pre-planning, early dismissal, planning days, and faculty meetings).

In-service opportunities will include, but are not limited to, the following:

? Problem Solving Model

? Positive Behavioral Intervention and Support

? Data-based decision-making to drive instruction

? Progress monitoring

? Selection and availability of research-based interventions

? Tools utilized to identify specific discrepancies in reading, math and/or behavior.

RtI learning will be Job-embedded during the following:

? Professional Learning Communities

? Classroom Observations

? Collaborative Planning

? Analysis of Student Work

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

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Kimberly Cooper York, Carrie Warren, Crystal Connor, Anora Simon, and Erika Alexander-Slaughter

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

Weisha Day-Killette, Kimberly Cooper York: Reading Coach, Carrie Warren – Administrative Asst. and Crystal Connor – Reading Interventionist, Anora Simon – Primary Teacher and Erika Alexander-Slaughter - Intermediate Teacher - We will meet once a week to review assessment scores benchmark, fair, baseline and post assessments. We will focus on weak areas to guide instruction and create baseline and post assessments, which will help teachers to prioritize their curriculum i.e. Learning Schedule. LLT will go into the classrooms to model and introduce reading strategies that can be used across the curriculum. We will assist teachers in prioritizing their curriculum, as well as creating baseline and post assessments by using the Common Core Standards to guide instruction

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

Prioritizing the instruction to increase assessment scores across the curriculum. Implementing reading strategies across the curriculum. Using the readers workshop to focus on learning targets that will increase comprehension. Most importantly have professional development focusing on the use and implementation of the Common Core Standards.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 10/19/2012)

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

Rufus Payne offers early childhood pre-kindergarten education for 18 four year olds. The objectives for the program are comprehensive and provide a solid foundation for entry into basic kindergarten. Students experience hands on literacy activities that build pre-reading, oral expression and phonemic awareness skills. Math skills are enhanced through daily living activities that involve matching, sorting and counting.

Within the first 45 days of enrollment, kindergarten students are given two assessments; the Florida Kindergarten Readiness Screening (FLKRS) and the Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) to obtain a pre-reading benchmark. These results are used to group students for differentiated instruction and provide strategies for Response To Interventions (RTI) student groups. At the end of the 45 days, students are reassessed using Houghton Mifflin Kindergarten Reading Benchmark assessments to determine continual need or to exit out of the program.

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the [High School Feedback Report](#)

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

| | |
|---|--|
| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a: | To increase the Level 3 Reading proficiency in grades 3-5 from 22% to 27% proficiency on the 2012-2013 FCAT. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 22%(40 Students) | 27% (48 students) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|---|--|---|--|
| 1 | 1A.1. Teachers anticipate a decrease in ability to integrate supplemental materials due to time management | 1A.1. The administration will continue to support the implementation of supplemental materials and an extra 15-20 minutes will be added to the morning routine. | 1A.1. Instructional Coaches and Grade Level Chair will monitor the progress. | 1A.1. Teachers and Grade Level Chairs will review assessment data through Insight. | 1A.1. Lesson plans with the focus on using supplemental materials to aid in instruction to increase student achievement. |
| 2 | 1A.2. Teachers are not familiar with utilizing the text complexity process of choosing the grade appropriate text for their classroom (i.e. too easy, too hard). | 1A.2 Teachers will engage in Professional Development to demonstrate how to utilize the text complexity process. | 1A.2. Reading Coaches | 1A.2. Teachers to integrate process in lesson plans, listing the complexity of text based on the common core standards. | 1A.2. Text Complexity rubric |

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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: | To increase the number of students achieving above proficiency in reading from 13% to 18% proficiency on the 2012-2013 FCAT. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 22% 40 Students | 27% (48 students) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2A.1. Students are not prepared to answer higher order questions. | 2A.1. Teachers will scaffold questions to help students build their background knowledge in order to effectively answer higher order questions. Teachers will instruct students to create their own questions using the Depth of Knowledge Wheel. | 2A.1. Teachers and Reading Coaches | 2A.1. Instructional focused observations and lesson plans viewed on line. Classroom-walkthroughs will determine if students are in fact facilitating their own questions. | 2A.1. Lesson plans with contain higher order questions. Coaches will have scheduled Focus walks to view student created questions in their journals, chart paper, and artifacts |
| 2 | 2A.2. Students lack exposure to informational text. | 2A.2. Teachers will revise the reading framework to integrate informational text through cross-curricular instruction. | 2A.2. Teachers and Reading Coaches | A.2. Focused classroom observations with an emphasis on lesson plans that will determine the frequency of cross-curricular instruction. | 2A.2. Lesson plans and student artifacts that demonstrate integrated text. |

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

| | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a: | To increase the percentage of student achieving learning in reading from 61% to 67% . |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 61% (85 Students) | 67% (78 students) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| 1 | 3A.1. Students are not receiving adequate time for remediation. | 3A.1. Students will receive remediation during designated grade level Response to Intervention time (RtI), after school tutoring and Saturday school.. | 3A.1. RtI Facilitator and School-based RtI Team | 3A.1. Response to Intervention documentation , benchmark data and classroom walk-throughs | 3A.1. Response to Intervention data logs and Interventionist logs FCAT Benchmark FAIR |
| 2 | 3A.2. Teachers use and understanding of data to differentiate instruction based on the needs of the students | 3A.2. Teachers will be trained in the process of categorizing and prioritizing the curriculum based on the students test results. | 3A.2. Reading Coaches and Principal | 3A.2. Categorizing the curriculum using test scores to drive instruction. | 3A.2. Categorizing the curriculum using test scores to drive instruction. |

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

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| | |
|---|--|
| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4: | To increase the percentage of student in the Lowest 25% making learning gains from 56% to 61%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 56% (20 students) | 61 %(18 students) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| 1 | 4A.1. Seven intermediate classroom reading teachers utilizing Inform/Insight as a tool to identify and monitor the Lowest 25% in Reading. | 4A.1. Train teachers on how to utilize Inform/Insight to identify and monitor the Lowest 25% students in their class. | 4A.1. Reading Coaches and Reading Interventionist | 4A.1. Quarterly Status Reports with Principal | 4A.1. Inform/Insight reports |
| 2 | 4A.2. Students' comprehension and application of reading strategies, "What Good Readers Do". | 4A.2. Create a lesson and teach students, from that lesson, what proficient readers do to understand the text | A.2. Teachers and Instructional Coaches will monitor the progress. | 4A.2. Teacher's lesson plans and monitoring students' progress. | 4A.2. Surveys given to students and data collected from Insight. |

| | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|----------------------|------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| 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 |
| <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> | <input type="text"/> |

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: | Based on the 2011 Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test, 50% of students in the subgroup (Black) made AYP. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| White: 0% Black: 50% Hispanic: 0% Asian: 0% Am. Ind.: 0% | White: 0% Black: 79% Hispanic: 0% Asian: 0% Am. Ind.: 0% |

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 | Black | 5B.1. The administration will continue to support the implementation of supplemental materials and an extra 15-20 minutes will be added to the morning routine. | 5B.1. . Instructional Coaches and Grade Level Chair will monitor the progress. | 5B.1. Teachers and Grade Level Chairs will review assessment data through Insight. | 5B.1. Lesson plans with the focus on using supplemental materials to aid in instruction to increase student achievement. |
| 2 | | 5B.2 Teachers will engage in Professional Development to demonstrate how to utilize the text complexity process. | 5B.2 Reading Coaches | 5B.2. Teachers to integrate process in lesson plans, listing the complexity of text based on the common core standards. | 5B.2. Text Complexity rubric |

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: | |
| 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 subgroup:

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D: | |
| 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 subgroup:

| | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|---|-----------------|
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E: | n/a | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| n/a | n/a | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|------------------------|---|--|--|--|---|
| Enhancing Reading through Science and Social Studies (Informational Text) | K – 5th Reading | Carrie Warren, Instructional Coach | K – 5 ELA Teachers | Summer 2012 | Monitoring of Reading Framework | Principal and Instructional Coaches |
| Data Analyzing | K – 5th Reading | Carrie Warren Instructional Coach, Kimberly York, Reading Coach | K – 5th ELA Teachers | Early Release Day Trainings from October to May | Monitoring of Differentiated Instruction in DATA notebooks | Principal and Instructional Coaches |
| PLC Strategies that Work in Reading | ELA Classroom Teachers | Instructional and Reading Coach | K – 5 Teachers | Bi-Weekly Early Release Day Trainings | Classroom Walk through and Teacher Lesson Plans | Principal and Instructional Coaches |
| RTI Implementation | K – 5th Reading | Linda Copeland, ESE Liaison Crystal Conner, RTI Facilitator | K- 5th ELA Teachers | Pre-Planning 2012 Early Release Trainings | Monitoring and support of RTI Documentation | Principal and Instructional Coaches |
| Insight and Inform DATA retrieval and analysis to correlate the Data to instruction | ELA Classroom Teachers | Instructional and Reading Coach | K – 5 Teachers | Bi-weekly | Student Data Attaché and Teacher Data Notebook | Principal and Instructional Coaches |

Reading Budget:

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|---|---|---------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Students failing to meet grade level standardson quarterly grade reports | Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) | Title One Funding/SAC Funding | \$0.00 |
| Obtain 79% proficient Adequate Yearly Progress in grades 3-5 and grades K-2 students will obtain and 80% average level of proficiency | Florida Ready Skills Books | School Intructional Supply Fund 10000 | \$2,500.00 |
| K-5 students lack the desire and motivation to read for information. | Comprehension Tool Kit by Stephanie Harvey and Anne Goudvis | Title One Funding | \$2,390.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$4,890.00 |
| 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: \$4,890.00 |

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

| | | | | |
|---|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | | | | |
| 1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. | | | | |
| CELLA Goal #1: | | | | |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

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

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

| |
|--|
| |
|--|

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

CELLA Budget:

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

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

| | |
|--|--|
| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1a: | In grades 3-5, students achieving proficiency will increase from 28% to 34% on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 28% (51 students) | 34% (61 Students) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| 1 | Students not critically thinking through problems, which would not allow the students to be successful with high complexity level questions. | Teachers will implement instructional practices based on the practices discussed in the PLC titled The Math Practices | Principal and Instructional Coach | Focus walks by administration and coaches will be used to ensure all teachers are implementing the Math workshop models using the core Math curriculums. | Administration Focus Walk forms and Coaches Logs |
| 2 | Duval County has two adopted Math curriculums and merging the two curriculums to form fluent lessons may be challenging for the teachers. | Implement a 60 minute Math Workshop in all Mathematics classrooms, using the core Math curriculums (enVisions and Math Investigations). | Principal and Instructional Coach | Focus walks by administration and coaches will be used to ensure all teachers are implementing the Math workshop models using the core Math curriculums. | Administration Focus Walk forms and Coaches Logs FCAT Benchmarks |

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a: | In grades 4-5, students achieving above proficiency will increase from 11 % to 14% on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 11% (20 students) | 14% (25 students) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|
| 1 | The lack of focus being placed on our high performing students can have a long term effect on our level 4's & 5's dropping in achievement gains. | Our school math interventionist will disaggregate data and spend an allocated time with the 4th and 5th grade high performing students to continue their academic growth. | Principal Math interventionist | Review math interventionist lesson plans for the enrichment opportunity that the students were given. | Inform/Insight Benchmark FCAT |
| 2 | High performing students are not aware of their strengths and weaknesses shown by the data | Teachers will have data dives with students to continue a high performing status. Title I Math Interventionist will provide enhancing interventions weekly. Assignments will include use of math journals and enrichment interventions to maintain high performing student proficiency. | Teacher Math Interventionist Math Coach | Data dives with students to discuss areas of concern. | Inform/Insight Benchmark |

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

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| | |
|---|--|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a: | In grades 3-5, students making learning gains will increase from 51% to 60% on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 51% (71 students) | 68% (70 students) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| 1 | Students not critically thinking through problems, which would not allow the students to be successful with high complexity level questions. | Create a school wide focus on the Common Core Math Practices. Teacher will teach how to be a mathematician, as well as focus on a specified math practice monthly. | Math Coach Classroom Teachers | Review lesson plans for evidence of teaching how to be a mathematician and the monthly math practice schedule. | Progress of the students when retested on the district K-2 common core assessment and 3-5 math benchmark assessment. |
| 2 | Teachers not fully understanding how to release responsibility to their students to create independent learners. | Teachers will implement instructional practices based on the practices discussed in the PLC titled "The Gradual Release." | Principal Instructional Coach | Focus walks by administration and coaches will be used to ensure all teachers are implementing the instructional practices that will allow students to become independent learners. | Administration Focus Walk forms and Coaches Logs FCAT |

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| | |
|---|--|
| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% | |
|---|--|

| | |
|---|---|
| making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4: | In grades 3-5, students in the lowest quartile making learning gains will increase from 57% to 65% on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 57% (20 students) | 65% (19 students) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| 1 | Teacher's ability to meet the needs of each differentiated group during the Math Workshop Model. | Support personnel will push in to selected 3-5 grade classrooms to pull data driven small groups within the Math block to ensure student success. | Principal Math interventionist Math Coach | Review schedules, groupings, and math lesson plans for the intervention opportunity that the students were given to the low quartile students. | Insight/Inform FCAT |
| 2 | Availability of math tutoring programs | Give targeted assignments to the lowest quartile students. Student Participation in Team Up will include 20% of the lowest 25%. | Principal, Team Up Lead Teacher And Instructional Coach | Review instructional content taught to ensure alignment with each grade levels pacing guide. | K-2 common core assessment 3-5 math benchmark assessment. FCAT |

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 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 # For 2012-2013 we will reduce achievement gap through RTI, differentiated instruction, Saturday School and Team-Up 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: | Not Applicable |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| N/A | N/A |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|
| | Students not critically thinking through problems, which would | Teachers will implement instructional practices based on the practices | Principal Instructional Coach | Focus walks by administration and coaches will be used to | Administration Focus Walk forms and Coaches Logs. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|----------------------|--|---|
| 1 | not allow the students to be successful with high complexity level questions. | discussed in the PLC titled The Math Practices. | | ensure all teachers and students are implementing the math practices that will allow students to critically think though problems. | FCAT Benchmarks |
| 2 | Duval County has two adopted Math curriculums and merging the two curriculums to form fluent lessons may be challenging for the teachers. | Implement a 60 minute Math Workshop in all Mathematics classrooms, using the core Math curriculums (enVisions and Math Investigations). | Principal Math Coach | Focus walks by administration and coaches will be used to ensure all teachers are implementing the Math workshop models using the core Math curriculums. | Administration Focus Walk forms and Coaches Logs FCAT Benchmarks |

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: | Not Applicable |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| N/A | N/A |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---------------------|----------------|---|---|-----------------|
| 1 | Not Applicable | Not Applicable | Not Applicable | Not Applicable | Not Applicable |

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: | Not Applicable |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| N/A | N/A |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---------------------|----------------|---|---|-----------------|
| 1 | Not Applicable | Not Applicable | Not Applicable | Not Applicable | Not Applicable |

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

| | |
|--|--|
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making | |
|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|---|---|-----------------|
| satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E: | Not Applicable | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| N/A | N/A | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g. , frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| Disaggregate Data for RTI purposes | K-5 | Math Coach/RTI coordinator | Grade level | WOW Wednesdays and teacher planning times as needed | RTI documentation will reflect the disaggregated data | Principal and Math Coach |
| Question Writing for Pre/Post test | K-5 | Math Coach | Grade Level | WOW Wednesdays | Teachers create their own pre/post test after professional development | Principal and Math Coach |
| Inputting Data into Insight | K-2 | Math Coach | Grade Level | WOW Wednesday session | Teacher independently input data into Insight | Principal and Math Coach |
| Math Workshop Model/Lesson Planning | K-5 | Math Coach | Grade Level | WOW Wednesday session | Instructional Focus Observations and Teacher Lesson Plans. | Principal and Math Coach |
| The Gradual Release | K-5 | IST Team | School-wide | Early Release Day | Instructional Focus Observations and Teacher Lesson Plans. | IST Team |
| Common Core Math Practices | K-5 | MathCoach | School-Wide | Pre planning, Early Release Session, other sessions as needed | Instructional Focus Observations and Teacher Lesson Plans. | Principal and Math Coach |

Mathematics Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|--|----------------------------|----------------|------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Professional Development based on "The Gradual Release" to | "The Gradual Release" book | Title I/SAC | \$1,500.00 |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| create independent learners. | | | |
| | | | Subtotal: \$1,500.00 |
| 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: \$1,500.00 | | | |

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. | | In grade 5, 34%(15) of the students will score a level 3 on the 2013 FCAT Science Assessment. | | | |
| Science Goal #1a: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| 29%(15 students) | | 37% (19 students) | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 1A.1. Teacher knowledge, practice, and understanding of the new science curriculum that aligns to the standards, | 1A.1. Instructional coach will provide professional development opportunities on the use of all components of the new Science series. | 1A.1. Instructional Coaches | 1A.1. Principal and Instructional Coach will monitor the rigor in lessons and strategies. | A.1. 1A.1. Improvement on the School, District, and State Science Assessments. (Write Score, District Benchmarks, LSA's and FCAT). |
| 2 | 1A.2. Scheduling of adequate time for Science instruction daily in all grade levels. | 1A.2. Curriculum implementation will be determined per grade based on the pacing guide | 1A.2. Principal, Instructional Coaches | 1A.2. Focus walks by administration and coaches will be used to ensure all teachers are implementing the Science Curriculum daily. | 1A.2. Administration Focus Walk forms and Coaches Logs |
| | 1A.3. Student's proficiency in Science. | 1A.3. Use Science Write Score testing | 1A.3. Principal, Instructional | 1A.3. Review lesson plans as well as RTI | 1A.3. Principal Data Check and RTI |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|------------------------------|--|---|
| 3 | | and data to guide instruction and create RTI groups. | Coach and Classroom teacher. | documentation and how it correlates directly to the pacing guide | Documentation with progress shown on RTI assessments. |
|---|--|--|------------------------------|--|---|

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a: | In grade 5, 10% (5) of the students will score at a level 4 or 5 on the 2012 FCAT Science Assessment increasing from 8% (5) on the 2012 administration of the Science FCAT. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 8% (5 students) | 10% (5 students) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|
| 1 | 2A.1. Teacher knowledge, practice, and understanding of the new science curriculum that aligns to the new standards. | 2A.1. Instructional coach will provide professional development opportunities on the use of all components of the new Science series. | 2A.1. Principal Instructional Coaches | 2A.1. Principal and Instructional Coach will monitor the rigor in lessons and strategies. | 2A.1. Improvement on the District Science Benchmarks, LSA's, and Write Score Assessments |
| 2 | 2A.2. Time Restraints in teachers schedule to implement Science in grades KG-4th grade. | 2A.2. Focus Instruction in grades KG-4 with the PYP Units of Inquiry integrated into daily scheduled reading blocks. | 2A.2. Principal, Instructional Coaches | 2A.2. Focus walks by administration and coaches will be used to ensure all teachers are implementing Science. | 2A.2. Administration Focus Walks forms, LSA's, and unit assessments |
| | 2A.3. Teachers implementing | 2A.3. Provide professional | 2A.3. Science Cluster | 2A.3. Provide a grade level | 2A.3 Lesson plan |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|-------|---|-------------------|
| 3 | units not directly aligned to grade level standards. | development to ensure that teachers understand which units should be taught at each grade level. | Coach | list of units aligned to current standards so principal can monitor lesson plans for adherence. | checks/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: | | | | |
| 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 |
|--|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| How to Enhance Science Through Reading | K – 4th | Instructional Coaches | All Science subject area teachers. | September-June | Instructional Focus Observations and Teacher Lesson Plans. | Administrators, Instructional Coaches and Magnet Instructional Coach |
| How to utilize Science tools and curriculum (FCAT 2.0) | 3rd – 5th | Instructional Coaches | 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade teachers | September-June | Instructional Focus Observations and Teacher Lesson Plans | Administrators, Instructional Coaches, and Magnet Instructional Coach |

Science Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--|----------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Aligned assessments to monitor student progress on standards | Write Score | School Instructional Supply Fund 10000 | \$1,276.80 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$1,276.80 |
| 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: \$1,276.80 |

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

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

| | |
|---|--|
| 1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a: | 51 out of 53 students scored a 3.0 or higher |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 62% (53 students) | 52% (50 students) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|--|---|---|---------------------------------------|
| 1 | Students demonstrate a low proficiency in conventions. | Incorporate use of grammar resource materials in collaboration within the structured Writer's Workshop and student District Writing essays. | Principal, Instructional coaches | Students will peer edit other student works based on the district rubric. Students will keep a writing portfolio to track their writing progress. | District Rubric and Write Score |
| 2 | Students demonstrate a low proficiency in elaboration and organization. | Use of FCAT Anchor papers from the previous year to view and evaluate the understanding of the writing process. By students understanding the rubric first, they can then read and analyze anchor papers to become more effective writers. | Principal, instructional coaches | Use of FCAT writing anchor papers from previous years. | District Rubric and writing 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 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 | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | |

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|--|---|
| Common Core Writing k-5 | K-5/Writing | Schultz Center | School Wide | Oct 16 & 17, Dec 6, 2012 | District Writing and Revisions | Reading Coach |
| Writing Workshop | Teachers | Kimberly York Reading Coach | K-5 Teachers | Sept 26, 2012 | Dissect Rubric and Anchor Papers, use anchor papers to aide in grading | Reading Coach |

Writing Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--|----------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Aligned assessments to monitor student progress on standards | Writescore | School Instructional Supply Fund 10000 | \$1,276.80 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$1,276.80 |
| 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 |

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: | | The attendance rate will increase from 56% (231 students to 66% (271 students) missing less than 10 days of school. | | | |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: | | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: | | | |
| 56% (231 students) | | 66% (271 students) | | | |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | | | |
| 309 students (75%) | | 284 students (69%) | | | |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | | | |
| 165 students (40%) | | 140 students (34%) | | | |
| 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. School-wide initiative to encourage and motivate students to attend school daily. | 1.1. a. Monthly rewards and recognition for classrooms with perfect attendance. Monthly parties or treats for classrooms with perfect attendance, recognition on morning announcements, on school marquee, on bulletin board with class picture, and paper trophy outside of classrooms. 1.1.b. Quarterly rewards and recognition of individual students with perfect attendance. | 1.1. Student Achievement Team | 1.1. Analysis of monthly attendance report and verification with classroom teachers. | 1.1. Attendance Data |
| 2 | 1.2 School-wide initiative to encourage and motivate students to attend school daily. | 1.2 Implement a nine-week assembly that recognizes all the classes and/or grade levels and invite the parents to attend the celebration. | 1.2 Student Achievement Team and Administrator. | 1.2 Attendance will be monitored through reports. | 1.2 Attendance Data |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|----------------------------------|--|---------------------|
| 3 | 1.3. Parental cooperation with student attendance. | 1.3. Parental workshop or letter providing information about the importance of attendance, education, and the legal issues for parents of students with excessive absences/tardiness. | 1.3.Principal Guidance Counselor | 1.3. Analysis of monthly and quarterly attendance reports. | 1.3.Attendance Data |
| 4 | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | |

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| To increase student attendance | Incentives | School Improvement Supply Fund 10000 | \$500.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$500.00 |
| 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: \$500.00 |

Suspension Goal(s)

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

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 1. Suspension Suspension Goal # 1: | Decrease the total number of suspensions by 23% (3 suspensions) |
| 2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions |
| 8 students | 7 student |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School |
| 4 students | 3 student |
| 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions |
| 5 students | 3 students |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School |
| 9 students | 8 students |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|--|---|--|---|
| 1 | 1.1 Lack of school-wide behavior management systems for all areas within the school. | 1.1. Establishment of rituals and routines and implementation of a school-wide CHAMPS program. | 1.1. Foundations team and Administration | 1.1. Monthly Foundations Team meetings and analysis of suspension and climate survey data | 1.1. Surveys and observations |
| 2 | 1.2. Discipline is often punitive and does not fully address and correct the problem behavior. | 1.2. Increase use of behavior interventions that reduce problem behaviors and reinforce appropriate behaviors. | 1.2. RtI Leadership Team | 1.2. Classroom teacher will track and document student behavior and discuss with RtI Leadership Team | 1.2 Tracking sheets |
| 3 | 1.3 Parent awareness of expected behavior. | 1.3 Provide information on CHAMPS to parents, provide parents with specific behavioral concern. | 1.3 Classroom teacher during orientation and conferences. | 1.3 Improvement in students' behavior. | 1.3 Daily agenda classroom behavior chart, classroom referral, school referrals |
| 4 | 1.4 Students lack of problem solving skills. | 1.4 Teach problem solving and IB character traits to students and parents. | 1.4 Foundations team | 1.4 Reduction in number of arguments fights. Increase use of problem solving skills. | 1.4 Record observed positive behavior |
| | 1.5. Lack of daily communication with parents regarding student behavior. | 1.5. Continue school wide implementation of behavior flip chart system for primary | 1.5. Foundations Team, Administration | 1.5. Administrator and classroom teachers will monitor classroom management strategies | 1.5. Climate surveys and Foundations surveys |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|-------------------|--|----------------------|
| 5 | | grades, and behavior clip boards for intermediate grades. Citizenship grades will be recorded daily using students' agenda. | | and check for documentation of parent communication. | |
| 6 | 1.6.Lack of parent involvement in student behavior. | 1.6. Classroom teachers contact parents promptly to make aware of behavior patterns; mandatory conference with parent before suspension. | 16.Administration | 1.6. Follow up conference with Administration if there is no change in behavior. | 1.6. Suspension data |

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: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i> | In 2012, we will seek to inform and empower parent, our goal is to increase parent involvement at school wide events and functions from an average of 35 % (150 parents) in 2011 to an average of 40 % (149 parents) in 2012. |
| 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement: | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: |
| 35 % (150 parents) | 40 % (149 parents) |

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 | Timely communication of events to parents by multiple means | Quarterly Newsletter Telephone Parent Link | Administrators, Communities In Schools (Team Up), PTA Board | Parent Survey at end of events Parent Survey (How were You Informed) | Parent Survey Attendance Logs |
| 2 | Parent lack of awareness of Role of PTA/Volunteer opportunities | Place information regarding PTA/Volunteer opportunities in Parent Resource Room (In Front Office) Print PTA Responsibilities and volunteer opportunities in Newsletter, Make direct appeal to parent (grade, class etc.) to participate in specific programs/events | Administrator, PTA Board | Parent Survey (How were You Informed) | Parent Survey Attendance Logs |

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | | |
|---|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 1. STEM | | | | |
| STEM Goal #1: | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

Increase the Promotion Rate 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. Increase the Promotion Rate Goal Increase the Promotion Rate Goal #1: | | | To increase the promotion rate from 83.3% (348) to 90.1% (355) of the total student population. | | |
| 2012 Current level: | | | 2013 Expected level: | | |
| 83.3% (348) | | | 90% (355) | | |
| 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. Poor student attendance. | 1.1. Monitor student attendance regularly and report to AIT. AIT will contact and meet with parents of students with poor attendance patterns. AIT will notify school principal for follow-up | 1.1. Student Achievement Team | 1.1. Attendance reports will be ran and analyzed regularly. | 1.1. Genesis attendance report of all student absences, excused and unexcused. |
| 2 | 1.2. Parents unaware of tutoring options for their children. | 1.2. Offer opportunities for parents to learn more about Supplemental Educational Services (SES) that are available to them. | 1.2. Student Achievement Team and Administration | 1.2. Survey parents before and after information sessions | 1.2. Surveys |
| 3 | 1.3. Students not passing fair, not meeting 54% requirement on the last fair assessment (K-3) and FCAT. | 1.3. Ongoing targeted progress monitoring specific to student deficits. | 1.3. Reading and Math coaches | 1.3. Analyze data from benchmark testing, fair testing, scrimmages, pre and post tests | 1.3. Results of various assessments |
| 4 | 1.4. Lack of opportunity for students to remediate failing grades in core subjects. | 1.4. Students will be given the opportunity to remediate course work in Compass Odyssey. | 1.4. Compass Odyssey Teacher, classroom teacher, IST | 1.4. IST communicating and meeting with Compass Odyssey teacher to determine student progress level | 1.4. Student grades |
| 5 | 1.5 Students suspected of needing additional support and services not being readily identified | 1.5 Begin Rtl process immediately upon knowledge of student lack of performance on assessments | 1.5. Classroom teachers and IST | 1.5 Collaboration among classroom teachers and Rtl Leadership Team. | Teacher RTI Documentation |
| 6 | | | | | |

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 Increase the Promotion Rate Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|--|-------------------------|
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Students failing to meet grade level standard on quarterly grade reports | Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) | Title One Funding/SAC Funding | \$0.00 |
| Reading | Obtain 79% proficient Adequate Yearly Progress in grades 3-5 and grades K-2 students will obtain and 80% average level of proficiency | Florida Ready Skills Books | School Instructional Supply Fund 10000 | \$2,500.00 |
| Reading | K-5 students lack the desire and motivation to read for information. | Comprehension Tool Kit by Stephanie Harvey and Anne Goudvis | Title One Funding | \$2,390.00 |
| Science | Aligned assessments to monitor student progress on standards | Write Score | School Instructional Supply Fund 10000 | \$1,276.80 |
| Writing | Aligned assessments to monitor student progress on standards | Writescore | School Instructional Supply Fund 10000 | \$1,276.80 |
| Attendance | To increase student attendance | Incentives | School Improvement Supply Fund 10000 | \$500.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$7,943.60 |
| Technology | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Mathematics | Professional Development based on "The Gradual Release" to create independent learners. | "The Gradual Release" book | Title I/SAC | \$1,500.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$1,500.00 |
| 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: \$9,443.60 |

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Priority | <input type="checkbox"/> Focus | <input type="checkbox"/> Prevent | <input type="checkbox"/> NA |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 10/19/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

✓ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

| Projected use of SAC Funds | Amount |
|---|------------|
| Provide extra academic support to students who are working below, on, or above the standard. Approved supplemental teaching supplies and resources, as needed, for teachers. \$ | \$2,500.00 |
| Approved supplemental teaching supplies and resources, as needed, for teachers. \$ | \$1,000.00 |

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

The School Advisory Council (SAC) has an important function for the success of Rufus E. Payne Elementary. The council meet the third Thursday of each month during the school year. Listed below are some of the functions of the SAC.

- Participating in planning and monitoring of the school improvement plan, building, and grounds
- Initiating activities or programs that generate cooperation between the community and the school
- Recommend different support services for the school
- Performing other functions as requested by the principal

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

| Duval School District RUFUS E. PAYNE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011 | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------|---|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 53% | 70% | 94% | 31% | 248 | 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 | 55% | 63% | | | 118 | 3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School? | 60% (YES) | 73% (YES) | | | 133 | 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 | | | | | 499 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | B | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |

| Duval School District RUFUS E. PAYNE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010 | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------|---|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 58% | 64% | 89% | 48% | 259 | 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% | 46% | | | 111 | 3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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? | 63% (YES) | 60% (YES) | | | 123 | Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math. |
| FCAT Points Earned | | | | | 493 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | C | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |