

# 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: VENETIA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Duval

Principal: Jennifer Copeland

SAC Chair: Vernon Washington

Superintendent: Ed Pratt-Dannals

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/19/2012

## PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

### STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

<a href="#">School Grades Trend Data</a>
<a href="#">Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data</a>
<a href="#">High School Feedback Report</a>
<a href="#">K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan</a>

### 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	Jennifer Copeland	BS - Mathematics Education, University Of South Florida; Master of Education – Georgia State University; Master of Education- Educational Leadership, University of North Florida; Level II Principal Certification- State of Florida; 21 years of experience as an educator	1	6	2008-2009: Grade: A, Reading Mastery: 91%, Math Mastery: 90%, Science Mastery: 80%, Writing Mastery: 80%  AYP: Venetia Elementary increased two letter grades from a C to A, placing the school in the Reward category.  In 2012, the % of students making learning gains in Reading increased by 15% and in Math increased by 11%. The bottom quartile in Reading increased by 37%.

## INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
NA					

## 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. The faculty will participate in Professional Learning Communities, focusing on the Common Core Standards and learning strategies that improve student achievement.	Principal Academic Leadership Team Members, Shared Decision Making Team Members	June 30, 2013	

## Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
0	

## 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
30	0.0%(0)	16.7%(5)	30.0%(9)	53.3%(16)	46.7%(14)	100.0%(30)	3.3%(1)	0.0%(0)	36.7%(11)

## Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program/plan by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities

## 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

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

### School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

RtI Facilitator: Katie Mobley-Keith  
Gr. 1 Rep.: Linda Hegdal  
Gr. 3 Rep.: Ellen Chaffin  
Gr. 4 Rep.: Katie Mobley-Keith  
Gr. 5 Rep.: Tammy Burrows  
ELL Rep. and Child Development Trained: Lisa Thornton  
ESE Rep. (Gr. K-2) and Target Team Coordinator: Genevieve Reddick  
ESE Rep. (Gr. 3-5) and Target Team Coordinator: Julia Smith  
Foundations Chairperson: Calvin Rockward  
Administrator: Jennifer Copeland

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 RtI Leadership Team focuses meetings around the following academic and behavioral questions:

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

The RtI Leadership Team meets bi-weekly to engage in the following activities: Review screening and progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development and resources. The team will also collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skills. The team will facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation.

In addition to the oversight work of the RtI Leadership Team, other building instructional teams such as grade level teams, and/or content area teams carry the work forward with smaller groups of students. This academic and behavioral work will include the following, beginning with Tier 1 (core/universal instruction) and continuing through Tier 2 (supplemental instruction/intervention):

- Identifying and analyzing systematic patterns of student need
- Identifying appropriate evidence-based differentiation and intervention strategies
- Implementing and overseeing progress monitoring
- Analyzing progress monitoring data and determining next steps

For the most intensive interventions at Tier 3 in the 2012 - 2013 school year, the current TARGETeam structure will be used collaboratively with the building instructional teams to provide classroom support for students.

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

The RtI Building Leadership Team leads the faculty in a review of the data and, with input from building instructional teams, helped develop the initial draft of the School Improvement Plan utilizing the template provided by the Department of Education. The draft SIP was then presented to the School Advisory Council for review and recommendations. The Shared Decision Making Team and the Academic Design Team finalized the plan.

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

### MTSS Implementation

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

Academic Data  
Baseline data: Pearson/Inform, Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Florida Assessments for Instruction in

Reading (FAIR), Diagnostic Reading Assessment-2 (DRA-2), Star Early Literacy, District Benchmark Assessments as appropriate, Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), PMA's (Progress Monitoring Assessments), and Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM)

Midyear: FAIR, DRA-2, Star Early Literacy, District Benchmark Assessments as appropriate, PMA's

End of year: FAIR, DRA-2, Star Early Literacy, FCAT

Ongoing Progress Monitoring: PMRN, Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM), FAIR (ongoing formative assessments), Fast ForWord Program Reports

Frequency of data review: Data will be managed by Pearson Inform as soon as available. Other data management systems are used at the school among grade level groups as needed. Data is reviewed every 2-3 weeks as determined by grade level teams and subject learning schedules.

Behavioral Data and Attendance Data

Absenteeism, referrals, and suspension data will be viewed using OnCourse with downloads from Genesis.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The school's Professional Development Plan supports continuous learning for all teachers and instructional paraprofessionals that result in increased student achievement and includes evidence of scaffold RtI professional learning. The training provided is results-driven, standards-based, school-centered, and sustained over time. The RtI Leadership Team will establish protocols for on-going assessment and adjusting of the plan to meet school needs.

RtI Professional Development will include traditional RtI training during the year in addition to summer, pre-planning, early dismissal, and faculty meetings. RtI learning should be job-embedded and occur during the following:

- Professional learning communities
- Classroom observations
- Collaborative planning
- Analysis of student work
- Book study
- Lesson study

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The principal will make sure professional development training is held during faculty meetings, early release days, and planning days.

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

### School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

At Venetia Elementary, the Literacy Leadership Team is synonymous with the Academic Design Team. It's members are as follows:

Chairperson and Past Standards Coach: Tammy Burrows

Kindergarten Rep.: Renoda Nealey

1st Grade Rep.: Linda Hegdal and Sharon Rougier

4th Grade Rep.: Katie Keith-Mobley and Jasmine Milner

5th Grade Rep.: Missy Tanner

ESE Rep.: Genevieve Reddick

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

The principal, lead content area teachers, and other principal appointees serve on this team which meets bi-monthly. The committee chairperson will report committee activities by making written notes for members and making oral reports at faculty meetings.

The purpose of the Literacy Leadership Team in relation to the area of Literacy is:

- to focus on building the capacity for growth in that area for all students
- to increase integration of reading and writing skills into the other core subjects of math and science
- to ensure knowledge of literacy concerns are addressed with effective problem solving
- to ensure that the Superintendent's Book of the Month initiatives are in place and functioning
- to provide effective support and professional assistance where appropriate to include such as mentoring and professional development

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

The major initiatives of the Literacy Leadership Team as it pertains to Literacy this year are:

- monitor student performance and make recommendations for targeted instruction
- assist the principal in monitoring instruction
- collaborate to plan for effective RTI activities
- collaborate to plan for effective professional development
- implement professional learning communities

## Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification

No Attachment

## \*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

Parents are given information about Kindergarten expectations as well as the knowledge and skills their child will obtain during the school year.

During Open House, Kindergarten parents will view a PowerPoint which gives information about transitioning from Pre-K to Kindergarten. Academic performance expectation lists are provided to parents in the first mid-term progress report. Within the first month of school, all first time Kindergarten students are administered the FLKRS and FAIR readiness assessments to determine school readiness so that teachers can differentiate instruction.

Venetia Elementary transitions ESE pre-school students into Kindergarten through the provision to parents of summer reading lists, suggested activities to increase school readiness and academic awareness. As ESE students transition to Kindergarten, they are administered the FLKRS assessment to determine the gross motor, fine motor, academic, and social/emotional developmental age equivalents.

## \*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:	100% of students scoring previously at level 3 will demonstrate at least one year's growth by maintaining or exceeding their level of proficiency and increasing their developmental scale score proportionately. 43%(74) of students will score at level 3 on the 2013 Reading FCAT, up 4%(6) more students than last year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
37%(68) scored at level 3	43% (74) of students will score at level 3

#### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Lack mastery of applying higher order thinking skills	1.1. Explicitly teach students how to use text to answer higher order questions.	1.1. Classroom Teacher	1.1. Use data from formal and informal assessments to analyze student results, determine areas of weakness, and plan next steps  Use DRA2 Continuum Chart to analyze student results, determine areas of weakness, and plan next steps	1.1. District Progress Monitoring Assessment DRA2 FCAT Results FAIR Results
2	1.2. Lacking confidence to select higher level texts for independent reading	1.2. Exposure to a variety of texts to enhance student interest in higher level texts  Model book choice behaviors  Students participate in book clubs to spark their interest and engagement	1.2. Classroom Teachers  Media Specialist	1.2. Reading conferences  Accelerated Reader	1.2. Book logs  Accelerated Reader reports  Anecdotal notes from reading conferences
3	1.3 Lack of vocabulary to determine meaning of words	1.3 Exposure to a variety of texts and explicitly teach context clues	1.3 Classroom Teachers	1.3 Use data from formal and informal assessments to analyze student results, determine areas of weakness, and plan next steps.	1.3 Formal and informal assessments  FCAT Results

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 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
No Data Submitted				

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading.  Reading Goal #2a:	100% of students scoring level 4 or 5 will demonstrate at least one year's growth by maintaining or exceeding their level of proficiency and increasing their developmental scale score proportionately. 8% (10) more students will achieve at levels 4 or 5 from last year.
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
20% (38) scored level 4 or 5	28% (48) will score at level 4 or 5

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. Higher level students are not self-selecting challenging texts	2.1. Students participate in the book clubs that provide challenging level texts  Model book choice behaviors  Exposure to challenging texts	2.1. Classroom Teachers  Media Specialist	2.1. Reading conferences  Evaluation of book club discussions	2.1. Anecdotal notes from reading conferences and book clubs  Book logs
2	2.2. Students are not reading from a variety of genres	2.2. Teach literary analysis through a variety of genres  Make available a variety of genres for students to self-select  Model reading from a variety of genres emphasizing characteristics	2.2. Classroom Teachers  Media Specialist	2.2. Reading conferences	2.2. Book logs  Anecdotal notes from reading conferences

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
No Data Submitted				

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.  
Reading Goal #3a:

75% (129) of students will make gains in reading.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71% (122) reading gains	75% (129) reading gains

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3.2. Influx of students working below grade level	3.2. Work with identified students daily during designated RTI time.	3.2. Classroom Teachers ESE Teachers ESE Paraprofessionals	3.2. RTI Problem Solving Model	3.2. Progress Monitoring Tools
2	3.3. High percentage of economically disadvantaged students (60%) lacking exposure to printed text	3.3. Teachers will increase explicit instruction during Readers Workshop.	3.3. Classroom Teachers	3.3. Student mastery on mini-assessments (formatives) based on the focus lessons will determine if the focus lessons need to be revised and/or re-taught.	3.3. HM Selection Test District Benchmark Tests FAIR Results

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

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

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:	88% (37) of the bottom quartile students will make learning gains in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
87% (37) of the lowest quartile	88% (37) of the lowest quartile

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	4.1. High percentage of students coming in with varied ability levels	4.1. Utilize Destinations in K-2 with the lowest 25% and set up learning path based on student needs. Utilize guided reading groups, peer partners, and strategy groups for differentiation.	4.1. Classroom Teachers	4.1. Use formal and informal assessment to analyze student results, determine areas of weakness, and plan next steps	4.1. FCIM assessments
2	4.2. Influx of students working below grade level	4.2. Teachers will increase explicit differentiated instruction during Readers Workshop	4.2. Classroom Teachers	4.2. RTI Problem Solving Model	4.2. Progress Monitoring Tools
3	4.3. High percentage of economically disadvantaged students (60%) lacking exposure to the printed text	4.3. Exposure to a variety of texts during Readers Workshop.	4.3. Classroom Teachers	4.3. Use formal and informal assessments to analyze student results, determine areas of weakness, and plan next steps	4.3. Progress Monitoring Tools FCAT Results

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	Reading Goal # _____
---	----------------------

school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		5A :				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	The percent of students by subgroups who will score level 3 or higher are as follows:
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 51% (44), Black: 55% (47), Hispanic: NA, Asian: NA, American Indian: NA	White: 86% (73), Black: 86% (72), Hispanic: NA, Asian: NA, American Indian : NA

**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5A.1. High percentage of economically disadvantaged students from all demographic areas are lacking exposure to printed text	5A.1. Expose students to a variety of text features during Readers Workshop.	5A.1. Classroom Teachers	5A.1. Use formal and informal data to analyze student results, determine areas of weakness, and plan next steps	5A.1. Progress Monitoring Assessments DRA2 Results STAR Results FAIR Results FCAT Results
2	5A.2. Tier 1 services are not meeting the needs of the student subgroups	5A.2. Through daily FCIM (focus lessons) skill practice students are exposed to a spiral curriculum of NGSSS strands  Work with identified students daily during designated RtI time	5A.2. Classroom Teachers	5A.2. Use PMA data chart to analyze student results, determine areas of weakness, and plan next steps  RtI Problem Solving Model	5A.2. District Progress Monitoring Assessment  Progress Monitoring Tools

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:	79% (108) will score level 3 or higher on Reading FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
63% (86)	86% (108)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5D.1. Lack of background knowledge and prerequisite skills	5D.1. Provide a language rich environment and tools to assist students in making sense of the printed text (eg. graphic organizers, illustrated texts, vocabulary development programs, leveled libraries, guided instruction, peer tutoring, etc.)	5D.1. Classroom teachers	5D.1. Use formal and informal assessments to analyze student results, determine areas of weakness, and plan next steps	5D.1. Progress Monitoring Assessments DRA2 Results STAR Results FAIR Results
	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.	5D.2.

2	Lack of consistent communication between parents and school	Non-negotiable high expectations for student achievement  Parent communication through daily planners, progress reports, parent portal (online access to student grades), parent link phone broadcasting system, participation in award/recognition programs.	Faculty & Staff Principal	Compare student performance with parent participation indicators	Parent signatures on home communication, parent surveys, activity sign-in sheets
3	5D.3. Instability of home environment	5D.3. Faculty and staff mentoring program, referral to community service agencies (full service schools, Youth Crisis Center, Police Athletic League, etc.)	5D.3. Principal Guidance Counselor Social Worker Faculty & Staff	5D.3. Monitor student performance Results of District and school generated surveys	5D.3. Progress Monitoring Assessments DRA2 Results STAR Results FAIR Results District and school surveys

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
Lesson Study on utilizing best practice and data to drive instruction	Grades K - 5	Principal  Teacher Leaders	All Grade Levels	Monthly Early Release days	Classroom observations, monitoring of lesson plans and PMPs (Progress Monitory Plans) for individual students	Principal  Literacy Leadership Team
RtI	Grades K - 5	RtI Team	All Grade Levels	Pre-Planning Days, Early Release Days	Classroom observations, monitoring of lesson plans, RtI data	Principal  RtI Leadership Team
Study on understanding and implementation of Common Core State Standards	Grades K - 5	Principal  Teacher Leaders	Grades K - 5 ELA teachers	Monthly Early Release Extended Days	Faculty feedback, classroom observations, monitoring of lesson plans	Principal  Literacy Leadership Team

Reading Budget:

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

			Subtotal: \$0.00
<b>Professional Development</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
<b>Other</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			<b>Grand Total: \$0.00</b>

*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:	48% of the students will score at level 3, thereby decreasing the combined % of students scoring at levels 1 and 2 last year by 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
43% (74) scored at level 3.	48% (83) of students will score level 3

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Inconsistent use of higher order thinking skills	1.1. More exposure to higher order questions and problem solving skills  Use of graphic organizers to promote use of higher order thinking skills	1.1. Classroom Teachers	1.1. Use summative and formative data chart to analyze student results, determine areas of weakness, and plan next steps	1.1. District summative and formative assessment  Performance Task steps  FCAT Results
2	1.2. Inability to apply reading strategies to math word problems	1.2. Problem of the Day  Problem solving strategies  Unpacking the standards through a diagnostic graphic organizer (eg. four column method)	1.2. Classroom Teachers	1.2. Use summative and formative data chart to analyze student results, determine areas of weakness, and plan next steps	1.2. District summative and formative assessment  Performance Task steps

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
---------------------	----------	---	---	-----------------



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:	100% of students scoring level 4 or 5 will demonstrate at least one year's growth by maintaining or exceeding their level of proficiency and increasing their developmental scale score proportionately. 11% (19) more students will achieve at levels 4 and 5 than last year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
17% (29) scored level 4 and 5	28% (48) will score at level 4 or 5

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. Lack of efficient mathematical strategies/automaticity.	2.1. Full implementation of mathematical skills block and mathematical workshop	2.1. Classroom Teachers	2.1. Use brief mini assessments to determine effectiveness	2.1. District summative and formative assessment  FCAT Results
2	2.2. Lack of product related mathematical projects.	2.2. Provide opportunities for performance task	2.2. Classroom Teachers	2.2. Results of performance task based rubric specifications	2.2. Performance Task 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:

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:	80% (138) of students will make gains in math
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
76% (131) made gains	80% (138) of students will make gains

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3.2. Influx of students working below grade level	3.2. Work with identified students during small group instruction	3.2. Classroom Teachers Paraprofessionals	3.2. Analyze results of informal assessments to determine next steps	3.2. Informal assessments
2	3.3. High percentage of economically disadvantaged students (60%) lacking basic math skills and fluency of the math skills	3.3. Through small group skill practice students are exposed to a spiral curriculum of NGSSS strands.	3.3. Classroom Teachers Faculty and Staff	3.3. Use summative and formative data chart to analyze student results, determine areas of weakness, and plan next steps	3.3. Summative and formative tests

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following 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:	80% (34) of the bottom quartile students will make learning gains
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

77% (33) of the bottom quartile made gains			80% (34) of the bottom quartile will make gains		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Increasing student response to Tier 1 instruction	Focus lessons will be taught by teachers based on a review of previous assessments where students were struggling.	Principal RTI Team	Student mastery on mini-assessments (formatives) based on the focus lessons will determine if the focus lessons need to be revised and/or re-taught.	Increased achievement between assessments  District Math Benchmark  2012 Math FCAT
2	4.2. Influx of students working below grade level	4.2. Work with identified students during small group instruction	4.2. Classroom Teachers Paraprofessionals	4.2. Analyze results of informal assessments to determine next steps	4.2. Informal assessments
3	4.3. High percentage of economically disadvantaged students (60%) lacking basic math skills and fluency of the math skills	4.3. Through daily small group skill practice students are exposed to a spiral curriculum of NGSSS strands.	4.3. Classroom Teachers Faculty and staff	4.3. Use summative and formative data chart to analyze student results, determine areas of weakness, and plan next steps	4.3. Summative and formative tests

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target						
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.			Elementary School Mathematics Goal # 5A : <input type="text"/>			
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 mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #5B:	The percent of students by subgroups who will score level 3 or higher are as follows: White:86% (74), Black:86% (68), Hispanic: NA, Asian: NA, and American Indian: NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 76% (65), Black: 52% (41), Hispanic: NA, Asian: NA, and American Indian: NA	White: 86% (74), Black: 86% (68), Hispanic: NA, Asian: NA, and American Indian: NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	5A.1. High percentage of	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.	5A.1.

1	economically disadvantaged students from all demographic areas are lacking basic math skills	Through daily FCIM skill practice students are exposed to a spiral curriculum of NGSSS strands.	Classroom Teachers	Use data charts to analyze student results, determine areas of weakness, and plan next steps	Summative and formative tests
2	5A.2. Tier 1 services are not meeting the needs of the student subgroups	5A.2. Through daily FCIM skill practice students are exposed to a spiral curriculum of NGSSS strands  Work with identified students in small groups	5A.2. Classroom Teachers Faculty and Staff	5A.2. Use data chart to analyze student results, determine areas of weakness, and plan next steps	5A.2. Summative and formative tests

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics 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 mathematics.  Mathematics 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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	80% (110) of Economically Disadvantaged students will score level 3 or higher
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
64% (88)	80% (110)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5D.1. Lack of background knowledge and prerequisite skills	5D.1. Provide instruction using manipulatives, computer learning activities, math centers, collaborative learning, and peer tutoring.	5D.1. Classroom teachers	5D.1. Use data charts to analyze student results, determine areas of weakness, and plan next steps	5D.1. Summative and formative tests
2	5D.2. Parents do not know how to help their kids	5D.2. RTI and focus lessons communicate expectations for student achievement and have Parent Nights to teach parents how to support their children.	5D.2. Faculty & Staff Principal	5D.2. Compare student performance with parent participation indicators	5D.2. Parent signatures on home communication, parent surveys, activity sign-in sheets
3	5D.3. Instability of home environment	5D.3. Faculty and staff mentoring program, referral to community service agencies (full service schools, Youth Crisis Center, Police Athletic League, etc.)	5D.3. Principal Guidance Counselor Social Worker Faculty & Staff	5D.3. Monitor student performance Results of District and school generated surveys	5D.3. Progress Monitoring Assessments DRA2 Results STAR Results FAIR Results District and school surveys

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
Study on understanding and implementation of Common Core State Standards	Grades 2 - 5	Principal Teachers Leaders	Grades 2 - 5 Math Teachers	Monthly Early Release Extended Days	Faculty feedback, classroom observations, monitoring of lesson plans	Principal Literacy Leadership Team
Collaborative Learning Cycle Lesson	Grades 3 - 5 Math	Principal District Math	Grades 3 - 5 Math teachers	Six week study during Fall 2012	Classroom observations, monitoring of lesson	Principal District Math

Mathematics Budget:

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

End of Mathematics Goals

## Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.		56% (31) of the students will score level 3 or higher			
Science Goal #1a:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
39% (21)		56% (31)			
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 content knowledge from previous grades	1.1. Review the information from the previous grade level's standards and curriculum	1.1. Classroom Teachers	1.1. Use data charts to analyze student results, determine areas of weakness, and plan next steps	1.1. Teacher created assessments
	1.2. Tier 1 services do not provide a spiral	1.2. Integrate curriculum reviews throughout the	1.2. Classroom Teacher	1.2. Use data charts to analyze student	1.2. Teacher created assessments

2	curriculum	year		results, determine areas of weakness, and plan next steps	
3	Teachers do not understand FCAT 2.0 Science Standards	Unpack FCAT 2.0 Science Standards	Principal	Performance of students on Science Assessments	District Benchmark Assessments FCAT Results
4	Increasing teachers' knowledge of effectively using the 5 E's research-based model to deliver science instruction	Use inquiry based teaching tools to support the 5 E's model for Science Instruction	Principal Science Teachers	Academic Design Team will analyze student work to confirm the effective use of the 5 E's Model, direct and guided inquiry	2012 Science FCAT Grade level performance tasks

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:	21% (11) or more of the students will score a level 4 or 5
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
11% (6) scored level 4 or 5	21% (11) or more of the students will score a level 4 or 5

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. Lack of connection between hands-on experiments and application of written expression	2.1. Students will use science notebooks to enhance their written expression of scientific knowledge	2.1. Classroom teachers	2.1. Use data charts to analyze student results, determine areas of weakness, and plan next steps	2.1. District Progress Monitoring Assessment

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
Incorporating the 5 E's experiential curriculum directives in Grades K - 5	Grades K - 5	Lead Science Teachers	Grades K - 5, Science Teachers	Early Release Days	Classroom observations and lesson plans	Principal

Science Budget:

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



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

*End of Science Goals*

## Writing Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.  Writing Goal #1a:	62% (31) will score level 4.0 or higher
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
84% (45) scored 3.0 or higher	62% (31) will score 4.0 or higher

### 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 writing structure with regard to supporting details and elaboration	1.1 Students are required daily to use the writing process: edit, revise, and polished piece during Writers Workshop	1.1. Classroom Teachers	1.1. Use data charts to analyze student results, determine areas of weakness, and plan next steps	1.1. District and Teacher Created Writing Prompts  6 Point Holistic Rubric and Anchor Papers

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.  Writing Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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
Using Anchor Papers to effectively assess student writing versus rubrics	Grades 3 - 5 ELA	Teacher Leader District Literacy Coach	Grades 3 - 5 ELA Teachers	Early Release Days	Classroom observations, student portfolios	Principal
Study on understanding and implementation of Common Core State Standards	Grades K - 5 ELA	Principal Teacher Leaders	Grades K - 5 ELA Teachers	Monthly Early Release Extended Days	Faculty feedback, classroom observations, lesson plans	Principal Literacy Leadership Team

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

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

of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	In 2011 - 2012, the percentage of students missing 10 or more days of school will decrease by 14% (24) and the percent of students who are tardy will decrease by 5% (24).
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
Data not available	Data Not Available
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
% (167)	20% (81)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
17% (77)	12% (53)

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. Most of the students ride a school bus to school. Students occasionally miss the bus and arrive late.	1.1. Notify parents when students arrive late by notes in their planners and phone calls home. Remind parents to have their children at the bus stop on time daily via flyers and personal phone calls.	1.1. Principal	1.1. Data Analysis of Monthly Attendance Reports	1.1. OnCourse Reports
2	1.2. A significant percentage of our students have parents who serve in the military (associated with neighboring NAS Jax). These children often miss school due to transferring parents and/or family vacations which are in conflict with our school schedule.	1.2. Counseling with parents on individual basis is warranted. Navy Liaison will be consulted for advice.	1.2. Principal	1.2. Data Analysis of Monthly Attendance Reports	1.2. OnCourse Reports
3	1.3. Medical and or legal appointments for students or parents made during the school day often interfere with student attendance.	1.3. Parents will need to meet with the school Attendance Team and/or the District Attendance Officer if the problem becomes excessive (more than 3 times).	1.3. School Attendance Team (includes the Principal)	1.3. Data Analysis of Monthly Attendance Reports	1.3. OnCourse Reports

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal # 1:	To reduce the number of out-of-school suspensions by 30% from the previous year without increasing the number of in-school suspensions.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
2 in-school suspension occurred.	No more than 1 in-school suspension will occur.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School

.4%(2) of entire student body received in-school suspensions	No more than .2% (1) of entire student body will receive in-school suspensions.
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
41 out of school suspensions occurred.	No more than 10 out of school suspensions will occur.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
4% (17) of entire student body received out of school suspensions.	No more than 2% (8) of entire student body will receive out of school suspensions.

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 self esteem	1.1. Identify at-risk students and provide opportunities for them to be socially recognized and reinforced for displaying acceptable behaviors	1.1. Principal and Guidance Counselor	1.1. School Foundations Team will meet quarterly to disaggregate the data on referrals received to date and evaluate the effectiveness of the interventions applied.	1.1. Quarterly Electronic Discipline Reports and Student/Staff Surveys
2	1.2. lack of sense of social responsibility	1.2. Provide mentors for at-risk students from within school community as well as volunteers from NAS Jax and community at-large.	1.2. Principal and Foundations Committee Chair	1.2. School Foundations Team will meet quarterly to disaggregate the data on referrals received to date and evaluate the effectiveness of the interventions applied.	1.2. Quarterly Electronic Discipline Reports and Student/Staff Surveys
3	1.3. frustration over academic inability	1.3. Provide tutoring and homework assistance	1.3. Principal and Foundations Committee Chair	1.3. School Foundations Team will meet quarterly to disaggregate the data on referrals received to date and evaluate the effectiveness of the interventions applied.	1.3. Quarterly Electronic Discipline Reports and Student/Staff Surveys

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
			<b>Grand Total: \$0.00</b>

*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>	On the 2011-2012 School Climate Survey, percentage ratings of satisfaction for parents on the communication areas will remain high (100%) so as to continue to encourage and maintain the high levels of parental involvement already established school-wide.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
On the 2011-2012 School Climate Survey, parents indicated the following percentage ratings of satisfaction on the communication areas of the parent surveys as follows: good relationship with the community 95%, parents are treated with respect and dignity 100% , school offers positive experiences for parents 100%, parents provided adequate access to teachers for conferences 100%, volunteers are welcome at the school 100%, and adequate notification about school events is provided 100%	On the 2012-2013 School Climate Survey, we want to increase how many parents feel that the school and the community share a good relationship to 100%. We want to maintain the 100% levels of satisfaction in all other areas: parents being treated with respect and dignity, school offering positive experiences for parents, parents being provided adequate access to teachers for conferences, volunteers being welcomed at the school, and having adequate notification about school events provided .

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. Parents do not always read flyers and other written information that goes home with their child	1.1. Use Duval Connect for recorded telephone messages about school matters and events.	1.1. Principal and School Duval Connect Administrator	1.1. Attendance at conferences and school events will be documented.	1.1. Sign-in Sheets
2	1.2. Students often forget to share news about academic curriculum with parents	1.2. Highlight aspects of the academic curriculum via student planners, calendar of events developed by the school, newsletters, and the school website.	1.2. Shared Decision Making Team Members and School Technology Contacts	1.2. Parent surveys will be conducted twice a year.	1.2. Parent survey results
3	1.3. Parents may appear to be disinterested in school news but actually they may be overwhelmed with job and family-related duties to pay close attention to school news	1.3. Special engaging events are scheduled for family entertainment as well as for educational purposes, often with meals offered at reasonable or no cost. Aspects of the academic curriculum are discussed at these events as well as at PTA and SAC meetings, and at parent workshops.	1.3. Principal, PTA, SAC	1.3. Parent surveys will be conducted twice a year.	1.3. Parent survey results, sign-in sheets

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
<b>Professional Development</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
<b>Other</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			<b>Grand Total: \$0.00</b>

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
<b>Technology</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
<b>Professional Development</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
<b>Other</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of STEM Goal(s)

## Additional Goal(s)

### Safety Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1. Safety Goal Safety Goal #1:		In 2011 - 2012, Venetia Elementary will reduce failure to follow directions by 5%(20).			
2012 Current level:		2013 Expected level:			
In 2010 - 2011, the number of failure to follow directions decreased by 50%.		In 2011 - 2012, the number of failure to follow directions will decrease by 5%(20).			
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	Increased enrollment from the previous school year	Teachers will implement CHAMPs strategies with all students in the classroom and common areas.	Classroom Teachers	Ongoing progress monitoring	Quarterly discipline 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						

### 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
<b>Professional Development</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
<b>Other</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			<b>Grand Total: \$0.00</b>

*End of Safety Goal(s)*

# FINAL BUDGET

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

## Differentiated Accountability

### School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school:  Yes  No

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

No Attachment

## 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
Purchase of instructional materials and supplies for classroom use as determined by the teachers.	\$304.59

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

The School Advisory Council shall review school performance data and determine the causes of low performance. The School Advisory Council shall advise the school on the School Improvement Plan.



# 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 VENETIA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	66%	66%	58%	51%	241	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	56%	65%			121	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Improve FCAT Levels</li> <li>● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5</li> <li>● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2</li> </ul>
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	50% (YES)	80% (YES)			130	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					492	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Duval School District VENETIA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	72%	69%	81%	45%	267	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	62%	66%			128	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Improve FCAT Levels</li> <li>● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5</li> <li>● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2</li> </ul>
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	58% (YES)	70% (YES)			128	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					523	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested