

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: ABESS PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Duval

Principal: Tarsha N. Mitchell

SAC Chair: Susan Lashley

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.

| |
|--|
| 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 | Tarsha N. Mitchell | Principal Degrees: B.A.E (Bachelor of Arts in Education) M.Ed (Masters of Education) Certifications: Elementary Education 1st – 6th grades Ed Leadership K-12 Principal Level II | 1 | 10 | Principal of Abess Park Elementary 2011-2012 Grade A Principal of North Shore K-8: 2010-2011 Grade D- Overall increase of 31 points 2009-2010 Grade F- Overall increased 57 points Reading Proficiency 40%, Reading Gains 50%, and BQ Reading 51% Math Proficiency 49%, Math Gains 56%, and BQ Math 62% Writing Proficiency 63%, and Science 11% Principal of Hyde Park Elementary: 2008-2009 Grade A- Reading Proficiency 66%, Reading Gains 65%, and BQ Reading 60%, Math Proficiency 64%, Math Gains 78%, BQ Math 90%, 75% Writing Proficiency, and 33% Science Proficiency 2007-2008 Grade B- Reading Proficiency 64%, Reading Gains 67%, and BQ Reading 80%, Math Proficiency 46%, Math Gains 52%, BQ Math 70%, 68% Writing |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | Proficiency, and 25% Science Proficiency |
| Assis Principal | Kristin Shore | Degrees: B.A.E (Bachelor of Arts in Education) M.Ed (Masters of Arts in Education) Certifications: Educational Leadership All Levels PreKindergarten-Primary Education | 3 | 3 | Assistant Principal of Abess Park Elementary: 2011-2012 Grade A 2010-2011 Grade A- Overall decrease of 4 points, AYP improved from not meeting in 4 areas to not meeting in 1 area Reading Proficiency 83% Math Proficiency 83% Writing Proficiency 82% Science Proficiency 55% |

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.

| | 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) |
|-------------------|------|------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| No data submitted | | | | | |

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. Carefully review resumes of candidates | Principal | Ongoing | |
| 2 | 2. Carefully align candidate qualifications to school needs | Principal | Ongoing | |
| 3 | 3. Team Questioning as applicable | Principal | Ongoing | |
| 4 | 4. Reward and recognize accomplishments | Principal | Ongoing | |
| 5 | 5. Provide release time for professional development | Principal | Ongoing | |
| 6 | 6. Complete the Mentoring and Induction for Novice Teachers (MINT) Program portfolio with the assistance of the PDF. | 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 |
|--|---|
| 1 Pre-K Handicap 1 Autistic K-2(CSS) | Releasing for time to attend training and working on taking the ESE test. |

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 |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 59 | 5.1%(3) | 16.9%(10) | 40.7%(24) | 40.7%(24) | 25.4%(15) | 72.9%(43) | 1.7%(1) | 10.2%(6) | 52.5%(31) |

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 |
|-------------|-----------------|--|---|
| Jones | Baker | Based on what the individuals had to offer and obtain the Professional Development Facilitator and Administration made recommendations for the relationship. | Observations, goal setting, and reflections. |
| Gerisch | Rasner | Based on what the individuals had to offer and obtain the Professional Development Facilitator and Administration made recommendations for the relationship. | Observations, goal setting, and reflections. |
| Ferguson | Tyson | Based on what the individuals had to offer and obtain the Professional Development Facilitator and Administration made recommendations for the relationship. | Observations, goal setting, and reflections. |
| Nehrbass | Smith | Based on what the individuals had to offer and obtain the Professional Development Facilitator and Administration made recommendations for the relationship. | Orientation, observations, goal setting, and reflections. |
| Rosborough | Taylor | Based on what the individuals had to offer and obtain the Professional Development Facilitator and | Orientation, observations, goal setting, and reflections. |

| | | | |
|----------|----------|--|---|
| | | Administration made recommendations for the relationship. | |
| Thompson | Flower | Based on what the individuals had to offer and obtain the Professional Development Facilitator and Administration made recommendations for the relationship. | Orientation, observations, goal setting, and reflections. |
| Miller | York | Based on what the individuals had to offer and obtain the Professional Development Facilitator and Administration made recommendations for the relationship. | Orientation, observations, goal setting and reflections. |
| Buyno | Goldberg | Based on what the individuals had to offer and obtain the Professional Development Facilitator and Administration made recommendations for the relationship. | Orientation, observations, goal setting, and reflections. |
| Rieber | Dassie | Based on what the individuals had to offer and obtain the Professional Development Facilitator and Administration made recommendations for the relationship. | Orientation, observation, goal setting, and reflections. |
| Lee | Cheek | Based on what the individuals had to offer and obtain the Professional Development Facilitator and Administration made recommendations for the relationship. | Orientation, observation, goal setting, and reflections. |
| Crosby | Cram | Based on what the individuals had to offer and obtain the Professional Development Facilitator and Administration made recommendations for the relationship. | Orientation, observations, goal setting, and reflections. |
| | | Based on what the individuals | |

| | | | |
|---------|---------|--|--|
| Beckham | Johnson | had to offer and obtain the Professional Development Facilitator and Administration made recommendations for the relationship. | Orientation, observation, goal setting, and reflections. |
|---------|---------|--|--|

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.

Guidance Counselor
Administrator
Primary Teacher
Intermediate Teacher

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 guidance counselor, is our facilitator for implementation of RtI at the school level. She receives ongoing RtI training and presents information to the 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. The guidance counselor coordinates with child-service and community agencies to the school and families to support students' academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success; provides consultation services to general and special education teachers, parents, and administrators; conducts direct observation of student behavior. Content area teams and PLC's consistently analyze student work, plot assessment data, and collaborate about student progress. When students are not meeting grade level standards for any content area or exhibit behavioral concerns, they are referred to the RtI Team to determine additional support and interventions.

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 Leadership Team will monitor the progress of students who are low achieving or exhibiting behavioral concerns but not necessarily in need of exceptional education services. The students who will be targeted first are Black and Economically Disadvantaged students, the subgroups that did not make adequate progress on FCAT in reading and math. The RtI Team will focus on monitoring student progress and collaborating about appropriate, research based interventions. Academic and behavioral questions to consider are:

- What do we expect the students to learn or how to behave?
- How do we know they have or have not learned what was expected?
- What will we do when they do or don't learn/behave in a safe manner?
- What evidence do we have to support our responses to these questions?

During the Problem Solving Team weekly meetings, the team will discuss the effectiveness of Reading, Math, Science, and Writing instruction and behavioral expectations based on student data. Students meeting/exceeding expectations, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks will be identified through the screening data at each grade level. Based on this information, professional development needs, instructional adjustments, or resource availability will be discussed. The priority will be to problem-solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skills. The goal is to build consensus on the decision making process. This academic and behavioral work will include the following, beginning with Tier 1 core 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 2011-2012 school year, the current RtI Team structure will be used collaboratively with the building instructional teams to provide instructional support for students.

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.

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) from 2011-2012

Our Baseline Data Include:

- Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR) conducted 3 times per year
- District Benchmarks for Reading, Math and Science administered three times this year
- District Writing Assessments administered according to the district calendar
- Duval County Math/Science Formatives conducted throughout the year/Summatives conducted at the beginning and end of the year
- Diagnostic Reading Assessment (DRA2) administered as needed
- Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN)
- Code of Conduct Violations
- Promotion Rate
- Attendance

Our Midyear Data Include:

- Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR)
- Diagnostic Reading Assessment (DRA2)
- District Benchmarks
- District Writing Assessments
- Duval County Math/Science Formatives/Summatives
- Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN)
- Code of Conduct Violations
- Promotion Rate
- Attendance

Our End of year Data Include:

- Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR)
- Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)
- FCAT Writes
- Diagnostic Reading Assessment (DRA2)

The RtI Problem-solving process is interwoven throughout the SIP development and implementation by defining the problem and determining the discrepancy between what is expected and what is occurring. Teachers and leadership team analyze the data to determine why the discrepancy is occurring. An intervention plan is developed to address the goal, and determine how the student's progress will be monitored. Through progress monitoring, we will evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention plan based on the student's response to the intervention.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional development for the staff was provided during an Early Release Day in September. Additional training will occur during common planning periods during the school year and Early Dismissal Days as well as district planning days. The focus will be to identify student deficiencies and match it to instructional interventions. RtI learning will be job embedded and will occur during the following: professional learning communities, classroom observations, collaborative planning, analysis of student work, book studies, lesson studies and action research.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

After Professional Development for the team, the team will discuss resources and support they feel will be needed in order to effectively maintain the program. Quarterly or as needed the team will review the program to discuss if materials and or resources are needed.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Tarsha N. Mitchell-principal
Kelly Matz-fifth grade teacher
Juandalynn Conaway-third grade teacher

Cindy Nehrbass-first grade teacher
Julia Kendall- first grade teacher
Kim Hoffman- fourth grade teacher
Maria Miller- fifth grade teacher

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

The Literacy Leadership team meets regularly to discuss data, student work, needed Professional Development and develops activities that engage all stakeholders in Reading. The team prepares family involvement programs/activities as well as assemblies for students to promote Literacy.

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

As members of the Reading Academy, our Literacy Lead Team will acquire deep knowledge, skills and understanding of the following:

1. Florida Next Generation Sunshine State Reading and Common Core Standards and Benchmarks
2. Effective core reading instruction (Tier 1 – RtI) using district curriculum
3. Teaching of reading through the research-based best practices
4. Effective use of formative assessment and how to plan instruction based on analyzing assessment results
5. The reciprocity between the reading and writing process
6. Diagnostic assessments and planning for instruction around assessments
7. Plan and implement parent informational nights
8. Provide professional development to teachers and support staff to provide evidenced based instructional activities to differentiate as needed
9. Train teachers to analyze and interpret FAIR and district benchmark data
10. Provide professional development to teachers in Explicit Vocabulary Instruction and Strategies to increase Reading Volume goals
11. Plan and implement Read it Forward Jax activities

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.

*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: | In 2010, 77% (88/115) of our fourth grade students demonstrated proficiency. In 2010, 80% (102/128) of our fifth grade students demonstrated proficiency. There will be a school-wide focus on vocabulary instruction and a more laser-like focus in targeted groups with the implementation of Focus Lessons. Our school did not achieve AYP in 2010 as it had in 2009. The Economically Disadvantaged subgroup did not make adequate progress in math. However, progress was made Reading with all AYP subgroups. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 83% (284 of 363) of our tested population achieved or exceeded proficiency in reading | 86% (295 of 343) of our tested population will achieve or exceed |

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 | All teachers will require training in Common Core Standards to effectively implement them in all subject areas. | Seek training in Common Core Standards to provide to teachers to frame the instructional work in the classroom. | Administrators Professional Development Facilitator | Monitor implementation and instructional delivery techniques and analyze student data to determine effectiveness. | District walk-through instruments and CAST rubric |
| 2 | Resources/materials for small group instruction in all core areas readily available. | Utilize assessments to form flexible small groups for targeted focused instruction. | Problem solving team chairperson Administrators | Monitor student progress on class assignments, district, class, and state assessments. | Benchmarks, FAIR, DRA2, FCAT, and FCIM assessments. |
| 3 | Ability to choose appropriate level text. | Teach, Model, and Monitor choices. | Teachers | Monitor student texts and student performance on grade level assessments. | FAIR, Benchmark, Class Assessments, FCAT |

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

| | |
|--|---|
| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b: | In 2011, (8) students took the FL Alternate Assessment and _____ scored Level 4, 5, and 6 in reading. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Currently _____ % of the students that took the FL Alternate Assessment in 2012 and scored Level 4, 5, and 6 remain. | In 2013, out of _____ students who will take the FL Alternate Assessment, _____ will score Level 4,5, and 6 in reading. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Person or | Process Used to |
|--|-----------|-----------------|
|--|-----------|-----------------|

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Position Responsible for Monitoring | Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|--|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| 1 | 2 out of 4 Self-Contained CSS teachers are new to Duval County and the curriculum. | Train the teachers on unpacking the standards to differentiate instruction based on students' ability. | CSS Site Coach Administrators | Train teacher in various research based strategies, monitor teacher's implementation of the strategy, and review and analyze student assessment data. | District observation instrument, student performance data, and state 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:

| | |
|---|--|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a: | In 2011, 22% (76/353) of our students scored above proficiency (FCAT Level 4 or 5) |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 22% (76 of 353)of our students scored at level 4 or 5 | 25% (88 of 351) of our students 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 | Instructional personnel to supervise students in computer lab. | Dual enrollment of students in Public school and FI Virtual School in subjects that have mastered 90% of the current curriculum. | Core teachers, guidance counselor, gifted teacher, and administrators. | Student progress in FI Virtual School course. | Progress Report from FI Virtual school. |
| 2 | Vocabulary Selection | Increase vocabulary using research-based strategies to enrich student reading fluency and comprehension | Teachers and Leadership Team | Principal will monitor implementation through classroom walkthroughs, lesson plan review, classroom artifacts, and conferences with teachers and students | Effectiveness will be determined by evaluating student achievement data to determine effectiveness |

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

| | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b: | |
| 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: | In 2011, 65% (232/363) of our tested population showed learning gains in reading. This is a 2% decrease from 2011. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 65% (232 of 363) of our students made learning gains in reading, 70 of those students remain. | 68% (240 of 353) of our students will make learning gains 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 |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Students' attendance. | Provide targeted students with one-on-one tutoring. | Teachers Tutors Administrators | Monitor student progress for improvement. | Student grades and progress on assessments. |
| 2 | Balancing various groups due to the many levels. | Differentiate instruction for guided reading. | Teachers | Assess student needs by standards, benchmarks, and category. | DRA2, FAIR, Benchmarks, FCAT Reading |
| 3 | Parental Involvement | Family oriented activities with strategies for parents/guardians to use at home to assist with reading. | Teachers Administrators Parents | Monitor which parents attend and how their student performs on regular assessments. | DRA2, FAIR, Benchmarks, FCAT Reading |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b: | In 2011, 56% of our students made learning gains in reading. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 43% (3 of 7) of our students scored a 7 or above on the FAA. | 57%(4/7) of our students will make a 7 or higher in reading on the FAA. |

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 | Deficits in reading not address due to students being non-verbal. | Progress Monitoring Plan to specifically address deficits. | Teacher and CSS Site Coach | Monitor progress regularly. | Assessment data, progress reports, and report cards. |

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. | In 2011, 62% (219/353) of our bottom quartile showed |
|---|--|

| | |
|---|---|
| Reading Goal #4: | learning gains in reading. This is a 2% increase from 2010. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 62% (219 of 353) of our students in Lowest 25% made learning gains and 25 of those students remain. | 65% (228 of 351) of our students in the Lowest 25% will make learning 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 | Lack of Background Knowledge | Provide background knowledge prior to reading stories with vocabulary, read- a-louds, and building reading stamina by explicitly teaching and gradually building independent reading habits | Teachers | Principal and Leadership Team will review student data, monitor implementation of interventions for effectiveness, and assist in revising intervention strategies when deemed ineffective through achievement data. | Effectiveness will be determined through administrative review of district assessments, FAIR and classroom assessment data, benchmarks, and FCAT reading. |
| 2 | Needing more practice with reading and strategies | Students teach and use reading strategies with reading buddy. | Teachers | Review student data for improvements. | FAIR, DRA2, Benchmarks, FCAT reading |

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 # Reduce the achievement gap by 50% by utilizing Kagan Structures. | | | | | |
| | 5A : | | | | | |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | 67 | 70 | 73 | 75 | 78 | |

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: | 64% of African American students scored at or above grade level in Reading. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| White: 83% Black: 65% Hispanic: 83% Asian: 93% American Indian : NA | White: 86% Black: 76% Hispanic: 93% Asian: 100% 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 |
|--|-----------------------------|--|---|---|---|
| | Readiness level of students | Analyze and monitor student progress using FAIR, DRA, District | Leadership Team | Track student progress using profile sheets. Collaborate during PLC's | DRA2, Benchmarks, FCAT reading and math |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|---|
| 1 | | Benchmarks, and Progress Monitoring data regularly to determine learning needs and differentiate instruction | | about student progress and instructional implications | |
| 2 | Maintaining 50% active student involvement at all times. | Students focus on participation in their own learning process by implementing cooperative learning strategies by Kagan. | Teachers Students Administrators | Track student progress using profile sheets. Collaborate during PLC's about student progress and instructional strategies being implemented. | DRA2, Benchmarks, FCAT |
| 3 | Lack of Time to meet with differentiated instruction groups | Create flexible small groups based on student's needs to deliver effective instruction that maximizes student learning. | Teachers Problem Solving Teams Administrators | PLCs will monitor student progress by reviewing data creating small group lesson plans that addresses students' needs. | Instructional Focus Assessments, DRA2, Benchmarks, 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 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: | 66% (102/155) of the Economically Disadvantaged students scored a Level 3 or above in reading |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 37% (125 of 351) of Economically Disadvantaged students scored Level 3 or above in reading | 50% of (63 of 125) Economically Disadvantaged students will score a Level 3 or above 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 |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| 1 | Student Mobility | Create flexible focus instruction groups. | Teachers Problem Solving Team Administrators | Monitor student progress, plan for small group instruction, assess progress. | DRA2, Class Assessments, Benchmarks, FCAT |
| 2 | Student Attendance | Recruit academic sponsors for Economically Disadvantaged students performing below expectations | Administrators Teachers | PLCs and Leadership Team will monitor student progress | Classroom grades, DRA2, FAIR, Benchmarks, FCAT |
| 3 | Needed resources both personnel and materials | Identified students will be given opportunities for differentiated remediation during the school day (RtI and regular core instruction) and through after school programs for tutoring including tutoring at neighboring apartment complex | Teachers Tutors Administrators | Principal will monitor implementation through classroom walkthroughs, lesson plan review, data profile sheets, classroom artifacts, and regular conferences with staff responsible for remediation | Effectiveness will be determined by evaluating student achievement data to determine effectiveness of interventions specified in the Progress Monitoring Plans |

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|--|---|
| Differentiated Instruction | K-5 | District Coach | School-wide | ERD trainings | Lesson Plans Observations Student Data | Teachers Administrators |
| Kagan Strategies | K-5 | M. Miller | School-wide | 2 ERD trainings | Observations Classroom Data | Administrators |

Reading Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Guided Reading | leveled books | school general funds | \$2,000.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$2,000.00 |
| 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 |
| Kagan Structures | workshops | school general funds | \$189.00 |
| Differentiated Instruction | training via Webinar | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$189.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$2,189.00 |

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 2011, 83% (308 of 363) of students achieved proficiency. This is a 15 percentage point decrease and all grade levels 3rd-5th are in need of improvement. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 68% (240 of 353) of our tested population achieved or exceeded proficiency in reading and 162 of those students remain. | 70% (246 of 351) of our tested population will achieve or exceed proficiency 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 |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| 1 | All teachers will require training in Common Core Standards to effectively implement them in all subject areas. | Seek training in Common Core Standards to provide to teachers to frame the instructional work in the classroom. | Administrators Professional Development Facilitator | Monitor implementation and instructional delivery techniques and analyze student data to determine effectiveness. | District walk-through instruments and CAST rubric |
| 2 | Resources/materials for small group instruction in all core areas readily available. | Utilize assessments to form flexible small groups for targeted focused instruction. | Problem solving team chairperson Administrators | Monitor student progress on class assignments, district, class, and state assessments. | Benchmarks, FAIR, DRA2, FCAT, and FCIM assessments. |
| 3 | Knowledgeable teachers. | Use explicit instruction to teach concepts. | Administrators | Review lesson plans, monitor student progress on assignments and assessments. | Grade book, observation instrument, district and state 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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1b: | In 2011, 50% (5 of 9) scored 4, 5, or 6 in math. 2 students scored 4, 2 students scored 5, and 1 scored 7. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 43% (3 of 7) students scored a 4, 5, or 6 in math on the FAA. | 71% (5 of 7) students will score a 4, 5, or 6 in math on the FAA. |

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 out of 4 Self-Contained CSS teachers are new to Duval County and the curriculum. | Train the teachers on unpacking the standards to differentiate instruction based on students' ability. | CSS Site Coach Administrators | Train teacher in various research based strategies, monitor teacher's implementation of the strategy, and review and analyze student assessment | District observation instrument, student performance data, and state 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:

| | |
|---|--|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a: | 18% (64 of 353) scored at level 4 and 5 which is a decrease and indicates improvement is needed in providing acceleration opportunities. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 18% (64 of 353) scored at level 4 and 5 and 13% (44 of 351) students remain. | 25 % (88 of 353) of our students 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 | Instructional personnel to supervise students in computer lab. | Dual enrollment of students in Public school and FI Virtual School in subjects that have mastered 90% of the current curriculum. | Core teachers, guidance counselor, gifted teacher, and administrators. | Student progress in FI Virtual School course. | Progress Report from FI Virtual school. |
| 2 | Level of Rigor | Differentiate instruction to provide students with rigorous enrichment activities | Teachers Administrators | Teachers and administrators will monitor disaggregated data to determine effectiveness of instruction and re-teach as needed | FCAT data, class profile sheets, Duval County Benchmark assessments, DCPS-developed math assessments |

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

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b: | |
| 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: | There were 76% (268) in 2011 students making learning gains in mathematics which was a 9 percentage point increase from 2010. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 76% (268 of 353) of our students made learning gains and 66% (230 of 351) students remain. | 80% (280 of 351) students will make learning 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 | Students' attendance. | Provide targeted students with one-on-one tutoring. | Teachers Tutors Administrators | Monitor student progress for improvement. | Student grades and progress on assessments. |
| 2 | Understanding the process of developing Instructional Focus Calendars | Teachers will develop Instructional Focus Calendars, Lessons, and Assessments | Administrators | Administrators will monitor implementation via classroom snapshots, lesson plan reviews, student work, classroom artifacts, and conferences with teachers and students | Benchmarks, common classroom assessments, FCAT |
| 3 | Limited resources | Teachers will differentiate instruction | Administrators | Administrators will monitor implementation via classroom snapshots, lesson plan reviews, student work, classroom artifacts, and conferences with teachers and students | Benchmarks, common classroom assessments, and 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. | There was no increase in the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics from 2011 |
|---|--|

| | |
|---|--|
| Mathematics Goal #4: | to 2012. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 67% (236 of 353) of our students in our bottom quartile made learning gains | 70% (245 of 351) of our students in the bottom quartile will make learning 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 | Lack of financial resources to fund positions for the year | Provide after school safety nets to students on/off campus at our neighborhood apartment complex | M. Miller and teacher volunteers assisting at Timberwood Extended Day Staff | Safety net teachers will maintain plans and logs of attendance | Administrators will monitor plans and attendance logs each month |
| 2 | Not receiving data in a timely manner due to technical issues | Analyze and monitor data regularly to determine learning needs and differentiate instruction | Progress Monitoring Team | Analyze data and identify students in need of additional support | Class profile sheets |
| 3 | Parent/Student attendance | Teachers will provide parents with strategies to assist their child. Teachers will host Math Night and FCAT Night | Teachers Administrators | Progress Monitoring Team will monitor disaggregated data to determine effectiveness of instruction and re-teach as needed | Benchmarks, FCAT, and DCPS-developed math assessments |

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target | | | | | | |
| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | | Elementary School Mathematics Goal # The school will reduce the achievement gap by 50% by implementing best practices for effective standards based mathematics instruction. 5A : | | | | |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | 68 | 70 | 74 | 77 | 79 | |

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: | White: 88% Black: 83% Hispanic: 98% Asian: 98% American Indian : NA |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| White: 83% Black: 71% Hispanic: 92% Asian: 95% American Indian : NA | Increase the percentage of students qualifying in high performing in math. |

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 |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|---|---|------------------|
| | Lack of materials to use | Analyze and monitor data | Teachers and | Progress Monitoring Team | FCAT data, class |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--------------------------|---|---|
| 1 | during RtI that specifically addresses the needs of individual ethnic groups | regularly to determine learning needs and differentiate instruction. Make sure this subgroup is being pulled during RtI time to receive differentiated instruction | Progress Monitoring Team | will monitor disaggregated data to determine effectiveness of instruction and re-teach as needed | profile sheets, District Benchmark assessments |
| 2 | Lack of training of research based strategies | Teachers will use various research based instructional strategies to address different student modalities and abilities | Leadership Team | Conduct focus walks to monitor and provide feedback to teachers | Focus Walk results |
| 3 | Lack of effective best practice examples | Teachers will collaborate as a grade level on days designated as Working on the Work or WOW to discuss best practices and create lessons to address the needs of all students | Teachers | While in classrooms, the Leadership Team will review math journals to ensure that students are responding to high level prompting | Classroom Visitation Logs, Focus Walk results, FCAT data, Duval County Benchmarks, Math Source book reflecting higher level responses |

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: | 68% (15 of 22) students with disabilities were not making satisfactory progress in mathematics, this is less than 30 students and therefore will not be included as a subgroup. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 68% (15 of 22) students with disabilities were not making satisfactory progress in mathematics | Decrease the number of students with disabilities who were not making satisfactory progress in mathematics by 10 percentage points. |

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 |
|---------------------|---------------------------|---|---|-----------------|
| Student mobility | Tier 2: Plan supplemental | Response to | The Response to | Progress |

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|--|--|--|--|
| 1 | | instruction for students who need additional support. The focus of the instruction will be determined through the analysis of common assessments. Instruction will be explicit and timely with frequent modeling, guided practice and independent practice | Intervention Team and Teachers | Intervention Team will review the results of progress monitoring assessments bi-weekly | Monitoring assessment results |
| 2 | Student attendance | Tier 3: Teachers will plan strategic interventions for students who are not responding to core and supplemental instruction. These students will be referred to RtI team for individual interventions. Academic interventions will be provided in addition to core instruction | Response to Intervention Team and Teachers | The Response to Intervention Team will review the results of progress monitoring assessments bi-weekly | Progress Monitoring assessment results |

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

| | |
|--|--|
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E: | 41% (43 of 106) Economically Disadvantaged students were not making satisfactory progress in mathematics |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 41% (43 of 106) Economically Disadvantaged students were not making satisfactory progress in mathematics, 23 of these students remain. | 50% of Economically Disadvantaged students will be proficient (level 3 or above) in mathematics |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|------------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| 1 | Lack of parental involvement | Tier 1: Determine core instructional needs by reviewing the data of common assessments for all students. Plan differentiated instruction as needed and monitor for progress | Teachers and Progress Monitoring Team | The Progress Monitoring Team will review results of progress monitoring assessments every six weeks | Class profile sheets reflecting results of progress monitoring assessment |
| 2 | Student mobility | Tier 2: Plan supplemental instruction for students who need additional support. The focus of the instruction will be determined through the analysis of common assessments. Instruction will be explicit and timely with frequent modeling, guided practice and independent practice | Response to Intervention Team and Teachers | The Response to Intervention Team will review the results of progress monitoring assessments bi-weekly | Progress Monitoring assessment results |
| | Student attendance | Tier 3: Teachers will plan strategic interventions for students who are not responding to core and supplemental instruction. | Response to Intervention Team and Teachers | The Response to Intervention Team will review the results of progress monitoring assessments bi-weekly | Progress Monitoring assessment results |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| 3 | | These students will be referred to Rtl team for individual interventions. Academic interventions will be provided in addition to core instruction | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

Mathematics Budget:

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

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.

47% (45 of 95) of our students were proficient (level 3 and above) in science which was an 8 percentage point

| | |
|---|--|
| Science Goal #1a: | decrease from 2011 |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 47% (45 of 95) of our students were proficient (level 3 and above) in science | 50% (60/121) of our students will be proficient (level 3 and above) in science |

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 | All teachers will require training in Common Core Standards to effectively implement them in all subject areas. | Seek training in Common Core Standards to provide to teachers to frame the instructional work in the classroom. | Administrators Professional Development Facilitator | Monitor implementation and instructional delivery techniques and analyze student data to determine effectiveness. | District walk-through instruments and CAST rubric |
| 2 | Resources/materials for small group instruction in all core areas readily available. | Utilize assessments to form flexible small groups for targeted focused instruction. | Problem solving team chairperson Administrators | Monitor student progress on class assignments, district, class, and state assessments. | Benchmarks, FAIR, DRA2, FCAT, and FCIM assessments. |
| 3 | Teachers receiving training in a timely manner to plan for effective instruction. | Utilize the P-Sell Program in all 5th grade science classes | Administrators District Science Coach | Monitor student progress on class, district, and state assessments. | Unit Tests, P-Sell Assessments, FCAT science |

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: | 8% (8/95) scored a level 4 or 5 on the FCAT in science |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

| | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|--|---|---|---|
| 8% (8/95) scored a level 4 or 5 on the FCAT in science | | | 13% (16/121) of our 5th grade students 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 | Proper analysis of data | Analyze and monitor data regularly to determine learning needs | Teachers District Coach Administrators | Monitor assessments and plan for instruction | Class, district, and state Assessments |
| 2 | Student Engagement | Students will participate in P-Sell activities daily. | Teachers District Coach Administrators | Observe science instruction/activities, debrief with teachers, monitor student data, and plan for instruction | P-Sell workbooks, observation notes/evaluation instruments, assessments |

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

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

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

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

| | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
| P-Sell | 5th | District Coaches | 5th grade science teachers and administrators | Quarterly | Observations, monitoring lesson plans and student data | District Coach Administrators |

Science Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| P-Sell | texts, lab materials | District | \$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 |
| P-Sell | training | District | \$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: | | 42% (49 of 116) of our students were proficient in writing scoring at 4.0 and higher which is an increase from 2011 in students scoring 3.0 and higher. | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| 42% (49 of 116) of our students were proficient in writing scoring at 4.0 and higher | | 45% (49 of 108) of our fourth grade students will score a 4 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 | Understanding of Anchor Paper analysis | During Professional Learning Communities, teachers will analyze student writing using anchor papers provided by the state to measure progress and plan for instruction | Teachers Administrators | Teachers will meet monthly to examine student writing bi-monthly by grade level. | FCAT, district writing prompts, portfolio entries |
| 2 | Various levels of teacher proficiency with conferencing | Teachers, at all grade levels, will conference with students daily about their writing and keep conferencing notes to guide instruction for individual and small groups of | Teachers Administrators | The Leadership Team will conduct classroom visits and focus walks to monitor teacher/student conferences and provide feedback or professional | FCAT, portfolio entries, district writing prompts |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|----------------------------|--|---------------------------------|
| | | students. As well, the revision and editing process will be explicitly taught and seen in student writing drafts | | development as needed | |
| 3 | Not all students will purchase a book. | Students will purchase a self-made or class book to motivate them to become better writers. | Teachers Administrators | Monitor individual and class progress towards publishing their book. | Class observation, lesson plans |

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| Student Treasures Publishing | K-5 | Writing Team | K-5 | ERD | Conference with individual students and reviewing final products when published | Teachers Administrators |

Writing Budget:

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

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

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

| | |
|--|---|
| Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
| 1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1: | Enrollment this year has increased from 727 to 756, which includes PreK students. The number of PreK-2nd grade students need improvement. |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: |
| 95.5% is the average daily attendance of students enrolled in 2011-2012, 246 students were absent 1-4 days, 217 students absent 5-9 days, 159 students absent 10-19 days, 61 students were absent 20+ days | 98% is the expected attendance rate which is an increase of 3 percentage points from last year. |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) |
| 220 students were absent 10+ days | >200 students are expected to not exceed 10+ absences |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) |
| Over 200 had excessive tardies of 10 or more | >200 students are expected to not exceed 10+ tardies |

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 |
|--|---------------------|---|---|---|--|
| | Parental support | Quarterly awards for perfect and faithful attendance Consistent use of truancy officer and social worker Incentives for chronic absenteeism Consistent enforcement of tardy markings/reporting | Classroom teachers School Counselor CRT Administrators | Close monitoring of attendance and tardy reports | Attendance reports Attendance records for individual students |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| 1 | | <p>Consistent tardy referral system</p> <p>Tardy referral sent after 5 tardies</p> <p>Letters to students with chronic tardies</p> <p>Attendance intervention meetings</p> <p>Being proactive about attendance, instead of reactive</p> | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|

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 |
| Publish book | bound and publish | N/A | \$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 |

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: | Our goal is to reduce the numbers of out of school suspensions |
| 2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions |
| 2% (31 of 730) students received in school suspension | 1% (10 of 756) students will receive in school suspension |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School |
| 2% (16 of 730) students received in school suspension | 1% (10 of 756) students will receive in school suspension |
| 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions |
| 2% (31 of 730) students were suspended out of school | 1% (10 of 756) will be suspended out of school |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School |
| 2% (18 of 730) students were suspended out of school | 1% (10 of 756) will be suspended out of school |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|--|---|---|-------------------------------------|
| 1 | Lack of interventions for extreme behaviors | CHAMPs KAGAN Bullying prevention curriculum Implement Second Step program Use Behavioral tools Utilizing Full Service Schools for referring students Contacting behavioral interventionist | Teachers Guidance Counselor Administrators | Monitor disaggregated referral data and review interventions for each repeat offense. | Student Surveys and Discipline Data |
| 2 | Not referring students to Rtl | Contacting behavioral interventionist | Teachers Guidance Counselor Administrators | Monitor conduct grades of select students | Suspension Rate Report |
| 3 | Lack of interventions | Implement Foundations and Champs with fidelity | Administrators | Monitor disaggregated referral data | Foundations Survey |

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| Rtl for behaviors | K-5 | Rtl Team Administrators | K-5 | ERD | Observations and discipline data | Administrators |

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 |
| Rtl for behaviors | training | N/A | \$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> | Our parental involvement goal is to increase the percentage of parents participating in school activities by 10%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement: | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: |
| 40% (260) parents/families attend parent involvement | 50% (378) parents/families are expected to attend |

| activities on the average. | | | activities on average | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| 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 | Volunteers do not add hours in the Volunteer Book | Each Team Leader will ensure volunteers document time spent volunteering for all events including Dudes Do Read, Spring Clean Up, and Spring Festival, etc. | Assistant Principal | Review Volunteer Notebook monthly | Five Star Award |
| 2 | Teachers do not document volunteer forms | Provide teachers with information and documentation to record volunteer hours | Assistant Principal and Team Leaders | Teacher do not document volunteer forms | Five Star Award |
| 3 | Lack of involvement in PTA because of length of meeting | Monitor the agenda to ensure it is reasonable and change meeting time if needed | Administrators | Monitor PTA meeting sign-in sheets | Meeting minutes and sign-in sheet |

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: | | | Implement STEM practices regularly in all K-5 classrooms. | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Lack of knowledge in all content areas to integrate effectively | Engage students in inquiry | Administrators District Science Coaches | Review lesson plans for problem solving questions, observe students to see if they are asking complex questions, and monitor progress in all areas related to STEM | CAST rubric |

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)

Safe and Civil Schools 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. Safe and Civil Schools Goal Safe and Civil Schools Goal #1: | Establish a safe and respectful school, which is centered on the district's core belief that all schools can be safe learning environments where every student and adult is valued and respected. To significantly decrease incidents of fighting, battery, bullying, harrasment and intimidation among all students. Eliminate the School Crime and Violence incidents by half. |
|---|--|

| | |
|---------------------|----------------------|
| 2012 Current level: | 2013 Expected level: |
|---------------------|----------------------|

| | |
|---|--|
| There were a total of 206 School Crime and Violence incidents reported. | There will be 150 or less School Crime and Violence incidents. |
|---|--|

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 and adults may not know how to report incidents or to whom to report them. | Annual instruction on bullying prevention is available to all students and adults in our schools. | Foundations Team Principal Assistant Principal | School Crime and Violence Incident Report Data (DIS018) and Climate Survey will be analyzed monthly and annually respectively. | Student Climate Survey School Crime an Violence Incident Report (DIS018) Informal/Formal Observations using the CAST instrument Domain 2 |
| 2 | Media Specialist may not have enough time to teach all lessons for each character trait. | A community-based character education program which focuses on six pillars of character - trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, citizenship will be implemented and modeled in all classes. Students will be recognized monthly for modeling the expected behavior. | Media Specialist Principal Assistant Principal | Climate Survey Student Discipline/Incidents Records (DIS023) Student Report Cards will be analyzed annually and quarterly. | Climate Survey Student Discipline/Incidents Records (DIS023) Student Report Cards |
| 3 | Teachers will not implement the program with fidelity due to lack of understanding and/or training. | CHAMPs is a proactive and prosocial approach to classroom management covering eight aspects will be implemented school-wide. This program is a district-wide initiative. | Instructional Leadership Team Principal Assistant Principal Foundations Team | Administrator Observations using CHAMPs Walk-through instrument in various rooms daily and monitor discipline records analyzing data quarterly. | CHAMPs Walk-Through instrument Student Discipline Records (DIS023) |

(PLC) or PD Activity

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

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

Budget:

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

End of Safe and Civil Schools Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Guided Reading | leveled books | school general funds | \$2,000.00 |
| Science | P-Sell | texts, lab materials | District | \$0.00 |
| Attendance | Publish book | bound and publish | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$2,000.00 |
| 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 |
| Reading | Kagan Structures | workshops | school general funds | \$189.00 |
| Reading | Differentiated Instruction | training via Webinar | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Science | P-Sell | training | District | \$0.00 |
| Suspension | RtI for behaviors | training | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$189.00 |
| 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: \$2,189.00 |

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 (Uploaded on 10/1/2012)

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 |
|--|------------|
| Purchase intervention materials for teacher to use during RtI and before/after school. | \$2,167.00 |

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

- to participate in planning and monitoring of school buildings and grounds.
- to initiate activities or programs that generate greater cooperation between the community and the school;
- to assist in the development of educational goals and objectives.
- to review and provide input on curriculum issues.
- to recommend various support services and resources.
- to assist in the preparation of the accreditation report.
- to review the impact of property development and zoning changes in the vicinity of the school as they relate to the safety, welfare and educational opportunities of the students.
- Host fundraisers search for and write grants to acquire funds to add technology into the classrooms and update the APNN TV production studio.
- to perform any such functions as are prescribed by regulations of the school board.
- to perform 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 ABESS PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011 | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------|---|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 83% | 83% | 82% | 55% | 303 | 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 | 67% | 67% | | | 134 | 3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School? | 60% (YES) | 67% (YES) | | | 127 | 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 | | | | | 564 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | A | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |

| Duval School District ABESS PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010 | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------|---|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 79% | 82% | 89% | 58% | 308 | 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 | 64% | 65% | | | 129 | 3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School? | 61% (YES) | 70% (YES) | | | 131 | Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math. |
| FCAT Points Earned | | | | | 568 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | A | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |