

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: CORDOVA PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Escambia

Principal: Aggie Bauer

SAC Chair: Patrick Mrachek

Superintendent: Malcolm Thomas

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/17/2012

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	Aggie Bauer	Early Childhood, Elementary Education, Educational Leadership, Principal K-12	7	18	<p>School Grade: 2011-12 (A) 2010-11 (A) 2009-10 (A) 2008-09 (A) 2007-08 (A) 2006-07 (A) 2005-06 (A)</p> <p>High Standards: 2010-11(R-89,M-89,W-89,S-58) 2009-10(R-89,M-87,W-85,S-62) 2008-09(R-90,M-85,W-95,S-63) 2007-08(R-87,M-83,W-70,S-56) 2006-07(R-89,M-87,W-83,S-63) 2005-06(R-88,M-84,W-79,S-NA)</p> <p>Learning Gains: 2010-11(R-75,M-71) 2009-10(R-64,M-61) 2008-09(R-67,M-62) 2007-08(R-70,M-65) 2006-07(R-79,M-71) 2005-06(R-69,M-71)</p>

					<p>Lowest 25%: 2010-11(R-71,M-60) 2009-10(R-54,M-65) 2008-09(R-71,M-64) 2007-08(R-57,M-52) 2006-07(R-70,M-67) 2005-06(R-71,M-NA)</p> <p>AYP School Summary: 2010-11 - No (92%) 2009-10 - No (90%) 2008-09 - Yes (100%) 2007-08 - Yes (100%) 2006-07- Yes (100%) 2005-06 - No (95%)</p>
Assis Principal	Michelle Cox	Degrees: B.A. in Elementary M.A. in Educational Leadership Certified In: Elementary Education, Educational Leadership, National Board Certification, School Principal	1	5.5	<p>N. B. Cook Elementary (2008-2009): School Grade = A, Reading Proficiency = 92% , Math Proficiency = 89% , Writing Proficiency = 88, Reading Learning Gains = 70% , Math Learning Gains = 69%, Reading Gains for the Lowest 25% = 70%; 100% of AYP Met</p> <p>N. B. Cook Elementary (2009-2010): School Grade = A, Reading Proficiency = 94% , Math Proficiency = 87% , Writing Proficiency = 86% , Reading Learning Gains = 64% , Math Learning Gains = 61% , Reading Gains for the Lowest 25% = 64% ; 95% of AYP Met</p> <p>N. B. Cook Elementary (2010-2011): School Grade = A, Reading Proficiency = 94% , Math Proficiency = 91% , Writing Proficiency = 84% , Reading Learning Gains = 78% , Math Learning Gains = 69% , Reading Gains for the Lowest 25% = 71% ; Math Gains for the Lowest 25% = 74; 92% of AYP Met</p>

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

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

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	Assign veteran teachers to experienced teachers new to the school worksite.	Principal, Assistant Principal	August 23, 2012	
2	Hire experienced teachers.	Principal, Assistant Principal	July - September 2012	
3	Hire teachers who are certified in the area in which they teach.	Principal, Assistant Principal	July-September 2012	
4	Provide training for continued learning.	Assistant Principal, Guidance Counselor	October 19, 2012 January 7, 2013 February 18, 2013	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

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

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
48	4.2%(2)	16.7%(8)	25.0%(12)	56.3%(27)	35.4%(17)	95.8%(46)	0.0%(0)	2.1%(1)	22.9%(11)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

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

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Jamie Rickman	Alica Edgar	New to our county this year.	The mentor and mentee will meet on a regular basis for E3 observations / START Program.
Jamie Rickman	Audrey Burch	New to our county this year.	The mentor and mentee will meet on a regular basis for E3 observations / START Program.
Alicia Tucker	Jessica Kelly	New to our school this year.	The mentor and mentee will meet on a regular basis to discuss Cordova Park's policies and procedures.
Cheryl Killam	Kim Gillies	New to our school this year.	The mentor and mentee will meet on a regular basis to discuss Cordova Park's policies and procedures.
Julie Krehely	Mandy Brian	New to our school this year	The mentor and mentee will meet on a regular basis to discuss Cordova Park's policies and procedures.
Rose Coon	Fran Zayszly	New to our school this year	The mentor and mentee will meet on a regular basis to discuss Cordova Park's policies and procedures.
Rose Coon	Amy Voeltz	New to our school this year	The mentor and mentee will meet on a regular basis to discuss Cordova Park's policies and procedures.
Margaret Fox-McClellan	Andy Roberts	New to our school this year	The mentor and mentee will meet on a regular basis to discuss Cordova Park's policies and procedures.
Tammy Cooper	Charles Thomas	New to our school this year	The mentor and mentee will meet on a regular basis to discuss Cordova Park's policies and procedures.

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

Cordova Park is not a Title I school.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Cordova Park is not a Title I school.

Title I, Part D

Cordova Park is not a Title I school.

Title II

Cordova Park is not a Title I school.

Title III

Cordova Park is not a Title I school.

Title X- Homeless

Cordova Park is not a Title I school.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Cordova Park is not a Title I school.

Violence Prevention Programs

Cordova Park is not a Title I school.

Nutrition Programs

Cordova Park is not a Title I school.

Housing Programs

Cordova Park is not a Title I school.

Head Start

Cordova Park is not a Title I school.

Adult Education

Cordova Park is not a Title I school.

Career and Technical Education

Cordova Park is not a Title I school.

Job Training

Cordova Park is not a Title I school.

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Members of our RtI include: Principal (Aggie Bauer), Guidance Counselor (Cat Jordan), ESE Resource Teacher (Rose Coon), Primary Teacher (Alicia Tucker), and Intermediate Teacher (Debbie Sentz). The classroom teachers along with the counselor provide support, guidance, and strategies to other teachers on staff.

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 team meets on a regular basis to engage in the following activities:
Review universal screening data and link to instructional decisions; review progress monitoring data at grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks or are at moderate risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development resources if needed. The team will also collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skills.

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 team members will offer input for our School Improvement Plan in the months of April and May. Each goal is reviewed by all staff members who provide input as to what programs, teaching methods, etc... should be implemented or discontinued for the following year.

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.

Data sources used for the tier process is not limited to but includes school grades, FAIR, GoMath, STAR Reading, unit tests, academic screenings, etc...

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Our guidance counselor and school psychologist will provide training for all instructional staff on an "as needed" basis.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Our guidance counselor and school psychologist will provide training for all instructional staff on an "as needed" basis.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

At Cordova Park Elementary, the LLT team is referred to as the Reading Leadership Team. The members consist of one teacher per grade level, the principal, assistant principal and media specialist.

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

The Reading Leadership Team will meet 4 times per year to review our Reading Goal for the School Improvement Plan.

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

The major initiative for the Reading Leadership Team this year will be informal trainings and sharing effective strategies being used in the classrooms.

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.

N/A

*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.

Our school does not serve grades 6-12.

*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?

Our school does not serve high school students.

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?

N/A

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](#)

N/A

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:	The percentage of students scoring at proficiency on the 2012-13 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test will maintain or remain above 71%.
---	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

71% of our students met high standards in FCAT 2.0 Reading.	Our students will maintain or remain above 71% on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading score.
---	---

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 Knowledge Deficits and Need for Differentiated Instruction	Continue to monitor student progress while they are using the district's reading series, Use Tyner Model for K-2, FAIR for K-2, FAIR, Scootpad, Spelling City, SRA Imagine It!, Starfall, Tumblebooks, Renaissance Place, purchase of new technology devices, such as, Ipads, Laptops, Printers, Smart Response System, Smartboards, Projectors and Doc Cameras and software programs to support student learning, use tutors to assist low performing students	K-5 teachers	Reading Leadership Team will meet on a regular basis to monitor progress.	2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading scores.

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	N/A
---	-----

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

N/A	N/A
-----	-----

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	The percentage of students scoring at levels 4 or 5 will maintain or increase by 1%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
45% of our students scored at level 4 or higher on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading.	We expect to maintain or increase the percentage of students scoring at level 4 or higher on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 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	Need for adequate resources to provide enrichment	Continue to use E Inquiry component of the SRA Imagine It series. Provide full time gifted classes for grades 3-5, purchase technology hardware, such as, Ipads, Laptops, Printers, Smart Response System, Smartboards, Projectors and Doc Cameras and/or software to support student learning. Use Tyner Model for K-2, FAIR for K-2, FAIR, Scootpad, Spelling City, SRA Imagine It!, Starfall, Tumblebooks, Renaissance Place, and increased reading resources in the Media Center.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Media Specialist	Gifted teachers will communicate on a regular basis to determine progress.	2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading scores.

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	The percentage of students will maintain or increase by one (1) percentage point on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
64% of our students made learning gains on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	Our students will maintain or increase by one (1) percentage point on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.

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	Learning deficits and Need for differentiated instruction	Continue with the implementation of read-a-louds within all K-5 grades with an emphasis on vocabulary, increase reading resources in the Media Center, provide tutoring services, purchase technology hardware, such as, Ipads, Laptops, Printers, Smart Response System, Smartboards, Projectors and Doc Cameras and/or software to support student learning. Utilize Use Tyner Model for K-2, FAIR for K-2, FAIR, Scootpad, Spelling City, SRA Imagine It!, Starfall, Tumblebooks, Renaissance Place.	K-5 teachers, Principal, Assistant Principal	Reading Goal Committee will meet every teacher planning day to monitor progress.	2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	The percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains will maintain or increase by one (1) percentage point.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
55% of our students in the lowest 25% quartile made learning gains on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.	Our students will maintain or increase by one (1) percentage point on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test.

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 knowledge deficits and need for differentiated learning	Utilize technical assistant, volunteers, and peer teachers for one on one and small group tutoring, purchase technology hardware, such as, Ipads, Laptops, Printers, Smart Response System, Smartboards, Projectors and Doc Cameras and/or software to support student learning. Utilize Use Tyner Model for K-2, FAIR for K-2, FAIR, Scootpad, Spelling City, SRA Imagine It!, Starfall, Tumblebooks, Renaissance Place.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Data Team	Data meetings will be held on a regular basis with grade levels and individual teachers.	2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading test scores

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 # Our school will reduce the achievement gap by 50% by increasing our proficiency in reading by three (3%) percentage points over the course of six years. 5A :					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	77	79	81	83	85	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	The percentage of our black students scoring satisfactory on 2012-13 FCAT 2.0 Reading will increase by at least 16%.
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41% of our black students scored satisfactory on the 2011-12 FCAT 2.0 Reading.	57% of our black students will score satisfactory on 2012-13 FCAT 2.0 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 knowledge deficits and need for differentiated instruction	Tyner Model, Reading Groups, Read-a-Loud Program, AR Incentive Program, Purchase technology hardware, such as, Ipads, Laptops, Printers, Smart Response System, Smartboards, Projectors and Doc Cameras and/or software to support student learning, Use of tutoring	Principal / Assistant Principal	Starfall Reports, AR Reports, and teacher read-a-louds, and Classroom Walkthrough Reports.	2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading test scores

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:	We did not have a 2012 ELL subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
We did not have a 2012 ELL subgroup.	We do not anticipate having a 2013 ELL subgroup.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	The percentage of our students with disabilities scoring satisfactory on 2012-13 FCAT 2.0 Reading will increase by at least 13%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
43% of our students with disabilities scored satisfactory on 2011-2011 FCAT 2.0 Reading .	56% of our students with disabilities will score satisfactory on 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 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	Lack of a reading coach	Tyner reading model	principal assistant principal	lesson plans grade level meeting notes classroom walk throughs	FAIR reports

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:	The percentage of our economically disadvantaged students scoring satisfactory on 2012-13 FCAT 2.0 Reading will increase by at least 6%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
54% of our economically disadvantaged students scored satisfactory on 2011-12 FCAT 2.0 Reading.	60% of our economically disadvantaged students will score satisfactory on 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 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 knowledge deficits and need for differentiated instruction	AR Program, Leveled Grouping, Read-a-Louds, Purchase technology hardware, such as, Ipads, Laptops, Printers, Smart Response System, FAIR, Scootpad, Spelling City, SRA Imagine It!, Starfall, Tumblebooks, Smartboards, Projectors and Doc Cameras and/or software to support student learning	Principal / Assistant Principal	Monitor software Reports, AR Program Reports, and Classroom Walkthrough Reports.	2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading test scores

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 - Tyner Model	Reading K-2	District Reading Department	K-2 classroom teachers	September 10, 2012	grade level meeting, periodic data meetings	Grade level chairperson, principal, assistant principal

Reading Budget:

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
----------	--------------------------	----------------	------------------

Spelling City	on-line subscription	2011-2012 Title I Budget	\$700.00
Starfall	on-line subscription	PTA	\$200.00
Professional Resource Books	books focusing on differentiated learning	2011-2012 Title I Budget	\$3,000.00
Tumble Books	on-line subscription	2011-2012 Title I Budget	\$500.00
Reading Renaissance	Program used to give teachers an ability level of students at beginning, middle, and end of the year. Accelerated Reading program is part of this program.	PTA	\$4,000.00
			Subtotal: \$8,400.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Tyner Model	supply materials, subs	Professional Development Department	\$2,000.00
			Subtotal: \$2,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Grand Total: \$10,400.00			

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.		N/A			
CELLA Goal # 1:					
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
N/A					
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

N/A

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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:	The percentage of students meeting high standards on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Math Test will be maintained or remain above 69%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
69% of students met high standards on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Math Test.	Our students will maintain or remain above 69% on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Math Test.

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 knowledge deficits and need for differentiated instruction	Continue updates with the implementation of CCSS/Provide tutors to students where needed. Use of IXL, Sumdog, Think Central, and Multiplicaton Madness Programs. Increase number of technology resources available to increase student engagement, such as, Ipads, Laptops, Printers, Smart Response System, Smartboards,Projectors and Doc Cameras	Principal and Assistant Principal	Classroom Walk Throughs/Student Test Data/Grade Level Meetings	2013 FCAT 2.0 Math Test

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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

of improvement for the following group:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	The percentage of students scoring at levels 4 or 5 will be maintained or increased by one percentage point on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Math Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
39% students scored a level 4 or higher on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Math.	We will remain or increase the percentage of students scoring at level 4 or higher on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Math Test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Need for resources to provide enrichment and increased learning opportunities.	Continue training for recent implementation of CCSS. Continue the implementation of New Go Math! Series, Use of IXL, Sumsdog, Think Central, and Multiplication Madness Math Programs, increase number of technology resources available for student engagement, such as, Ipads, Laptops, Printers, Smart Response System, Smartboards, Projectors and Doc Cameras	Principal and Assistant Principal	Classroom Walk Through Data/Examine Student Scores	CWT Reports/FCAT 2.0 Data/Student Test Data

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	The percentage of students making learning gains on 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Math will be maintained or will increase by one percentage point.
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
70% of students made learning gains on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Math Test	Our students will maintain or increase by one (1) percentage point on 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 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
1	Struggling students	Response to Intervention	Principal/ AssistantPrincipal/Counselor	Classroom Walk Throughs	2013 FCAT 2.0 Math Test
2	Familiarity with CCSS	Continue to Go Math! training for teachers on as as needed basis/Continue to provide training for recently adopted CCSS/Provide tutors for those in need. Use of IXL, Sumdog, Think Central, Multiplication, Provide technology resources to properly utilize Go Math resources, , such as, Ipads, Laptops, Printers, Smart Response System, Smartboards,Projectors and Doc Cameras	Principal and Assistant Principal	Classroom Walk Throughs	2013 FCAT 2.0 Math Test

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	The percentage of students in the lowest 25th percentile will remain at 59% or increase on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Math Test
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

59% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Math Test			We will maintain or increase the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Math Test.		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Need for identification of knowledge deficits and need for differentiated instruction	Continue Go Math! Training on an as needed basis/ /Teachers will continue to be trained on the recently adopted CCSS on as needed basis/Provide tutors where needed/Implementation of IXL, Sumdog, Think Central, and Multiplication Madness math Programs/ Increase technology resources, , such as, Ipads, Laptops, Printers, Smart Response System, Smartboards,Projectors and Doc Cameras	Principal, Assistant Principal	Classrom Walk Throughs	2013 FCAT 2.0 Math test scores

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 # Our school will reduce the achievement gap by 50% by increasing our profociemcy in math by three (3%) percentage points over the course of six years. 5A :				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	74	77	79	81	84	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	The percentage of our black students scoring satisfactory on 2012-13 FCAT 2.0 Math will increase by at least 4%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
43% of our black students scored satisfactory on 2011-12 FCAT 2.0 Math.	47% of our black students will score satisfactory on 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 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
	Familiarity with the new CCSS	Go Math Implementation, Teachers will be trained	Principal, Assistant Principal	Classroom Walk Throughs	2012 FCAT Math test scores

1		on the new CCSS, Provide tutors where needed.			
2	Need for differentiated instruction	Use of IXL, Sumdog, Think Central, Multiplication Madness Math Programs. Increase technology hardware, such as , such as, Ipads, Laptops, Printers, Smart Response System, Smartboards, Projectors and Doc Cameras to properly utilize Discovery Education Assessment and other technology resources.	Principal, Assistant Principal	Classroom Walk Throughs	2012 FCAT Math Test Scores

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	We do not expect to have an ELL subgroup in 2013.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	The percentage of our students with disabilities scoring satisfactory on 2012-13 FCAT 2.0 Math will increase by at least 8%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
38% of our students with disabilities scored satisfactory on 2011-12 FCAT 2.0 math.	46% of our students with disabilities will score satisfactory on 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 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
1	lack of a math coach	IXL Math program	Technology Coordinator Principal Asst Principal	lesson plans grade level meeting notes classroom walk throughs	score reports GoMath BOY & EOY assessments

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

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:	The percentage of our economically disadvantaged students scoring satisfactory on 2012-13 FCAT 2.0 Math will increase by at least 4%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
54% of our economically disadvantaged students scored satisfactory on 2011-12 FCAT 2.0 Math.	56% of our economically disadvantaged students will score satisfactory on 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 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
1	Familiarity with the new CCSS.	Training of the CCSS/ Provide tutors where needed/ Use of IXL, Sumdog, Think Central, and Multiplication Madness Math Programs	Principal, Assistant Principal	Classroom Walk Throughs	2012 FCAT 2.0 Math results
2	Need for differentiated instruction	Use Discovery Education Assessment to identify needs and use integrated instructional resources to address those needs. Increase technology hardware, such as , such as, Ipads, Laptops, Printers, Smart Response System, Smartboards, Projectors and Doc Cameras to properly utilize Discovery Education Assessment and other technology resources.	Principal, Assistant Principal	Classroom Walk Throughs	2012 FCAT Math results

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
Differentiated Instruction /Data Analysis	K-5	Technology Coordinator	K-5th Grade Teachers	Tech Tuesdays	Math Program Reports	Principal, Assistant Principal, Technology Coordinator

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
IXL Math	on-line subscription	2011-2012 Title I funding	\$2,000.00

Sumdog	on-line subscription	2011-2012 Title I funding	\$750.00
			Subtotal: \$2,750.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$2,750.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:			Our 5th grade students will maintain or increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency (level 3 or higher) in science.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
69% of the students scored at level 3 or higher on the 2011-2011 FCAT 2.0 science.			69% or more of our students will score at level 3 or higher on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 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	Time	Provide science lab to 5th grade students for real world / hands on problem solving.	Principal, Assistant Principal, 5th grade gifted teacher	Classroom Walk Throughs, lesson plans	2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Test

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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	28% or more of our 5th grade students will score at or above level 4 on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28% of the 5th grade students scored at level 4 and 5 on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Science Test.	28% or more of our 5th grade students will score at levels 4 or 5 on the 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Test.

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	Time	Provide a science lab for our 5th grade students	Principal, Assistant Principal, 5th grade gifted teacher	Classroom Walk Throughs, lesson plans	2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Test

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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

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

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
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Hands-on science lab experiences	Various science lab materials	Science lab budget	\$650.00
			Subtotal: \$650.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$650.00

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:	4th grade students scoring level 3 or higher will increase by one (1) percent on 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Writing Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
88% of our 4th grade students scored level 3 or higher on the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Writing Test.	4th grade students scoring level 3 or higher will increase by one (1) percent on 2012-2013 FCAT 2.0 Writing Test.
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	Implementation of Differentiated Instruction	Teachers will group students according to skill level. Writing will be taught daily at every grade level. Teachers will be trained on "Step Up To Writing". Every student will participate in monthly writing prompts.	Principal, Assistant Principal, classroom teachers	Classroom Walk Throughs/Observations Lesson plans	2013 FCAT Writing Test

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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Step Up To Writing	3rd - 5th	Language Arts Department (district level)	Grade Level Chairpeople	August	Grade level chairs will train other teachers at school. Students/Teachers will use skills for monthly writing prompts. Lesson Plans. Grade level meeting notes.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Grade Level Chairs

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
Step Up To Writing	County-wide writing program	Language Arts Department	\$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		During the 2011-2012 school year, the average daily attendance rate was 96.3%, 158 students had ten or more absences, and 174 students had ten or more tardies. We will maintain or increase these numbers.			
Attendance Goal # 1:					
2012 Current Attendance Rate:		2013 Expected Attendance Rate:			
During the 2011-2012 school year, the average daily attendance rate was 96.3%		The attendance rate for the 2012-2013 school year will be maintained or increased from 96.3%.			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)			
During the 2011-2012 school year, the number of students with excessive absences (10 or more) was 158.		The number of students for the 2012-2013 school year with excessive absences will decrease or will not increase by more than 10 students.			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)			
During the 2011-2012 school year, the number of students with excessive tardies was 174.		The number of students for the 2012-2013 school year with excessive tardies will decrease or will not increase by more than 10 students			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Parents not bringing their students to school regularly or on time	Utilize school social worker to visit parents of students with excessive tardies and absences/Attendance meetings with parents of students in violation of attendance laws will	Assistant Principal/Data Clerk	Attendance Reports	Attendance Reports

be held monthly

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
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	The number of in-school and out-of-school suspensions will decrease during the 2012-2013 school year.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
The total number of in-school suspensions for the 2011-2012 school year was 61.	The expected number of in-school suspensions for the 2012-2013 school year will be 61 or less.

2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
The total number of students suspended in-school for the 2011-2012 school year was 33.	The expected number of students suspended in-school for the 2012-2013 school year will be 33 or less.
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
The total number of out-of-school suspensions for the 2011-2012 school year was 16.	The expected number of out-of-school suspensions for the 2012-2013 school year will be 16 or less.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
The total number of students suspended out-of-school for the 2011-2012 school year was 11.	The expected number of students suspended out-of-school for the 2012-2013 school year will be 11 or less.

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	No anticipated barriers	No anticipated barriers	No anticipated barriers	No anticipated barriers	No anticipated barriers

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00

			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$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>			We have a very active PTA and volunteer program at our school. We will maintain or increase the level of parent involvement.		
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:			2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:		
We had over 11,000 documented volunteer hours during the 2011-12 school year.			We expect to meet the district's goal of having our volunteer hours at least double the amount of students in our school. We will maintain or increase the level of parent involvement from last school year.		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Parents' work schedules/ transportation issues/ no knowledge of parent activities	Provide school activities at different times of the day/Publicize parental involvement activities in weekly newsletter and on school website/Inform parents of events via the school call out system.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Teachers	Sign-in Sheets	Sign-in Sheets

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$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:			Utilizing the school data for science and math our teachers will focus on incorporating more technology for students in math and science. This is a new goal therefore, we will establish the baseline data this year.		
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 resources of up to date technology	iPads for classrooms	Principal Assistant Principal	Classroom Walk-Throughs Lesson Plans	Student product
2	Implementation of software in classrooms to increase subject area proficiency	iXL software	Principal Assistant Principal Technology Coordinator	Classroom Walk-Throughs Lesson Plans	Student reports

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Technology Learning Community (Tech Tuesdays)	K-5	Technology Coordinator	classroom teachers	various	Classroom walk-throughs, Follow-up activities	Principal Assistant Principal Technology Coordinator

STEM Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s) /Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Spelling City	on-line subscription	2011-2012 Title I Budget	\$700.00
Reading	Starfall	on-line subscription	PTA	\$200.00
Reading	Professional Resource Books	books focusing on differentiated learning	2011-2012 Title I Budget	\$3,000.00
Reading	Tumble Books	on-line subscription	2011-2012 Title I Budget	\$500.00
Reading	Reading Renaissance	Program used to give teachers an ability level of students at beginning, middle, and end of the year. Accelerated Reading program is part of this program.	PTA	\$4,000.00
Mathematics	IXL Math	on-line subscription	2011-2012 Title I funding	\$2,000.00
Mathematics	Sumdog	on-line subscription	2011-2012 Title I funding	\$750.00
Science	Hands-on science lab experiences	Various science lab materials	Science lab budget	\$650.00
Attendance	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Suspension	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Parent Involvement	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
STEM	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$11,800.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Attendance	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Suspension	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Parent Involvement	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
STEM	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Tyner Model	supply materials, subs	Professional Development Department	\$2,000.00
Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Writing	Step Up To Writing	County-wide writing program	Language Arts Department	\$0.00
Attendance	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Suspension	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Parent Involvement	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
STEM	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$2,000.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Attendance	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00

Suspension	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Parent Involvement	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
STEM	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
				Grand Total: \$13,800.00

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 9/21/2012)

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
technical assistant	\$4,784.00

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

The School Advisory Council (SAC) has an important function for the success of Cordova Park Elementary. The following are some functions of the SAC: assist in the preparation of and approve the annual School Improvement Plan, provide input to the Principal in preparing the school's annual budget and plan, advise the faculty and staff on issues considered important to the welfare of the school, act as an ambassador to promote community involvement and awareness.

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

Escambia School District CORDOVA PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	89%	89%	89%	58%	325	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	75%	71%			146	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?	71% (YES)	60% (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					602	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Escambia School District CORDOVA PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	89%	87%	85%	62%	323	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%	61%			125	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?	54% (YES)	65% (YES)			119	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					567	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested