

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: R. C. LIPSCOMB ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Escambia

Principal: Susan Sanders

SAC Chair: Jason Spratley

Superintendent: Malcolm Thomas

Date of School Board Approval: November 20, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/27/2012

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

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	Susan E. Sanders	MA-Elementary Education, University of West Florida BA-Elementary Education, University of West Florida Educational Leadership Certification	1	4.5	Assistant Principal of R. C. Lipscomb Elementary in 2011-2012: Grade A, Reading Mastery: 65%, Math Mastery: 66%, Science Mastery: 59%, Writing Mastery: 83% Assistant Principal of Beulah Elementary in 2010-2011: Grade: A, Reading Mastery: 84%, Math Mastery: 80%, Science Mastery: 47%, Writing Mastery: 83%, AYP: 92%, Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in Reading or Mathematics. White students did not make AYP in Mathematics. Assistant Principal of Beulah Elementary in 2009-2010: Grade: B, Reading Mastery: 80%, Math Mastery: 78%, Science Mastery: 55%, Writing Mastery: 72%, AYP: 95%, Economically Disadvantaged and Students with Disabilities did not make AYP in Reading or Mathematics. Assistant Principal of Beulah Elementary in

		Early Childhood Certification			2008-2009: Grade: A, Reading Mastery: 88%, Math Mastery: 84%, Science Mastery: 65%, Writing Mastery: 88%, AYP: 100%. Assistant Principal of Beulah Elementary in 2007-2008: Grade: A, Reading Mastery: 86%, Math Mastery: 88%, Science Mastery: 53%, Writing Mastery: 84%, AYP: 95%. SWD did not make AYP in Math or Reading.
Assis Principal	Lisa Arnold	MA-Educational Leadership, University of West Florida BA-Early Childhood/Elementary Education, University of West Florida		1	Administrator on Special Assignment of Montclair Elementary in 2011-2012: Grade B

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Lipscomb Elementary does not have any school based coaches. District coaches assist our school.	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	Hire In-Field Teachers. Assign consulting teacher (CT) for first year teachers. Assign veteran teachers to experienced teachers new to the school worksite (mentors/buddy). Utilize START teachers.	Principal	July 2012	

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
One teacher at R. C. Lipscomb Elementary is teaching out-of-field in the area of ESOL.	Teacher will pursue ESOL Endorsement.

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
57	0.0%(0)	26.3%(15)	52.6%(30)	42.1%(24)	49.1%(28)	98.2%(56)	14.0%(8)	10.5%(6)	21.1%(12)

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
Diana Putkovich	Tonya Edgar	Ms. Edgar is an experienced teacher new to Lipscomb Elementary School. Ms. Putkovich is one of the inclusion teachers that Ms. Edgar works directly with.	The mentor and mentee meet bimonthly in a professional learning community to discuss evidence-based strategies for each domain.
Stacie Hammer	Candace Tart	Ms. Tart is an experienced teacher new to Lipscomb Elementary School. Ms. Hammer's students have shown improvement in reading achievement as reflected by FCAT reading learning gains and by scoring at high performance levels.	The mentor and mentee meet bimonthly in a professional learning community to discuss evidence-based strategies for each domain. The mentor is given release time to observe the mentee. Time is given for feedback, coaching, and planning.
Sara Sewell	Beth Ann Guerra	Ms. Guerra is an experienced teacher new to Lipscomb Elementary School. Ms. Sewell's students perform very well on district end of the year assessments as compared to beginning of the year assessments.	The mentor and mentee meet bimonthly in a professional learning community to discuss evidence-based strategies for each domain. The mentor is given release time to observe the mentee. Time is given for feedback, coaching, and planning.

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

R. C. Lipscomb received Title 1 Grant money for the 2012-2013 school year. We received \$37,214 which will be used to purchase a .50 technology person, staff development, supplies, pay for substitute teachers for staff development, software, parent involvement activities, and stipends for staff development.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Services for migrant Children are provided by the district Title 1 office. After thorough checking of the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) system and our local student data base we have determined the there are 8 migrant children at Lipscomb Elementary. We provide small group differentiated instruction to these students in the areas of reading and math.

Title I, Part D

Services to neglected and delinquent students are provided by various district-operated programs. These services are overseen by the Title I office. Our school does not serve Title 1, Part D students.

Title II

Professional development is offered at both the school and district level. Please see each goal area for specific professional development activities(inservice education).

Title III

Services for English Language Learners ar provided as required by law. Several ESOL centers are provided at various key locations in the district. Students who do not attend centrally located school based sites attend their zoned school where ESOL endorsed teachers provide services. All teachers who serve ELL identified students have ESOL endorsement on their teaching certificate. Our school is not an ESOL Center, but we serve X ELL students in grades K-5. I addition, an Itinerant ESOL teacher, funded through Title III monies, is assigned to the 8 students at our school. This teacher assists both the classroom teacher and the ELL student.

Title X- Homeless

The school works with the district's Homeless Coordinator to provide resources (clothing, school supplies, and social services referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education. This program is overseen by the District Title I Office. At Lipscomb Elementary we have identified 27 homeless students and provide additional assistance to these students and their families.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI monies were reduced and/or eliminated from our school budget. In the past we used SAI monies for school supplies.

Violence Prevention Programs

The school offers a non-violence and anti-drug program to students that incorporates guest speakers,counseling, and classroom discussion. Red Ribbon Week is held in October with school-wide activities and guest speakers. Through our school's Behavior Management Plan, we provide training for faculty, staff, and students regarding bullying. The Jeffrey Johnson Stand Up for All Students Act requires our school district to adopt an official policy prohibiting bullying and harrassment of students and staff on school grounds, at school sponsored events, and through school computer networks. In addition, our district has launched the "Bullying" reporting website where bullies may be reported anonymously.

Nutrition Programs

Our school is committed to continue offering nutritional choices in its cafeteria. This includes salad bar, ala carte items, and self serve options. Our school is a Healthier Generation Alliance School. The school follows the district's nutrition program for summer feeding at select sites. Additional programs and staff will address the obesity issue, especially in elementary age children.

Housing Programs

This is offered at the district level and overseen by the Title I District office. This program is not applicable to our school.

Head Start

We are not a "Head Start" school.

Adult Education

Adult Education programs are offered at all of the District's High Schools.

Career and Technical Education

Not applicable.

Job Training

Not applicable.

Other

Not applicable.

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

School-based MTSS/RTI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Doug Shoumaker - School Psychologist
Libby Debrabant - Guidance
Bryce Halfacre - Guidance
Susan Sanders - Principal
Lisa Arnold - Assistant Principal
Sara Sewell - K
Katie Strength - 1st
Amanda Choat - 2nd
Bonny Shiflett - 3rd
Karla Tindell - 4th
Anita Schmitt - 5th
Amanda Sanstead - ESE
Jesse Harms - Special Area

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 MTSS Leadership Team will meet monthly or as needed to deal with problem solving and response to intervention.

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 MTSS Leadership Team will provide data for the SIP that deals with problem solving and response to intervention. This Data will be used to write goals for :

1. Reading
2. Math
3. Science
4. Writing
5. Attendance
6. Suspension
7. Drop out Prevention

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.

The MTSS Leadership Team will provide data for the SIP that deal with problem solving and response to intervention. This Data will be used to write goals for :

1. Reading
2. Math
3. Science
4. Writing
5. Attendance
6. Suspension
7. Drop out Prevention

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional development in the problem-solving process, elements of the tiers, and data collection/graphing will be provided by the assigned School Psychologist for all new employees in September, 2013. Continuing professional development will be provided by content specialists during teachers' common planning time. Small sessions will be held throughout the year on topics such as instructional strategies, graphing and appropriate documentation as the need arises. The MTSS Team will determine additional professional development needs during the twice monthly MTSS Leadership Team meetings.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

R. C. Lipscomb Elementary supports the plan by providing substitutes as needed to release teachers for MTSS meetings and data collections as needed. Training is provided to new staff members as needed. Teachers are refreshed in the MTSS process periodically as needed during the school year.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Susan Sanders - Principal
Lisa Arnold - Assistant Principal
Kim Collier - K
Katie Strength - 1st
Tammy Miller - 2nd
Katie Marsh - 3rd
Laura Eggart - 4th
Stacie Hammer - 5th
Jodie Ritchie - ESE
Melissa Dorsett - Special Area

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

The LLT will meet monthly or as needed to provide guidance on school academic issues such as Reading, Math, Writing, Language Arts, Social Studies, and Science.

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

The major initiatives for the LLT will be:

1. To develop strategies for raising the lower quartile in Reading.
2. To develop strategies for raising the lower quartile in Math.
3. To develop strategies for raising the 4th grade scores in Writing.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 10/26/2012)

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

R. C. Lipscomb Elementary does not have a Title 1 Pre-K Program. Voluntary Pre-K students in Escambia County are served by private providers through the Escambia County Readiness Coalition and the Escambia County School District at selected locations. Children that are enrolled in local preschools, such as Headstart, are given the opportunity to come and visit in our Kindergarten classrooms. Our Kindergarten teachers meet with students and parents during preschool to discuss classroom expectations. This is a time when the child can get to know the teacher, see the classroom, and become familiar with the surroundings. Parents appreciate the opportunity to visit the school, meet the teacher, and find out needed information. The children are noticeably more comfortable the first day of school and seem to take on all the changes with ease.

Many of our Kindergarten students this year have not had Pre-K experience. This means that our Kindergarten teachers have to back up their curriculum to meet the needs of the children coming in to our Kindergarten classrooms. Our teachers do an outstanding job of transitioning preschool children into our public education system.

*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.

Not applicable.

*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?

Not applicable.

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?

Not applicable.

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](#)

Not applicable.

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 achieving level 3 in Reading in grades 3-5 will be maintained at 25% (122) or increase by 1 percentage point.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
In 2011, 84%(403) of the students tested at R. C. Lipscomb Elementary achieved Reading proficiency. In 2012, 25%(122) of the students tested at R. C. Lipscomb Elementary achieved Reading proficiency.		In 2013, the percentage of students achieving level 3 in Reading in grades 3-5 will be maintained at 25% (122) or increase by 1 percentage point.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Common Core Standards in Reading implementation.	1. Continue with FAIR testing 2. Teacher Inservice 3. Dissaggregate data	1. Principal 2. Assistant Principal 3. Classroom teacher	1. Review FAIR data 2. Classroom assessments	1. Fair data 2. FCAT Reading 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:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:		There are not enough FAA students to report at R. C. Lipscomb Elementary School.			
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 reading. Reading Goal #2a:		The percentage of students scoring at or above Level 4 in Reading in grades 3-5 will be maintained at 20% (196) or increase by 1 percentage point.			
---	--	--	--	--	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2011, 48% (231) of the students tested at R. C. Lipscomb Elementary scored at or above Level 4 in Reading. In 2012, 20% (196) of the students tested at R. C. Lipscomb Elementary scored at or above Level 4 in Reading.	In 2013, the percentage of students scoring at or above Level 4 in Reading in grades 3-5 will be maintained at 20% (196) or increase by 1 percentage point.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Common Core Standards in Reading implementation.	1. Continue with FAIR assessment. 2. Teacher Inservice 3. Dissaggregate data	1. Principal 2. Assistant Principal 3. Classroom teacher	1. Review FAIR data 2. Classroom assessments	1. Fair Data 2. FCAT Reading 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 reading. Reading Goal #2b:	There are not enough FAA students to report at R. C. Lipscomb Elementary School.
--	--

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 reading. Reading Goal #3a:	65% or more of students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains in Reading.
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2011, 68% (326)of students in grades 3-5 made learning gains in Reading. In 2012, 64% (219)of students in grades 3-5 made learning gains in Reading.	65% or more of students in grades 3-5 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. Fluency rate 2. Comprehension	1. Continue with FAIR testing.	1. Principal 2. Assistant	1. Data analysis 2. Review FAIR	1. FAIR data

1	3. Decoding skills	2. Data analysis 3. FCAT prep classes in February 4. Reading Inservice	Principal 3. Classroom teacher	Assessment and OPM reports to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the created schedule and that students are making progress towards each benchmark assessment.
---	--------------------	--	-----------------------------------	---

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal # 3b:	There are not enough FAA students to report at R. C. Lipscomb Elementary School.
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 reading. Reading Goal # 4:	63% of students in the lowest quartile will make learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2011, 53% of students in the lowest quartile made learning gains. In 2012, 62% of students in the lowest quartile made learning gains.	In 2013, 63% of students in the lowest 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	1. Productive time to work in small groups 2. Fluency rate 3. Comprehension 4. Decoding skills 5. Large ESE population	1. Continue with FAIR assessment. 2. Review FAIR Assessment and OPM reports to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the created schedule and that students are making progress towards each benchmark assessment.	1. Principal 2. Assistant Principal 3. Classroom teacher	1. Review FAIR data 2. Classroom assessments	1. FAIR data 2. Classroom data. 3. FCAT data

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 # By the school year 2016-2017, R. C. Lipscomb Elementary School will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	66	75	78	80	83	

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:	Each subgroup will maintain or increase by 1 percentile point.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, White (72%), Black (40%), Hispanic (44%), and Asian (77%) students made satisfactory progress in reading.	The expected level of performance in 2013 is as follows: White (80%), Black (49%), Hispanic (47%), and Asian (100%).

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
2	1. Common Core Standards in Reading implementation.	1. Continue with FAIR testing 2. Teacher inservice 3. Dissaggregate data	1. Principal 2. Assistant Principal 3. Classroom Teacher	1. Review FAIR data 2. Classroom assessments	1. FAIR data 2. FCAT Reading 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 subgroup:

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	There are 8 ELL students at R. C. Lipscomb Elementary. Sample size too small for goal/objective.
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 subgroup:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	Students with Disabilities will maintain or increase by 1 percentile point.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, Students with Disabilities (41%) made satisfactory progress in reading.	In 2013, the expected level of performance for Students with Disabilities is 49%.

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
2	1. Common Core Standards in Reading implementation 2. Productive time to work in small groups 3. Fluency rate 4. Comprehension 5. Decoding skills	1. Continue with FAIR testing 2. Teacher inservice 3. Review FAIR Assessment and OPM reports to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the created schedule and that students are making progress towards each benchmark assessment.	1. Principal 2. Assistant Principal 3. Classroom Teacher	1. Review FAIR data 2. Classroom assessments	1. FAIR data 2. FCAT Reading 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 subgroup:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	Economically Disadvantaged students will maintain or increase by 1 percentile point.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, Economically Disadvantaged (52%) students made satisfactory progress in reading.	In 2013, the expected level of performance for Economically Disadvantaged students is 58%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Common Core Standards in Reading implementation 2. Productive time to work in small groups 3. Fluency rate 4. Comprehension 5. Decoding skills	1. Continue with FAIR testing 1. Continue with FAIR testing 2. Teacher inservice 3. Review FAIR Assessment and OPM reports to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the created schedule and that students are making progress towards each benchmark assessment.	1. Principal 2. Assistant Principal 3. Classroom Teacher	1. Review FAIR data 2. Classroom assessments	1. FAIR data 2. FCAT Reading data

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Text Complexity Close Reading Common Core Standards	Grades K-5	District Reading Specialist	K-5 Classroom Teachers and ESE Teachers	January 2013	Classroom Walkthroughs Lesson Plans Grade Level Meetings	Principal and Assistant Principal

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
We will use FCAT workbooks to supplement our Reading series to prepare for FCAT.	Buckle Down workbooks	Title 1	\$3,500.00
			Subtotal: \$3,500.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Assist Teachers with Technology	Technology Teacher	Title 1	\$14,697.50
			Subtotal: \$14,697.50
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
We will have reading inservice on text complexity, close reading, and Common Core State Standards.	District Reading Specialist	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
We will purchase leveled readers to assist with reading comprehension.	Leveled readers	Internal Accounts	\$3,000.00
			Subtotal: \$3,000.00
			Grand Total: \$21,197.50

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:		There are 8 ELL students at R. C. Lipscomb Elementary. Sample size too small for goal/objective.			
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. CELLA Goal #2:		There are 8 ELL students at R. C. Lipscomb Elementary. Sample size too small for goal/objective.			
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:		There are 8 ELL students at R. C. Lipscomb Elementary. Sample size too small for goal/objective.			
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
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 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 achieving Level 3 in Mathematics in grades 3-5 will be maintained at 34% (167) or increase by 1 percentage point.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2011, 85%(816) of the students tested at R. C. Lipscomb Elementary achieved proficiency in mathematics. In 2012, 34% (167) of the students tested at R. C. Lipscomb Elementary achieved Level 3 in Mathematics.	In 2013, the percentage of students achieving Level 3 in Mathematics in grades 3-5 will be maintained at 34% (167) or increase by 1 percentage point.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Knowledge of Basic Facts 2. Comprehension of Word Problems 3. Finding productive time to work with small groups.	1. Continue with Math unit testing. 2. Dissaggregate data	1. Principal 2. Assistant Principal 3. Classroom teacher	1. Review data 2. Classroom assessments	1. Classroom data 2. FCAT Math 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:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1b:	There are not enough FAA students to report at R. C. Lipscomb Elementary School.
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 or above Level 4 in Mathematics in grades 3-5 will be maintained at 16% (157) or increase by 1 percentage point.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

In 2011, 42% (211) of the students tested at R. C. Lipscomb Elementary scored at or above Level 4 in Mathematics.	In 2013, the percentage of students scoring at or above Level 4 in Mathematics in grades 3-5 will be maintained at 16% (157) or increase by 1 percentage point.
In 2012, 16% (157) of the students tested at R. C. Lipscomb Elementary scored at or above Level 4 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	1. Knowledge of Basic Facts 2. Comprehension of Word Problems 3. Finding productive time to work with small groups.	1. Continue with Math assessment. 2. Dissaggregate data	1. Principal 2. Assistant 3. Classroom teacher	1. Review FCAT data 2. Classroom assessments	1. FCAT Data 2. Classroom 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:	There are not enough FAA students to report at R. C. Lipscomb Elementary School.
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:	71% (243) or more of students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains in Math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2011, 66% (306) of students in grades 3-5 made learning gains in Math. In 2012, 71% (243) of students in grades 3-5 made learning gains in Math.	In 2013, 71% (243) or more of students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains 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
	1. Knowledge of Basic Facts	1. Continue with Math unit testing.	1. Principal 2. Assistant	1. Data analysis	FCAT data

1	2. Comprehension of Word Problems 3. Finding productive time to work with small groups.	2. Data analysis	Principal 3. Classroom teacher		
---	--	------------------	-----------------------------------	--	--

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:	There are not enough FAA students to report at R. C. Lipscomb Elementary School.
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:	53% of students in the lowest quartile will make learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2011, 67% of students in the lowest quartile made learning gains. In 2012, 53% of students in the lowest quartile made learning gains.	In 2013, 53% of students in the lowest 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	1. Knowledge of Basic Facts 2. Comprehension of Word Problems 3. Finding productive time to work with small groups. 4. Large ESE population	1. Continue with Math unit assessment. 2. Dissaggregate data 3. Inclusion classes	1. Principal 2. Assistant Principal 3. Classroom teacher	1. Review data 2. Classroom teacher evaluation.	1. FCAT data 2. Classroom data.

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	Elementary School Mathematics Goal # By the school year 2016-2017, R. C. Lipscomb Elementary will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.
--	---

by 50%.			5A :			
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	67	69	72	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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	Each subgroup will maintain or increase by 1 percentile point.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, Black (40%) and Asian (82%) students made satisfactory progress in math.	The expected level of performance in 2013, Black (42%) and Asian (93%) students will achieve satisfactory progress 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
1	1. Knowledge of Basic Facts 2. Comprehension of Word Problems 3. Finding productive time to work with small groups.	1. Continue with Math unit assessment 2. Dissaggreagate data	1. Principal 2. Assistant Principal 3. Classroom teacher	1. Review data 2. Classroom assessments	1. Classroom data 2. FCAT Math 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 subgroup:

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	There are 8 ELL students at R. C. Lipscomb Elementary. Sample size too small for goal/objective.
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 subgroup:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	Students with Disabilities will maintain or increase by 1 percentile point.
--	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, Students with Disabilities (43%) made satisfactory progress in Math.	In 2013, the expected level of performance for Students with Disabilities is 45%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Knowledge of Basic Facts 2. Comprehension of Word Problems 3. Finding productive time to work with small groups	1. Continue with Math unit assessments. 2. Dissaggregate data	1. Principal 2. Assistant Principal 3. Classroom teacher	1. Review data 2. Classroom assessments	1. Classroom data 2. FCAT Math 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 subgroup:

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:	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

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
Data Analysis Common Core Standards	Grades K-5	Lead Teachers	K-5 Classroom Teachers	October 2012	Lesson Plans FCAT 2013 Assessment	Principal Assistant Principal Grade Level Chairs

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
We will use Sunshine Math program.	Sunshine Math program	Internal accounts	\$500.00
			Subtotal: \$500.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Assist Teachers with Technology	Technology Teacher	Title 1	\$14,697.50
			Subtotal: \$14,697.50
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: \$15,197.50

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:		The percentage of students achieving Level 3 in Science in grade 5 will be maintained at 55% (33) or increase by 1 percentage point.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
In 2011, 65% (104) of the students tested at R. C. Lipscomb Elementary achieved Science proficiency. In 2012, 55% (33) of the students tested at R. C. Lipscomb Elementary achieved Level 3 in Science proficiency.		In 2013, the percentage of students achieving Level 3 in Science in grade 5 will be maintained at 55% (33) or increase by 1 percentage point.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Time in Science Lab with hands on experiments	1. Continue with Science lab. 2. One on one teacher time. 3. FCAT prep in February. 4. Teacher aide assistance 5. Peer assistance.	1. Principal 2. Assistant Principal 3. Classroom teacher	1. Review data 2. Classroom assessments 3. Science project	1. Classroom data 2. FCAT Science 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:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b:		There are not enough FAA students to report at R. C. Lipscomb Elementary School.			
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:		The percentage of students achieving at or above Level 4 in Science in grade 5 will be maintained at 29% (17) or increase by 1 percentage point.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
In 2011, 18%(30)of 5th grade students scored a level 4 or 5 on FCAT science. In 2012, 29%(17)of 5th grade students scored a level 4 or 5 on FCAT science.		In 2013, the percentage of students achieving at or above Level 4 in Science in grade 5 will be maintained at 29% (17) or increase by 1 percentage point.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Time in Science Lab with hands on experiments	1. Continue with Science lab. 2. One on one teacher time. 3. FCAT prep in February. 4. Teacher aide assistance 5. Peer assistance.	1. Principal 2. Assistant Principal 3. Classroom teacher	1. Classroom data 2. FCAT data	1. FCAT Science 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 science. Science Goal #2b:		There are not enough FAA students to report at R. C. Lipscomb Elementary School.			
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
Science content inservice	5th grade	Lead Teacher	5th grade	8/2012-5/2013	Monitor student performance	Principal

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Science Lab Assistant	Science Lab		\$500.00
			Subtotal: \$500.00
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
Science Equipment for the Science Lab.	Science lab equipment	PTA	\$500.00
			Subtotal: \$500.00
			Grand Total: \$1,000.00

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:		The percentage of students achieving Level 3 or higher in Writing in grade 4 will be maintained at 83% (140) or increase by 1 percentage point.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
In 2011, 78% (130) scored 4.0 or higher on FCAT Writing. In 2012, 83% (140) scored 3.0 or higher on FCAT Writing.		In 2013, the percentage of students achieving Level 3 or higher in Writing in grade 4 will be maintained at 83% (140) or increase by 1 percentage point.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Unfamiliarity with new curriculum. 2. Writing expectation changes	1. Writing is taught every day in every grade. 2. Step Up to Writing Inservice	1. Principal 2. Assistant Principal 3. Classroom teacher	1. Monthly writing prompts	1. Classroom Data 2. Escambia Writes Data 3. FCAT Writing 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:					
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:		There are not enough FAA students to report at R. C. Lipscomb Elementary School.			
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
1. Step Up to Writing 2. Lucy Calkins Training	Grades K-5	1. Beverly Patteson, District Writing Specialist 2. Lead Teachers	Teachers in grades K-5	October, 2012	1. Lesson Plans 2. Writing Prompts	1. Principal 2. Assistant Principal 3. Classroom Teacher

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Implement Step Up to Writing	Step Up to Writing	Internal Accounts	\$500.00
			Subtotal: \$500.00
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
Step Up to Writing	District Writing Specialist	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: \$500.00

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		R. C. Lipscomb will continue to maintain or improve attendance.			
Attendance Goal # 1:					
2012 Current Attendance Rate:		2013 Expected Attendance Rate:			
In 2012, R. C. Lipscomb's attendance rate was 95.3%.		R. C. Lipscomb's expected attendance rate for 2013 will be 95.5%			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)			
The 2012 current number of students with excessive absences was 274.		The 2013 current number of students with excessive absences will be 264.			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)			
The 2012 current number of students with excessive tardies was 181.		The 2013 current number of students with excessive tardies will be 171.			
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	1. Implement positive	1. Principal	1. Attendance Data	1. Attendance

1	behavior plan. 2. Use visiting teacher to deal with excessive tardies and absences	2. Assistant Principal 3. Guidance counselors	data
---	---	--	------

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
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:	R. C. Lipscomb will maintain or decrease the number of students suspended for the 2013-2013 school year.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions

2	1				
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School				
2	1				
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions				
0	0				
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School				
0	0				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Parental support	Implement Positive behavior plan strategies.	1. Principal 2. Assistant Principal 3. Behavior Coach	Documentation of referrals	Suspension data

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
1. Schoolwide Behavior Plan 2. RtI for Behavior	Grades K-5	1. Behavior Coach 2. Guidance Counselor	School-wide	September 2012-ongoing	1. Number of referrals 2. Number of ERASE forms completed	1. Principal 2. Assistant Principal 3. Behavior Coach 4. Guidance Counselor

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>			R. C. Lipscomb will have 2 new Parental Involvement activities.		
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:			2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:		
R. C . Lipscomb had 17 Parent Involvement activities in 2011. R. C . Lipscomb had 19 Parent Involvement activities in 2012.			R. C. Lipscomb will have 2 new Parental Involvement activities.		
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	None	R. C. Lipscomb will have 2 new Parental Involvement activities.	1. Principal	Attendance at 2 new Parental Involvement activities.	Attendance rosters.

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
Volunteer training for teachers	Grades K-5	Assistant Principal	Teachers of Grades K-5	September 2012	Volunteer Hours	Assistant Principal

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
Host Boys and Girl's Reading Night	R. C. Lipscomb facilities	PTA	\$1,000.00
			Subtotal: \$1,000.00
			Grand Total: \$1,000.00

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		Increase the student usage of technology in the classroom in the areas of literacy, mathematics, and science.			
STEM Goal #1:					
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of training in the use of technology in the classroom in the areas of literacy, mathematics, and science.	Professional development in the use of technology in literacy, mathematics, and science.	Technology Teacher	Classroom Walkthroughs	Inservice 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
Staff development in student use of technology in the classroom in the areas of literacy, mathematics, and science.	Grades K-5	Technology Teacher	Grades K-5	February 2013	Classroom Walkthroughs	Principal

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	We will use FCAT workbooks to supplement our Reading series to prepare for FCAT.	Buckle Down workbooks	Title 1	\$3,500.00
CELLA	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Mathematics	We will use Sunshine Math program.	Sunshine Math program	Internal accounts	\$500.00
Science	Science Lab Assistant	Science Lab		\$500.00
Writing	Implement Step Up to Writing	Step Up to Writing	Internal Accounts	\$500.00
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: \$5,000.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Assist Teachers with Technology	Technology Teacher	Title 1	\$14,697.50
CELLA	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Mathematics	Assist Teachers with Technology	Technology Teacher	Title 1	\$14,697.50
Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Writing	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: \$29,395.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	We will have reading inservice on text complexity, close reading, and Common Core State Standards.	District Reading Specialist	N/A	\$0.00
CELLA	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
Writing	Step Up to Writing	District Writing Specialist	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
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	We will purchase leveled readers to assist with reading comprehension.	Leveled readers	Internal Accounts	\$3,000.00
CELLA	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00

Science	Science Equipment for the Science Lab.	Science lab equipment	PTA	\$500.00
Writing	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	Host Boys and Girl's Reading Night	R. C. Lipscomb facilities	PTA	\$1,000.00
STEM	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$4,500.00
				Grand Total: \$38,895.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent	<input checked="" 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 10/26/2012)

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
There are no expected funds for School advisory Council this year.	\$0.00

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

The School Advisory Council at R. C. Lipscomb will provide input and guidance to the school Principal on various issues. They will review budgets, Title 1 Parent Involvement Plan, School Improvement Plan and test scores. The SAC will also work closely with our PTA to provide a great learning environment for all students.

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 R. C. LIPSCOMB ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	84%	85%	78%	65%	312	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	68%	66%			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?	53% (YES)	67% (YES)			120	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					566	
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 R. C. LIPSCOMB ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	78%	82%	74%	58%	292	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	56%	63%			119	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	31% (NO)	53% (YES)			84	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					495	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested