

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: WILLIAM D. MOSELEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Putnam

Principal: Laura W. France

SAC Chair: Michelle McCullough

Superintendent: Thomas Townsend

Date of School Board Approval: Pending Board Approval on November 3, 2012

Last Modified on: 9/5/2012

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	Laura W France	MEd Elementary General Science School Principal	3	14	Yr School Grade Proficiency Learn Gains Low 25% AYP 06-07 KES A R/87 M/92 R/52 M/81 R/77 M/81 Y 07-08 KES A R/86 M/90 R/60 M/65 R/65 M/62 Y 08-09 KES A R/88 M/93 R/69 M/71 R/78 M/61 Y 09-10 MES D R/52 M/61 R/44 M/55 R/38 M/56 N 10-11 MES D R/48 M/71 R/49 M/69 R/39/M/73 AYP/N 11-12 MES F R/29 M/37 R/53 M/50 R/54 M/45
					Yr School Grade Proficiency Learn Gains Low 25% AYP 06-07 JMS C R/61 M/53 R/36 M/60 R/65 M/60 N

Assis Principal	Linda J. Oliver	BS Business ME Vocational Business Education Educational Leadership	2	17	07-08 JMS B R/64 M/60 R/39 M/60 R/68 M/51 N 08-09 JMS B R/65 M/61 R/32 M/59 R/65 M/70 N 09-10 QIR B R/66 M/65 R/51 M/62 R/67 M/51 N 10-11 MES D R/48 M/71 R/49 M/69 R/39 M/73 AYP/N 11-12 MES F R/29 M/37 R/53 M/50 R/54 M/45
-----------------	-----------------	--	---	----	---

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)
Reading	Michelle McCullough	ME-Elementary Ed. Educational Leadership ESOL Endorsement Reading Endorsement	3	3	Yr School Grade Proficiency Learn Gains Low 25% AYP 09-10 MES D R/52 M/61 R/17 M/44 R/55 M/38 N 10-11 MES D R/48 M/71 R/49 M/69 R/39 M/73 AYP/N 11-12 MES F R/29 M/37 R/53 M/50 R/54 M/45
Science	Karen Reddish	ME-Elementary Ed Elementary 1-6 Educational Leadership			

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	Accept interns from local colleges	Principal Assistant Principal	2012-2013	
2	Provide a mentor teacher program for beginning teachers	Administration	2012-2013	
3	Provide PLC's for literacy, math, and science. The focus will be to plan instruction and analyze student work.	Instructional Coaches	2012-2013	
4	District led training focusing on common core standards and best practices. Teachers are invited to attend at least 5 times a year.	District Data Driven Instruction Team	2012-2013	
5	Pre planning math training	Principal	August 2012	
6	Individual professional development to strengthen teachers knowledge of the curriculum.	Instructional coaches, administration	2012-2013	

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
--	---

3 teachers are out of field. One of these teachers also received a less than effective rating.	All teachers that are out of field will be encouraged to take ESOL classes that will allow them to be in field. The teacher who received a less than effective rating has been reassigned to non core classes. District personnel will be supporting the teaching process of this employee.
--	--

Staff Demographics

Please complete the following demographic information about the instructional staff in the school.

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
30	3.3%(1)	16.7%(5)	20.0%(6)	60.0%(18)	23.3%(7)	90.0%(27)	13.3%(4)	6.7%(2)	36.7%(11)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

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

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Mary Walts	Mercedes Boden	Boden is a beginning teacher at a similar grade level with Walts. Walts has successful classroom practices as well as positive leadership skills.	Planning, modeling, weekly meetings

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

Improving the Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged by Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies. Title I, Part A programs are coordinated through the District Instructional Team (IT) and includes the above mentioned personnel and the Directors of Elementary, Secondary, Exceptional Student Education, and Federal Programs. This team meets (at a minimum) monthly and establishes and monitors program evaluation for all schools to ensure all entitlement programs' resources are available and fully implemented at each school site and that all funds are used effectively and efficiently as possible. Communication throughout the year is ongoing with the building level administrators regarding progress toward these goals and objectives as stated in the grants. Coordination of these services is done in the following ways: (1) Principal meetings are scheduled monthly; (2) Periodic and scheduled validity assessments are completed during the year by the IT; (3) Email dissemination regarding technical assistance papers and guidance are made available to the school sites; (4) Training meetings are held targeting goals and objectives set by each participating school. (5) Collaborative assistance is provided by several consultants hired to address specific deficiencies demonstrated by participating schools through the comprehensive district-wide assessments completed prior to and at the outset of the year; (6) Quarterly review of periodic assessment data will be completed with the results reported to each participating school for review and needed

revisions in objectives or instructional strategies are addressed.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

In addition to the services provided by Title I, part A, the district uses Part C funds to Improve the Academic Achievement of the school's migratory children. Title I, Part C initiatives are coordinated by the district Instructional Team (IT) and includes the above mentioned personnel at the school site and the Directors of Elementary, Secondary and Exceptional Student Education.

Title I, Part D

See Title I, Part A. In addition, Putnam County District Schools maintains collaborative and partner-like relationships with Family Medical and Dental Services and Putnam Health (Health services for students) to serve Homeless and Neglected and Delinquent students by providing health services. The District also partners with the Department of Juvenile Justice and Putnam County Sheriff's Department to target delinquent students and provide mentoring and counseling services that foster relationships and provide supplemental support services. Funds are also utilized to provide services at the district's Solutions Center (Alternative Center).

Title II

Preparing, Training, and Recruiting High Quality Teachers and Principals includes Part A, Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund and Part D, Enhancing Education Through Technology. Initiatives to improve the quality of instruction are directed by Local Educational Agencies. These programs are directed through the district's Curriculum and Instruction Team (IT) and includes the above mentioned personnel and the Directors of Staff Development, Elementary, Secondary, Exceptional Education, and Federal Programs.

Title III

The school coordinates language Instruction for Limited English Proficient and Immigrant students to improve their academic achievement. LEP and Immigrant education initiatives are supervised by the Putnam Department of Curriculum and Instruction. This team meets (at a minimum) monthly and establishes and monitors program evaluation for all schools to ensure that services are aligned to specific school needs and are efficiently funded without duplication.

Articulation is ongoing regarding progress toward these goals and objectives as stated in the grants.

Coordination of these services is done in the following ways:

- (1) Principal meetings are scheduled monthly;
- (2) Periodic and scheduled validity assessments are completed during the year by the IT;
- (3) Email dissemination regarding technical assistance papers and guidance are made available to the school sites;
- (4) Training meetings are held targeting goals and objectives set by each school.
- (5) Collaborative assistance is provided by several consultants hired to address specific deficiencies demonstrated by participating schools through the comprehensive district-wide assessments completed prior to and at the outset of the year;
- (6) Quarterly review of periodic assessment data will be completed with the results reported to each participating school for review and needed revisions in objectives or instructional strategies are addressed. At the school level, teachers and administrators can access LEP and Immigrant student's progress monitoring plan across multiple data sources.

Title X- Homeless

The McKinney-Vento Homeless Education Assistance Improvement Act provides additional services to our students classified as homeless.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Moseley Elementary students are offered an opportunity to participate in the 21st Century After School Program. Students are also offered afterschool tutoring via Supplemental Educational Services.

Violence Prevention Programs

Moseley Elementary participates in Red Ribbon Week, Say No to Violence Poster Contest (offered by the State Attorney Office), Safe and Drug Free Program, Bully Free program offered by School Safety Officers, and Lauren's Kids program in Kindergarten (good touch/Bad touch). Passport to Peace is a character education program that is implemented throughout the school year.

Nutrition Programs

Every child is offered a breakfast free of cost each morning in the Moseley Elementary cafeteria. The USDA Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program is offered to all students and adults three times a week. Non perishable groceries are sent home with select students to supplement weekend meals via Snack in a Bag program supplied by school volunteers and donations in partnership with local churches. Students participating in after school programs through SES or 21st Century are provided a nutritional snack.

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

Title VI: Flexibility and Accountability includes Part B, Rural Education Initiative. These programs are administered by the the Director of Professional Development.

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The school-based MTSS/RtI Leadership Team includes the principal, assistant principal, school instructional coaches, guidance counselor, school psychologist, and lead teachers.

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 Leadership Team will focus meetings around implementation of MTSS/RtI and identifying students in need of Tier II or Tier III intervention services. The team will meet every 20 days to review the following:

- * review of universal screening data and link it to instructional decisions
- * review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level
- * identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks.

Based on the above information, the team will:

- * identify professional development and resources
- * collaborate regularly to problem solve and share effective practices
- * evaluate implementation
- * review individual student's intervention data.

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/RtI Leadership Team members assisted in construction of the School Improvement Plan.

MTSS Implementation

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

Baseline: FAIR assessment, PMRN, District Writing prompt (Putnam Writes), FCAT, Discipline data (Skyward), SRI, STAR
Progress Monitoring: PMRN, FCAT Released Tests, District Interim assessments for Reading, Math & Science, SRI, STAR, Putnam Writes
MidYear: District Interim assessments for Reading, Math & Science, FAIR, Discipline data (Skyward), SRI, STAR, Putnam Writes
End of Year: FAIR, FCAT, Discipline data (Skyward), SAT-10

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The MTSS team will use the initial PLC times to review the RtI process for Academics and Behavior along with the appropriate data to be collected and how to request assistance. After the first nine weeks, teachers will meet in grade level teams every 4 weeks to review student intervention data. From that meeting the RtI team will then review student data from Tier 2 and Tier 3 and determine if interventions are working and need to continue or if a different intervention should take place.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Once a quarter, trends in intervention data will be shared with the faculty and staff.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Laura France (Principal), Linda Oliver (Assistant Principal), Michelle McCullough (Reading Coach), Karen Reddish (Science Coach), Syd Breton (Media Specialist)

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

The LLT members meet bi-weekly to review progress toward schoolwide targets. After the first nine weeks, LLT members will meet each 4 weeks to review data and progress to schoolwide goals.

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

In grades K-2 the major initiative will be delving into the common core standards. This will specifically include text based writing and developing our students to respond using evidence from the text. We will also incorporate literacy centers into the reading block.

In grades 3-5 we will focus on text complexity, think alouds, text talks, writing with evidence, and incorporating literacy centers into the reading block.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 8/31/2012)

*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.

District wide, all elementary schools invite Pre-K students to a Kindergarten Round-Up in the Spring. This event is well-advertised and well attended. Additional information is sent through Child Find, so that parents of non-school age children can better prepare and any special needs can be identified and addressed prior to starting school. We also have Pre-K classes at each school. There is also outreach to the community to VPK providers via invitation to trainings and informational meetings at the district level. These initiatives are overseen by a District Pre-K Coordinator. The Pre-K Coordinator will ensure close articulation between Pre-K and Kindergarten.

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	By the end of the 2012-2013 School year there will be a 10% decrease in the number of students scoring below level 3 on the FCAT in Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on the 2011-2012 FCAT scores, 29% of students scored a level 3 or higher on the Reading portion of the FCAT.	In 2012-2013 36% of our students will score a 3 or higher on the Reading portion of the FCAT.

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	FCAT data does not inform current instructional strategies	Teachers will utilize FCAT Specifications and NGSSS district pacing guides to plan instruction and analyze student data.	Administration Curriculum Coaches	Analyzing data to determine proficiency and student growth.	District Interim Assessments Mini Focus assessments given by curriculum coach
2	Teacher understanding of FAIR data is limited	Common grade level PLC's to interpret data and analyze student work.	Administration Curriculum Coach	Analyze data to determine proficiency and student growth.	FAIR FAIR (OPM) STAR SRI
3	Student vocabulary and rigor of text exposure are limited.	On going content professional development Common Core PLC's with a focus on Tier 2 and Tier 3 vocabulary.	Curriculum Coach Administration District DDI team	Teacher attendance at the common planning time will be monitored. Analyze ongoing data to determine proficiency.	District Interim Assessments FAIR STAR SRI
4	Based on current reading data 37% (25) of 3rd grade students are below grade level; moreover 20% (14) of 3rd grade students are more than one year behind in reading. 52% (39) of 4th grade students are below grade level; moreover 28% (21) of 4th grade students are more than one year behind in reading. 48% (43) of 5th grade students are below grade level; moreover 40% (36) of 5th grade students are more than one year behind in reading.	Use District created pacing guides to focus on NGSSS and Common Core Standards. Common grade level PLCs to allow teachers an opportunity to have lesson studies. PLCs to plan instruction and analyze student data and work. Literacy Centers based on flexible grouping. Success For All Team Alphie Tutoring for targeted students in 1st grade. Scholastic Read About for targeted students in grades 3-5. SRA Early Reading	Principal Assistant Principal CRT RtI Team Teacher DA Reading Coach	The Leadership team will meet quarterly to evaluate school, district, and state FAIR reading data to evaluate the effectiveness of the curriculum realignment. Examining data collected from Interim Assessments for benchmark success. Analyzing ongoing data to determine student growth and proficiency. Examining data collected with Team Alphie, Read About, Success Maker, and Read Right.	FCAT Interim Assessments SRI FAIR

	Intervention tutoring for targeted students in grades 1-5.		
	Read Right tutoring for targeted students in grades 3-5		

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	By the end of the 2012-2013 School year there will be a 10% increase in the number of students scoring a 4 or 5 on the FCAT in Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2011-2012 6% of students scored a 4 or 5 on the Reading portion of the FCAT.	In 2012-2013 15% of students will score a 4 or 5 on the Reading portion of the FCAT.

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	<p>The level of questioning strategies are not being designed to promote critical, independent and creative thinking.</p> <p>At times, the scaffolding of instruction is not at an appropriate rate.</p> <p>Limited exposure to the NGSSS and Common Core Standards.</p> <p>Students have limited</p>	<p>Follow district pacing guides.</p> <p>Professional development on higher order questioning using Webb's depth of knowledge and vocabulary acquisitions.</p> <p>Literacy Groups for small group instruction</p> <p>Planning with teachers, reading coach and DA reading coach to</p>	<p>Principal Assistant Principal Teacher DA Reading Coach Curriculum Coach</p>	<p>Analyzing ongoing student data</p> <p>Examine data collected with Data Collection Form to determine interventions to increase vocabulary and background knowledge.</p> <p>Classroom observations</p>	<p>FCAT Interim Assessments Formal and Informal Assessments Scales Formal and informal Observations</p>

vocabulary and background knowledge.	increase the level of rigor in a lesson. Develop enrichment activities that expand vocabulary and knowledge. Teachers will focus on having challenging discussions with evidence in class.		
--------------------------------------	--	--	--

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	By the end of the 2012-2013 school year, 57% of students will make learning gains in Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2011-2012 53% of students made learning gains on the Reading portion of the FCAT.	In 2012-2013 57% of students will make learning gains on the Reading portion of the FCAT.

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	See Reading Goal 1a	See Reading Goal 1a	See Reading Goal 1a	See Reading Goal 1a	See Reading Goal 1a

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in	
--	--

reading. Reading Goal #3b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	By the end of the 2012-2013 school year, there will be a 10% increase in the number of students making gains in lowest quartile.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2011-2012 54% of students in the Lowest 25% made learning gains on the Reading portion of the FCAT.	In 2012-2013 59% of students in the Lowest 25% will make learning gains on the Reading portion of the FCAT.

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	See Reading Goal 1a	See Reading Goal 1a	See Reading Goal 1a	See Reading Goal 1a	See Reading Goal 1a

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal #					
	5A :					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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:	There will be a 10% decrease in students in the Black Subgroup who score a level 1 or 2 in Reading on the FCAT.
---	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
* of students in the black subgroup scored a 3 or above on the Reading portion of the FCAT.	* of students in the black subgroup will score a 3 or above on the Reading portion of the FCAT.

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	See Reading Goals 1a and 2a.	See Reading Goals 1a and 2a.	See Reading Goals 1a and 2a.	See Reading Goals 1a and 2a.	See Reading Goals 1a and 2a.

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:	NA
---	----

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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:	There will be a 10% decrease in the number of students in the SWD Subgroups scoring below level 3 on the FCAT in Reading.
--	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
* of students in the SWD subgroup scored a 3 or above on the Reading portion of the FCAT.	* of students in the SWD subgroup will score a 3 or above on the Reading portion of the FCAT.

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	See Reading Goals 1a and 2a.	See Reading Goals 1a and 2a.	See Reading Goals 1a and 2a.	See Reading Goals 1a and 2a.	See Reading Goals 1a and 2a.

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:	* there will be a 10% decrease in the number of students in the Economically Disadvantaged Subgroup scoring below level 3 on the FCAT in Reading.				
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
* of students in the economically disadvantaged subgroup scored a 3 or above on the Reading portion of the FCAT.	* of students in the economically disadvantaged subgroup will score a 3 or above on the Reading portion of the FCAT.				
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	See Reading Goal 1a and 2a.	See Reading Goal 1a and 2a.	See Reading Goal 1a and 2a.	See Reading Goal 1a and 2a.	See Reading Goal 1a and 2a.

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core Reading, Writing, Speaking and Listening Standards	K-2	Reading Coach	PLC with Grade levels K-2	Weekly Meetings	Observations, Lesson Plans, Walkthroughs	Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach
Common Core Reading, Speaking, Listening and Writing Standards	3-5	Reading Coach	PLC with Grade levels 3-5	Weekly Meetings	Observations, Lesson Plans, Walkthroughs	Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach
Supporting evidence found in text/Vocabulary	K-5	DDI	Each grade level	5 times a year	Observations, lesson plans, Walkthroughs	Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach
Literacy Centers and flexible grouping	1-5	Reading Coach	PLC	Weekly Meetings	Observations, walkthroughs, lesson plans	Reading Coach Principal Assistant Principal

Reading Budget:

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
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 Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

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

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.				
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.				
CELLA Goal #2:				
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.				
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.				
CELLA Goal #3:				
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

CELLA Budget:

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

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:	By the end of the 2012-2013 School year there will be a 10% decrease in the number of students scoring below level 3 on the FCAT in Math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2011-2012 37% of students scored a 3 or above on the Math portion of the FCAT.	In 2012-2013 43% of students will score a 3 or above on the Math portion of the FCAT.

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	FCAT data does not inform current instructional strategies	Teachers will utilize FCAT Specifications and NGSSS district pacing guides to plan instruction and analyze student data.	Administration Curriculum Coaches	Analyzing data to determine proficiency and student growth.	District Interim Assessments Mini Focus assessments given by curriculum coach
2	Student vocabulary and rigor of text exposure are limited.	On going content professional development Common Core PLC's with a focus on Tier 2 and Tier 3 vocabulary.	Curriculum Coach Administration District DDI team	Teacher attendance at the common planning time will be monitored. Analyze ongoing data to determine proficiency.	District Interim Assessments FAIR STAR SRI
3	Teachers lack the conceptual understanding to scaffold mathematical concepts. Students prior limited exposure to the NGSSS. Students limited vocabulary. Students inability to read and attack word problems. Students have limited conceptual understanding.	Teachers will use the District created Math Pacing Guide for math. Teachers will use cooperative learning and the effective cycle of instruction. Teachers recieved training sessions focusing on standards based instruction. Teachers will teach from concrete to pictorial to abstract. Teachers will use assessment data to plan for differentiated instruction. PLC meetings to discuss upcoming concepts and previous data. Small group interventions based on skill/standards deficit. Accelerated Math for grades 3-5	Principal Assistant Principal DA Math Coach Teachers	Examination of Interim Assessment data. Data from formal and informal assessments Lesson Plan Classroom observation	FCAT Interim Assessments Formal and informal assessments Scales Formal and informal Observations

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 2a:	By the end of the 2012-2013 School year there will be a 10% increase in the number of students scoring above level 4 or 5 on the FCAT in Math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2011-2012 8% of students scored at a 4 or 5 on the Math portion of the FCAT.	In 2012-2013 17% of students will score at a 4 or 5 on the Math portion of the FCAT.

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	See Math Goal 1a	See Math Goal 1a	See Math Goal 1a	See Math Goal 1a	See Math Goal 1a
2	Lack of differentiation of math instruction.	Common Planning time Use of Accelerated Math in grades 3-5.		Attendance at Math planning meetings Lesson Plans Data from AM and DIA.	DIA
3	Scaffolding, pacing prompting and probing techniques are not being used when asking question to promote a higher level of thinking. Teachers not creating lesson plans that follow the cycle of effective instruction. Lesson plans that do not move from concrete to pictorial to abstract. Students have limited	Use District created Pacing Guides to focus on NGSSS. Professional development on scaffolding, pacing, prompting and probing techniques for asking questions to promote higher level thinking. PLCs to focus on student mastery of standards and data to guide teacher interventions for math.	Principal Assistant Principal Teacher DA Math Coach	Examining data collected from District Intern Assessment for benchmark success. Examining data collected with SFA Setting Goals and Charting Progress Data (predicting) Examining data collected with SFA Tracking Observation Snapshot (SE-6 and IP-6)	ThinkGate FCAT

math vocabulary. Students struggle with computation thus slowing response time and limiting correct answers.				
---	--	--	--	--

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	By the end of the 2012-2013 school year, our students will increase by 10% the number who make learning gains in Math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2011-2012 50% of students made learning gains on the Math portion of the FCAT.	In 2011-2012 55% of students will make learning gains on the Math portion of the FCAT.

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	See Math Goal 1a	See Math Goal 1a	See Math Goal 1a	See Math Goal 1a	See Math Goal 1a

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	By the end of the 2012-2013 school year, there will be a 10% increase of students who make learning gains in Math, in the lowest 25%
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2011-2012 45% of students in the Lowest 25% made learning gains on the Math portion of the FCAT.	In 2012-2013 50% of students in the Lowest 25% will make learning gains on the Math portion of the FCAT.

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	See Math Goal 1a	See Math Goal 1a	See Math Goal 1a	See Math Goal 1a	See Math Goal 1a

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Elementary School Mathematics Goal #					
	5A : <input type="text"/>					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	There will be a 10% decrease in students in the Black Subgroup who make below a 3 in Math on the FCAT.
---	--

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

* of students in the Black Subgroup scored a 3 or above on the Math portion of the FCAT

* of students in the Black Subgroup will score a 3 or above on the Math portion of the FCAT.

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	See Math Goal 1a and 2a	See Math Goal 1a and 2a	See Math Goal 1a and 2a	See Math Goal 1a and 2a	See Math Goal 1a and 2a

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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:	There will be a 10% decrease in the number of students in the SWD Subgroups scoring below level 3 on the FCAT in Math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
* of students in the SWD Subgroup scored a 3 or above on the Math portion of the FCAT.	* of students in the SWD Subgroup will score a 3 or above on the Math portion of the FCAT.

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	See Math Goal 1a.	See Math Goal 1a.	See Math Goal 1a.	See Math Goal 1a.	See Math Goal 1a.

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	There will be a 10% decrease in students in the Economically Disadvantaged Subgroup who make below a 3 in Math on the
--	---

Mathematics Goal #5E:	FCAT.				
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
* of students in the Economically Disadvantaged Subgroup scored a 3 or above on the Math portion of the FCAT	* of students in the Economically Disadvantaged Subgroup will score a 3 or above on the Math portion of the FCAT.				
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	See Math Goal 1a.	See Math Goal 1a.	See Math Goal 1a.	See Math Goal 1a.	See Math Goal 1a.

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
Singapore Math Overview/Concrete-Pictorial-Abstract	K-5		all teachers	August 2012	PLC Observation Walkthrough, Lesson Plans	Administration
Model Drawing Math	2-5		teachers 2-5	Weekly lesson studies	PLC Observation Walkthrough, Lesson Plans	Administration

Mathematics Budget:

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

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.O: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	By the end of the 2012-2013 School year there will be a 10% decrease in the number of students scoring below level 3 on the FCAT in Science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on the 2011-2012 FCAT scores, 24% of students scored a level 3 or higher on the Science portion of the FCAT.	In 2012-2013 31% of our students will score a 3 or higher on the Science portion of the FCAT.

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	FCAT data does not inform current instructional strategies	Teachers will utilize FCAT Specifications and NGSSS district pacing guides to plan instruction and analyze student data.	Administraion Curriculum Coaches	Analyzing data to determine proficiency and student growth.	District Interim Assesments Mini Focus assessments given by curriculum coach
2	Student vocaulary and rigor of text exposure are limited.	On going content professional development Common Core PLC's with a focus on Tier 2 and Tier 3 vocabulary.	Curriculum Coach Administration District DDI team	Teacher attendance at the common planning time will be monitored. Analyze ongoing data to determine proficiency.	District Interim Assesments FAIR STAR SRI
3	Scaffolding, pacing prompting and probing techniques are not being used when asking question to promote a higher level of thinking. Lesson plans that are not align with NGSSS and lack of differentiated instruction Students lack of content knowledge for 3rd and 4th grade benchmarks on NGSSS. Students limited exposure to science outside of school. Students have limited vocabulary and background knowledge. Students inability to read on level text.	Professional development on scaffolding, pacing, prompting and probing techniques for asking questions to promote higher level thinking. PLCs that analyzes data from the district interim assessment, formal and/or informal assessment to help differentiate instruction in the classroom. The use of differentiated instruction and lesson plans that align with the NGSSS. Block science time to encourage experiments. Use non-fiction science content books for reading instruction (Tradebooks in SFA)	Principal Assistant Principal Science Coach	Walk through observations. Analyzing district interim assessment data Formal and infromal data Lesson Plans	FCAT District Interim assessment Formal and infromal data Lesson Plans Informal and Formal Observations

	Encourage highly challenging discussions in class.			
	PLCs to focus on student mastery of on data to guide teacher interventions.			

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	By the end of the 2012-2013 School year there will be a 10% increase in the number of students scoring above level 4 or 5 on the FCAT in Science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2011-2012 4% of students scored above a 3 on the Science portion of the FCAT.	In 2012-2013 13% of students will score above a 4 or 5 on the Science portion of the FCAT.

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	See Science Goal 1a.	See Science Goal 1a.	See Science Goal 1a.	See Science Goal 1a.	See Science Goal 1a.

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:	
--	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Discovery Science Professional Development	K-5	Science Coach	All teachers	Early Release	Lesson Plans, Observation, Walkthroughs	Science Coach Principal Assistant Principal
Inquiry Method Lesson Studies	3-5	Science Coach	Teachers of science in grades 3-5	PLCs	Lesson Plans, Observations, Walkthrough, Journal Entries	Science Coach Principal Assistant Principal

Science Budget:

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

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:	To increase the number of students who receive a 4 on their Florida Writes.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2011-2012 85% of students scored a 3 or above on the FCAT Writes. In 2011-2012 6% of students scored a 4 or above on the FCAT Writes.	In 2012-2013 85% of students scored a will score a 4 or above on the FCAT Writes.

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	<p>Teachers lack of understanding of the 4th grade FCAT rubric.</p> <p>Teachers lack of understanding in how to teach the process of revising and editing.</p> <p>Teachers are not providing strategies for content area writing.</p> <p>Teachers are not modeling effective writing strategies and/or writing process.</p> <p>Teachers are not conferencing with student to help increase student understanding of the writing process.</p> <p>Students are not using correct grammar in everyday language.</p> <p>Students have a limited vocabulary, background and language structure.</p>	<p>Incorporate writing into the literacy block and throughout all content areas.</p> <p>Provide professional development on modeling effective writing strategies and incorporating rigorous writing instruction across the curriculum.</p> <p>Provide professional development and peer modeling so that students effectively use the process of revising and editing in their writing.</p> <p>Teachers will conference with students.</p> <p>Students participate in Putnam Writes to give baseline data.</p> <p>Student will journal write in all content areas.</p>	Principal Assistant Principal CRT DA Reading Coach	Putnam Writes Student Writing Samples Walk Through Observations	FCAT Writes Putnam Writes Student Writing Samples Formal and Informal Observations

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

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

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PD from DOE workshop on Sept 7th	4th	Reading Coach	4th grade	Late September	Student Artifacts Lesson Plans Observation	Reading Coach Principal Assistant Principal
Common Core Writing in content areas	K-5	Curriculum Coaches	All teachers	bi-weekly	Journal entries Lesson Plans Observations	Curriculum Coaches Principal Assistant Principal

Writing Budget:

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

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal # 1:	Our goal will be to have at least a 96% average daily attendance rate.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
For 2011-2012 the average daily attendance rate was 95%.	For 2012-2013 we expect the average daily attendance rate to be 96%.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
In 2011-2012 25% (117) students had 10 or more absences.	In 2012-2013 we expect the percent of students with 10 or more absences to be 20%.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
In 2011-2012 20% (94) students had 10 or more tardies.	In 2012-2013 we expect the percent of students with 10 or more tardies to be 15%.

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	School-to-home communication not being delivered by students. Lack of communication between multiple caregivers and households per child.	Automated call home each time a child is absent.	Data Clerk	Skyward data	ADA
2	Lack of transportation for parents and students.	Bus transportation for students	District	Skyward data	ADA
3	Poor health that keeps students home.	Partner with health department to teach hand washing and healthy habits to avoid germs.	Health Attendant	Skyward data	ADA
4	Students with chronic head lice.	Provide information on how to treat hair and house.	Health Attendant	Skyward data	ADA
5	Earlier start time, thus an increase in tardies.	A system to reward classes that have 100% ADA and NO tardies.	Guidance	Skyward data	ADA

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	Our goal for 2012-2013 would be to decrease the number of suspensions by 10%.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
In 2011-2012 the total number of In-School Suspensions were 33.	Because we did not use the In School Suspension code until May of 2012, I believe the number of occurrences will rise.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
In 2012-2013 16 students were assigned In School Suspension.	Because we did not use the In School Suspension code until May of 2012, I believe the number of students this impacts will rise.

2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
In 2011-2012 there were 190 incidents in which suspensions were given from Moseley Elementary School.	In 2012-2013 the expected number of events in which suspensions are given at Moseley Elementary School will be no more than 171.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
In 2011-2012 there were 59 students who had suspensions from Moseley Elementary School.	In 2012-2013 the expected number of students who will have suspensions from Moseley Elementary School will be no more than 54.

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	Conflicts that arise in the neighborhoods surrounding the school are brought to school.	The first 15 minutes of the day is focused on activities from Passport to Peace and positive character traits. Getting Along Together curriculum from SFA and Conflict Resolution. Positive Behavior Support System in each class and school wide	Principal Assistant Principal Guidance Classroom Teacher	Decreased referrals to the office	Behavior Reports run through Skyward
2	Students are not aware of what good character traits looks like. The use of physical force is not discouraged in some homes.	Passport to Peace program explicitly teaches the trait and rewards for children exhibiting the traits.	Classroom Teacher Guidance	Decreased referrals to the office. Increase of reported indicators of respect.	Behavior reports run through Skyward. Title I Climate Survey (Student, Parent, and Teacher)
3	Expected daily procedures and behaviors are not followed.	Create a video showing the expected behaviors followed by students. The video will be shown repeatedly throughout the first week. The broadcast will be tapered off and then will be shown after breaks so to remind students what expected behavior looks like.	Principal Assistant Principal	Decrease referrals to the office.	Behavior reports run through Skyward.
4	Positive behavior is not consistently supported throughout the school.	High Five program of PBS and school wide incentive is run throughout the year with a common list of school wide expectations.	Teacher Guidance Principal Assistant Principal	Increase in classroom receiving the reward each nine weeks.	The number of High Fives each class receives each nine weeks.

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
PBS	All	Nicole Owens	All staff members	Preplanning	Monitoring of classroom behavior/school wide expectations	Principal Assistant Principal Guidance
PCM Training	Various	Chris Lee	Selected teachers and Parapros	July 2012 Early Release Preplanning	review of procedures	Assistant Principal
Passport to Peace	All	PTP facilitators	All teachers	June 2012	Observations Walkthrough	Principal Assistant Principal Guidance

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	A goal for this year is to increase parent involvement with academic concerns.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
Attendance at activities such as Fall Festival and Polar Express are highly attended. The activities that are based around academics (Chips and Chapters/ Reading) are not well attended.	We expect for the parent involvement to remain high at the fun activities while we infuse some academic information into the fun 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	Parents frequently come to after school programs but do not frequently attend academic functions or meetings	Infuse after school programs with short academic informational materials.	LLT	Attendance at functions continues to be high.	Percent of parents involved at functions.
2	Communication from school-to-home is not delivered or returned by students.	Reward students for returning Parent Communication Folders regularly.	Classroom Teachers	Increased number of communications returned.	Increased number of communications returned.
3	Parent telephone numbers are inoperable.	Update parent telephone numbers frequently.	Classroom Teachers Data Clerk Receptionist	Increased number of working phone numbers.	Increased number of working phone numbers.

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
Positive Interactions with Students and Families	PreK-5	Chris Lee	All teachers	June 2012	Increased positive contacts and parent conferences.	Administration Guidance
Home School Communicator Folder training	PreK-5	Laura France	All teachers	August 2012	Increased communications home returned to school.	Administration Guidance
Speaking with Parents: Do's and Don'ts (NASP)	PreK-5	Laura France	All Teachers	August 2012	Increased positive parent contacts.	Administration Guidance

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

Technology Goal:

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:				
1. Technology Goal Technology Goal #1:		Faculty will use technology to enter and analyze student data.		
2012 Current level:		2013 Expected level:		
100% of the staff consistently used technology to enter and track student data.		100% of the staff will use the technology available to retrieve, enter and analyze student data.		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

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 Technology Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

<input checked="" type="radio"/> Priority	<input type="radio"/> Focus	<input type="radio"/> Prevent	<input type="radio"/> 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 8/31/2012)

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.

No. Disagree with the above statement.

If NO, describe the measures being taken to Comply with SAC Requirement

Many of our parents from the SAC team no longer have students that attend Moseley Elementary. We are asking parents to join and have not gotten enough response to meet the requirement.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

Assist in the evaluation of the School Improvement Plan and monitor the SIP targets.
Discuss and provide suggestions on how to improve student performance.
Discuss and provide suggestions on how to increase parent participation.

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

Putnam School District WILLIAM D. MOSELEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	48%	71%	82%	25%	226	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	49%	69%			118	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?	39% (NO)	73% (YES)			112	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					456	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					D	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Putnam School District WILLIAM D. MOSELEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	52%	61%	86%	17%	216	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	44%	55%			99	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?	38% (NO)	56% (YES)			94	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					409	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					D	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested