

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



Gerard Robinson, Commissioner
Florida Department of Education
325 West Gaines Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Dr. Mike Grego, Chancellor
K-12 Public Schools
Florida Department of Education
325 West Gaines Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

School Name: BAY HAVEN SCHOOL OF BASICS PLUS

District Name: Sarasota

Principal: Betsy Asheim

SAC Chair: Jaime Kisner

Superintendent: Lori White

Date of School Board Approval: 11/12

Last Modified on: 10/19/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

School Grades Trend Data
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data
High School Feedback Report
K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan

ADMINISTRATORS

List your school's administrators and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an administrator, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide assessment performance (percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and Ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (AMO) progress.

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Betsy Asheim	MS TESOL MS Educational Leadership Elementary Ed certification K-6 Gifted Endorsement	5	8	School grade of A all 8 years in administration / AYP 2008-09 school did not meet AYP in Math black subgroup. 2009-10 school did not meet AYP in Reading/Math in black subgroups. 2010-11 Met AYP in all subgroups in Math.

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	# of Years as an Instructional	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and
--------------	------	-----------------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------------	---

			School	Coach	AMO progress along with the associated school year)
n/a	n/a	n/a			n/a

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

Describe the school-based strategies that will be used to recruit and retain high quality, effective teachers to the school.

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1. Regular meetings of new teachers with Principal 2. Partnering new teachers with veteran staff 3. SCIP Mentor program provides district support and mentors for the first year for all beginning teachers. Mentor works with beginning teacher weekly to complete a portfolio and offer support.	Principal	On-Going	
2	100% of our teachers are highly qualified	Human Resources	On-Going	

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
No data submitted	

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
40	17.5%(7)	17.5%(7)	40.0%(16)	25.0%(10)	62.5%(25)	0.0%(0)	2.5%(1)	0.0%(0)	60.0%(24)

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
District Trainer	Teacher in need of assistance	Teacher is on a performance improvement plan as a teacher in need of assistance.	Mentor and mentee meet biweekly in the classroom to improve planning and lesson delivery. The mentor will model lessons, management, and provide feedback as well as coaching.
			Mentor and mentee meet

Melissa Owens-Lead SCIP Mentor	Melissa Germanio Megan Perkins	Teacher is 1st year and is matched to a mentor familiar with school and grade level.	weekly to familiarize the teacher with the school policies, assist with the development of effective lesson plans, classroom procedures, discuss best practices in the area of instruction and effective strategies.
Mary Wedebroek	Corrinne Fallacara, Robert Taylor	Teacher is 1st year and is matched to a mentor familiar with school and grade level.	Mentor and mentee meet weekly to familiarize the teacher with the school policies, assist with the development of effective lesson plans, classroom procedures, discuss best practices in the area of instruction and effective strategies.
Susan Wilhelm	Cheryl Heinlein Jeannette Nowaski Krystalle Nichols	Teacher is 1st year and is matched to a mentor familiar with school and grade level	Mentor and mentee meet weekly to familiarize the teacher with the school policies, assist with the development of effective lesson plans, classroom procedures, discuss best practices in the area of instruction and effective strategies.
Jane Wiechmann	Lorienne Nickelson	Teacher is 1st year and is matched to a mentor familiar with school and grade level	Mentor and mentee meet weekly to familiarize the teacher with the school policies, assist with the development of effective lesson plans, classroom procedures, discuss best practices in the area of instruction and effective strategies.

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

Please describe how federal, state, and local services and programs will be coordinated and integrated in the school. Include other Title programs, Migrant and Homeless, Supplemental Academic Instruction funds, as well as violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, career and technical education, and/or job training, as applicable.

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RTI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The MTSS Leadership Team consists of Betsy Asheim, Principal; Jaime Kisner, Assistant Principal Intern; Susan Wilhelm, Counselor; Lois Blackway, ESE teacher; Kathy Gold, Speech and Language Teacher; Joyce Hinkle, ESE Liaison; Jon Mari, School Psychologist; and the Classroom teacher.

School Administration: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensures that the school based team is implementing RTI, conducts assessment of RTI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of the intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RTI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RTI plans and activities.

Select General Education Teachers: Provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.

Exceptional Student Education Teachers: Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities, materials into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching.

School Psychologist: Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation; facilitates data-based decision making activities.

Speech Language Pathologist: Educates the team in the role language plays in curriculum, assessment, and instruction, as a basis for appropriate program design; assists in the selection of screening measures; and helps identify systemic patterns of student need with respect to language skills.

School Counselor: facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides information about social/emotional strategies and supports; works with staff to assist in the implementation of the RTI process;

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 focus meetings around one question: How do we develop and maintain a problem-solving system to bring out the best in our schools, our teachers, and in our students?

The team meets once per week to engage in the following activities:

Review universal screening data and link to instructional decisions; review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting / exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development and resources, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skills. The team will also facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation.

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 team is used to help identify those specific students who need assistance and are in student groups identified on the SIP that are in need of improvement while helping to set clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, and Relationship). The MTSS problem-solving process is used to correctly identify students, examine the instruction they are receiving and adjust/provide instruction and interventions as necessary to promote student growth in academics as well as social/emotional behavior. The frequent evaluation of student progress by the MTSS team helps ensure that identified students are making progress and that areas of need are being addressed.

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 Data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Stanford-10 (SAT-10), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)
Progress Monitoring: PMRN, LEARN, Curriculum Based Measurement (CBM), FCAT Simulation, STAR, SuccessMaker, District Benchmark Assessments
Midyear: Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Diagnostic Assessment for Reading (DAR), Early Reading Diagnostic Assessment (ERDA)
End of Year: FAIR, FCAT, SAT-10
Frequency of Data Days: twice a month for data analysis

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional development will be provided during teachers' common planning time and small sessions will occur throughout the year. The MTSS team will also evaluate additional staff PD needs during the weekly MTSS Leadership Team meetings and providing training as needed.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The school-based MTSS Leadership Team will focus on the effective implementation of MTSS/RTI. Continued collaboration regarding data will be encouraged to help support staff with implementing best practices related to student performance.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The Literacy Leadership Team consists of Principal, Assessment Coordinator/Assistant Principal Intern, Counselor, and Lead Teachers.

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

The Literacy Leadership Team meets once a month or as needed to determine literacy events, review FAIR data, and create a plan of action based on data results. New trends, research, and effective strategies will be shared and disseminated with staff.

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

School wide events to promote literacy. Bookfair, Sunshine State Reader Awards, Literacy Night and Build-A-Book nights will be planned. PALS volunteers will be recruited to work one on one with struggling K, 1st, 2nd and 3rd grade students.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for Level 3 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 3 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 3 - 26%(69) Level 3,4,5 - 77%(204)	Level 3 -30% Level 3,4,5 - 79%

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	Technology/network support and usage	Bay Haven will utilize the FAIR assessment to monitor student progress. Discussions will occur at CPT and SWST to review data and create targeted interventions.	Principal, Assistant Principal Intern, and teachers	Review FAIR reports and progress monitoring spreadsheets to ensure teachers are assessing students and following the created assessment schedule	FAIR Assessment reports and progress monitoring spreadsheets
2	knowledge/ understanding of the depth and complexity of the curriculum	Teachers will differentiate instruction and provide access to higher text complexity selections; discussions at CPT will include focus on IFC, assessment and lesson planning	Teachers, administration	Classroom walkthroughs, FAIR data, implementation of instructional strategies, classroom assessments	FAIR, FCAT, Storytown, 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 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 year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5) Any subgroup that is 90% or higher can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 4,5 - 51%(135) Level 3,4,5 - 77% (204)	Level 4,5 - 55% Level 3,4,5 - 79%

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	technology/network support and usage	Utilize the FAIR and benchmark assessments to monitor student progress; discussions will occur at CPT and SWST to review data and create targeted interventions	Administration and teachers	Review FAIR reports, benchmark assessment results and progress monitoring spreadsheets to ensure teachers are assessing students, using results to modify groups/instruction and following the created assessment schedule	FAIR reports, benchmark assessment results, common classroom assessments and progress monitoring spreadsheets
2	knowledge/understanding of the depth and complexity of the curriculum	teachers will differentiate instruction and provide access to higher text complexity selections; teachers will integrate curriculum; discussions at CPT will include focus on IFC, assessment and lesson planning; the school will implement an after-school tutoring program for grades 1-5	Administration and teachers	classroom walkthroughs, review of benchmark data, implementation of instructional strategies, classroom assessments, school-wide data chats	observations, benchmark assessments, classroom assessments, FAIR, SuccessMaker

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 year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
70%(114)	72%

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	technology/network support and usage	Utilize FAIR and benchmark assessments to monitor student progress; discussions will occur at CPT and SWST to review data and create targeted interventions	Administration and teachers	Review FAIR reports, benchmark assessment results, and progress monitoring spreadsheets to ensure teachers are assessing students, using results to modify groups/instruction, and following the created assessment schedule	FAIR, benchmark assessments, common classroom assessments, and progress monitoring spreadsheets
2	knowledge/understanding of the depth and complexity of the curriculum	teachers will differentiate instruction and provide access to higher text complexity selections; teachers will integrate curriculum; discussions at CPT will focus on IFC, assessment and lesson planning; the school will implement an after school tutoring program for grades 1-5	Administration and teachers	classroom walkthroughs, review of benchmark data, implementation of instructional strategies, classroom assessments, school-wide data chats	observations, benchmark assessments, common classroom assessments, FAIR, SuccessMaker

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 year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase in the number of students demonstrating a learning gain in the lowest quartile.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
69%(29)	73%

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	technology/network support and usage	Utilize FAIR, SuccessMaker and benchmark assessments to monitor student progress; discussions will occur at CPT and SWST to review data and create targeted interventions	Administration and teachers	Review FAIR reports, benchmark assessment results, SuccessMaker reports and progress monitoring spreadsheets to ensure teachers are assessing students, using results to modify groups/instruction and following the created assessment schedule	FAIR, benchmark assessment, SuccessMaker, common classroom assessments, and progress monitoring spreadsheets
2	knowledge/understanding of the depth and complexity of the curriculum	teachers will differentiate instruction and provide access to higher text complexity selections; teachers will integrate curriculum; discussions at CPT will focus on IFC, assessment and lesson planning; the school will implement an after school tutoring program for grades 1-5	Administration and teachers	classroom walkthroughs, review of benchmark data, implementation of instructional strategies, classroom assessments, school wide data chats	observations, benchmark assessments, classroom assessments, FAIR, SuccessMaker
3	Loss of Intervention Teacher	Progress monitored students will use SuccessMaker for a minimum of 60 minutes per week. The lowest 25% will be monitored and interventions will be implemented by the classroom teacher as appropriate	Administration, Classroom teacher	Teacher will use last session report to monitor success. Administration will monitor cumulative report weekly. Interventions will be discussed/reviewed at CPT and SWST for effectiveness. Intervention times are scheduled on master calendar.	Successmaker reports, FAIR data, and classroom assessments

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Reading Goal # The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your school's total population for SY 2012-2013 and the 5 year project ion (2016-2017) is				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	79	81	83	85	87	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Black 50%(23) Hispanic 68%(17) White 87%(135)	Black 63% Hispanic 72% White 90%

Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	technology/network support and usage	Utilize FAIR, SuccessMaker and benchmark assessments to monitor student progress; discussions will occur at CPT and SWST to review data and create targeted interventions	Administration and teachers	Review FAIR reports, benchmark assessment results, SuccessMaker reports and progress monitoring spreadsheets to ensure teachers are assessing students, using results to modify groups/instruction and following the created assessment schedule	FAIR, benchmark assessment, SuccessMaker, common classroom assessments, and progress monitoring spreadsheets
2	knowledge/understanding of the depth and complexity of the curriculum	teachers will differentiate instruction and provide access to higher text complexity selections; teachers will integrate curriculum; discussions at CPT will focus on IFC, assessment and lesson planning; the school will implement an after school tutoring program for grades 1-5	Administration and teachers	classroom walkthroughs, review of benchmark data, implementation of instructional strategies, classroom assessments, school wide data chats	observations, benchmark assessments, classroom assessments, FAIR, SuccessMaker

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:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
---	---

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
No Data Submitted				

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
--	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50%(10) making satisfactory progress	66%

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	technology/network support and usage	Utilize FAIR, SuccessMaker and benchmark assessments to monitor student progress; discussions will occur at CPT and SWST to review data and create targeted interventions	Administration and teachers	Review FAIR reports, benchmark assessment results, SuccessMaker reports and progress monitoring spreadsheets to ensure teachers are assessing students, using results to modify groups/instruction and following the created assessment schedule	FAIR, benchmark assessment, SuccessMaker, common classroom assessments, and progress monitoring spreadsheets
2	knowledge/understanding of the depth and complexity of the curriculum	teachers will differentiate instruction and provide access to higher text complexity selections; teachers will integrate curriculum; discussions at CPT will focus on IFC, assessment and lesson planning; the school will implement an after school tutoring program for grades 1-5	Administration and teachers	classroom walkthroughs, review of benchmark data, implementation of instructional strategies, classroom assessments, school wide data chats	observations, benchmark assessments, classroom assessments, FAIR, SuccessMaker

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.	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or
--	---

Reading Goal #5E:		above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
66%		68%			
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/understanding of the depth and complexity of the curriculum	teachers will differentiate instruction and provide access to higher text complexity selections; teachers will integrate curriculum; discussions at CPT will focus on IFC, assessment and lesson planning; the school will implement an after school tutoring program for grades 1-5	Administration and teachers	classroom walkthroughs, review of benchmark data, implementation of instructional strategies, classroom assessments, school wide data chats	observations, benchmark assessments, classroom assessments, FAIR, SuccessMaker
2	technology/network support and usage	Utilize FAIR, SuccessMaker and benchmark assessments to monitor student progress; discussions will occur at CPT and SWST to review data and create targeted interventions	Administration and teachers	Review FAIR reports, benchmark assessment results, SuccessMaker reports and progress monitoring spreadsheets to ensure teachers are assessing students, using results to modify groups/instruction and following the created assessment schedule	FAIR, benchmark assessment, SuccessMaker, common classroom assessments, and progress monitoring spreadsheets

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
SuccessMaker Training	K-5	Marla Myers	instructional staff	October 2012, weekly	cumulative reports will be printed weekly to monitor student success;	administration/support staff
Differentiated Instruction	K-5	Principal, Assistant Principal Intern	all instructional staff	on-going	CPT discussions, monitoring of lesson plans	administration
Data Chat	K-5	Principal, Assistant Principal Intern	all instructional staff	quarterly	discussions at CPT, review of progress monitoring data,	administration and support staff
Book Study: Teach Like a Champion	K-5	Principal, support staff teachers	all instructional staff	Monthly	classroom walkthroughs, formal/informal assessment, standardized test results	Administration and support staff
Reading-					classroom walkthroughs,	

Instructional Focus Calendar	K-5	Susan Naiman	all instructional staff	October 2012	assessment results, discussions at CPT, alignment of lesson plans	Administration
------------------------------	-----	--------------	-------------------------	--------------	---	----------------

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

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:

<p>1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.</p> <p>Mathematics Goal # 1a:</p>	<p>By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for Level 3 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 3 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.</p>
---	---

<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</p>
<p>Level 3 - 27%(73) Level 3,4,5 - 71%(189)</p>	<p>Level 3 - 29% Level 3,4,5 - 73%</p>

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/ understanding of the depth and complexity of the curriculum	Teachers will differentiate instruction and provide access to higher text complexity selections; discussions at CPT will include focus on IFC, assessment and lesson planning; the school will implement an after-school tutoring program for grades 3-5	Teachers, administration	Classroom walkthroughs, review of benchmark data, implementation of instructional strategies, classroom assessments, progress monitoring of the tutoring students	observations, math benchmark results, classroom assessment results
2	Technology/network support and usage	Use of common assessments to monitor students and determine the need for interventions and/or enrichment	Administration and teachers	review of progress monitoring data to ensure teachers are assessing students and using results to modify groups and instruction	benchmark assessment, common classroom assessments, progress monitoring spreadsheets

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:

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

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 year 2013, there will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a one percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 4,5 - 44%(116) Level 3,4,5 - 71%(189)	Level 4,5 - 45% Level 3,4,5 - 72%

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	technology/network support and usage	Utilize the FAIR and benchmark assessments to monitor student progress; discussions will occur at CPT and SWST to review data and create targeted interventions	Administration and teachers	Review FAIR reports, benchmark assessment results and progress monitoring spreadsheets to ensure teachers are assessing students, using results to modify groups/instruction and following the created assessment schedule	FAIR reports, benchmark assessment results, common classroom assessments and progress monitoring spreadsheets
2	knowledge/understanding of the depth and complexity of the curriculum	teachers will differentiate instruction and provide access to higher text complexity selections; teachers will integrate curriculum; discussions at CPT will include focus on IFC, assessment and lesson planning; the school will implement an after-school tutoring program for grades 1-5	Administration and teachers	classroom walkthroughs, review of benchmark data, implementation of instructional strategies, classroom assessments, school-wide data chats	observations, benchmark assessments, classroom assessments, FAIR, SuccessMaker

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 year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
60% (97)	64%

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	technology/network support and usage	Utilize FAIR and benchmark assessments to monitor student progress; discussions will occur at CPT and SWST to review data and create targeted interventions	Administration and teachers	Review FAIR reports, benchmark assessment results, and progress monitoring spreadsheets to ensure teachers are assessing students, using results to modify groups/instruction, and following the created assessment schedule	FAIR, benchmark assessments, common classroom assessments, and progress monitoring spreadsheets
2	knowledge/understanding of the depth and complexity of the curriculum	teachers will differentiate instruction and provide access to higher text complexity selections; teachers will integrate curriculum; discussions at CPT will focus on IFC, assessment and lesson planning; the school will implement an after school tutoring program for grades 1-5	Administration and teachers	classroom walkthroughs, review of benchmark data, implementation of instructional strategies, classroom assessments, school-wide data chats	observations, benchmark assessments, common classroom assessments, FAIR, SuccessMaker

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 year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase in the number of students demonstrating a learning gain in the lower quartile.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
60% (24)	64%

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	technology/network support and usage	Utilize FAIR, SuccessMaker and benchmark assessments to monitor student progress; discussions will occur at CPT and SWST to review data and create targeted interventions	Administration and teachers	Review FAIR reports, benchmark assessment results, SuccessMaker reports and progress monitoring spreadsheets to ensure teachers are assessing students, using results to modify groups/instruction and following the created assessment schedule	FAIR, benchmark assessment, SuccessMaker, common classroom assessments, and progress monitoring spreadsheets
2	knowledge/understanding of the depth and complexity of the curriculum	teachers will differentiate instruction and provide access to higher text complexity selections; teachers will integrate curriculum; discussions at CPT will focus on IFC, assessment and lesson planning; the school will implement an after school tutoring program for grades 1-5	Administration and teachers	classroom walkthroughs, review of benchmark data, implementation of instructional strategies, classroom assessments, school wide data chats	observations, benchmark assessments, classroom assessments, FAIR, SuccessMaker
3	Loss of Intervention Teacher	Progress monitored students will use SuccessMaker for a minimum of 60 minutes per week. The lowest 25% will be monitored and interventions will be implemented by the classroom teacher as appropriate	Administration, Classroom teacher	Teacher will use last session report to monitor success. Administration will monitor cumulative report weekly. Interventions will be discussed/reviewed at CPT and SWST for effectiveness. Intervention times are scheduled on master calendar.	Successmaker reports, FAIR data, and classroom assessments

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Elementary School Mathematics Goal #				
		The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your school's total population for SY 2012-2013 and the 5 year project ion (2016-2017) is				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	75	78	80	82	84	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White 84%(124) Black 48%(22) Hispanic 68%(16)	White 86% Black 49% Hispanic 76%

Problem-Solving Process to I ncrease Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	technology/network support and usage	Utilize FAIR, SuccessMaker and benchmark assessments to monitor student progress; discussions will occur at CPT and SWST to review data and create targeted interventions	Administration and teachers	Review FAIR reports, benchmark assessment results, SuccessMaker reports and progress monitoring spreadsheets to ensure teachers are assessing students, using results to modify groups/instruction and following the created assessment schedule	FAIR, benchmark assessment, SuccessMaker, common classroom assessments, and progress monitoring spreadsheets
2	knowledge/understanding of the depth and complexity of the curriculum	teachers will differentiate instruction and provide access to higher text complexity selections; teachers will integrate curriculum; discussions at CPT will focus on IFC, assessment and lesson planning; the school will implement an after school tutoring program for grades 1-5	Administration and teachers	classroom walkthroughs, review of benchmark data, implementation of instructional strategies, classroom assessments, school wide data chats	observations, benchmark assessments, classroom assessments, FAIR, SuccessMaker

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:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
---	---

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
No Data Submitted				

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
--	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% making progress	63%

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	technology/network support and usage	Utilize FAIR, SuccessMaker and benchmark assessments to monitor student progress; discussions will occur at CPT and SWST to review data and create targeted interventions	Administration and teachers	Review FAIR reports, benchmark assessment results, SuccessMaker reports and progress monitoring spreadsheets to ensure teachers are assessing students, using results to modify groups/instruction and following the created assessment schedule	FAIR, benchmark assessment, SuccessMaker, common classroom assessments, and progress monitoring spreadsheets
2	knowledge/understanding of the depth and complexity of the curriculum	teachers will differentiate instruction and provide access to higher text complexity selections; teachers will integrate curriculum; discussions at CPT will focus on IFC, assessment and lesson planning; the school will implement an after school tutoring program for grades 1-5	Administration and teachers	classroom walkthroughs, review of benchmark data, implementation of instructional strategies, classroom assessments, school wide data chats	observations, benchmark assessments, classroom assessments, FAIR, SuccessMaker

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.	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or
--	---

Mathematics Goal #5E:	above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).				
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
61%	63%				
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	Technology/network support and usage	Utilize FAIR, SuccessMaker and benchmark assessments to monitor student progress; discussions will occur at CPT and SWST to review data and create targeted interventions	Principal, Assistant Principal Intern, and teachers	Review FAIR reports, benchmark assessment results, SuccessMaker reports and progress monitoring spreadsheets to ensure teachers are assessing students, using results to modify groups/instruction and following the created assessment schedule	FAIR, benchmark assessment, SuccessMaker, common classroom assessments, and progress monitoring spreadsheets
2	knowledge/understanding of the depth and complexity of the curriculum	teachers will differentiate instruction and provide access to higher text complexity selections; teachers will integrate curriculum; discussions at CPT will focus on IFC, assessment and lesson planning; the school will implement an after school tutoring program for grades 3-5	Administration and teachers	classroom walkthroughs, review of benchmark data, implementation of instructional strategies, classroom assessments, school wide data chats	observations, benchmark assessments, classroom assessments, FAIR, SuccessMaker

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Differentiated Instruction	K-5	Principal, Assistant Principal Intern	all instructional staff	on-going	CPT discussions, monitoring of lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs	administration
Lesson Study	5	Susan Naiman, Jaime Kisner	5th grade teachers	on-going 2012-2013	video taped lessons and CPT discussions	administration and teachers
Data Chat	K-5	Principal, Assistant Principal Intern	all instructional staff	Quarterly	discussions at CPT, review of progress monitoring data	administration and support staff
Book Study: Teach Like a Champion	K-5	Principal, support staff, teachers	all instructional staff	Monthly	classroom walkthroughs, formal/informal assessment, standardized test results	Administration and support staff
					cumulative reports	

SuccessMaker Training	K-5	Marla Myers	instructional staff	October 2012; weekly	will be printed weekly to monitor student success;	administration/support staff
-----------------------	-----	-------------	---------------------	----------------------	--	------------------------------

Mathematics Budget:

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

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal # 1a:		By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5) Any subgroup that is 90% or higher can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
Level 3 - 33% (28) Level 3,4,5 - 65% (55)		Level 3 - 32% Level 3,4,5 - 69%			
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
	knowledge/ understanding of the depth and complexity	Teachers will differentiate instruction and provide	Teachers, administration	Classroom walkthroughs, review of benchmark data,	observations, math benchmark results,

1	of the curriculum	access to higher text complexity selections; discussions at CPT will include focus on IFC, assessment and lesson planning; the school will implement an after-school tutoring program for grades 3-5		implementation of instructional strategies, classroom assessments, progress monitoring of the tutoring students	classroom assessment results
2	Technology/network support and usage	Use of common assessments to monitor students and determine the need for interventions and/or enrichment	Administration and teachers	review of progress monitoring data to ensure teachers are assessing students and using results to modify groups and instruction	benchmark assessment, common classroom assessments, progress monitoring spreadsheets

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 year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5) Any subgroup that is 90% or higher can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
Level 4,5 - 32% (27) Level 3,4,5 - 65% (55)		Level 4,5 - 36% Level 3,4,5 - 69%			

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	technology/network support and usage	Utilize the FAIR and benchmark assessments to monitor student progress; discussions will occur at CPT and SWST to review data and create targeted interventions	Administration and teachers	Review FAIR reports, benchmark assessment results and progress monitoring spreadsheets to ensure teachers are assessing students, using results to modify groups/instruction and following the created assessment schedule	FAIR reports, benchmark assessment results, common classroom assessments and progress monitoring spreadsheets
2	knowledge/understanding of the depth and complexity of the curriculum	teachers will differentiate instruction and provide access to higher text complexity selections; teachers will integrate curriculum; discussions at CPT will include focus on IFC, assessment and lesson planning; the school will implement an after-school tutoring program for grades 1-5	Administration and teachers	classroom walkthroughs, review of benchmark data, implementation of instructional strategies, classroom assessments, school-wide data chats	observations, benchmark assessments, classroom assessments, FAIR, SuccessMaker

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
					classroom	

Writing Through the Content Areas	K-5	Kathy Kopp	all instructional staff	August 2012	walkthrough, district writing assessment results, discussions at CPT, alignment of lesson plans	administration and support staff
Book Study: Teach Like a Champion	K-5	Principal, support staff, teachers	all instructional staff	Monthly	classroom walkthroughs, formal/informal assessment, standardized test results, discussions at CPT	Administration and support staff
Lesson Study	5	Susan Naiman, Jaime Kisner	5th grade teachers	on-going 2012-2013	video taped lessons and CPT discussions	administration and teachers
Elementary Science-Inquiry Science and LEARN Courses	3-5	Brad Pornichak	3-5th team leaders	October 2012	LEARN, classroom walkthroughs, CPT discussions	administration and teachers

Science Budget:

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 75% are currently demonstrating 4.0 or higher on the writing essay. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 75% or more are currently demonstrating 4.0 or higher on the writing essay. Any subgroup that is 90% or higher must maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

92%(80)		92%			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Instructional Time	Weekly Writing Assessments, master schedule includes daily writing block	Assistant Principal Intern, teachers	Lesson Plans and data analysis of writing	Writing scores
2	Familiarity with writing standards and scoring rubrics	provide training and modeling in best practices for writing and scoring	Principal and Assistant Principal Intern	evaluation of district writing prompts and school-based weekly writing assessment	Weekly writing prompt data, district writing scores

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 75% are currently demonstrating 4.0 or higher on the writing essay. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 75% or more are currently demonstrating 4.0 or higher on the writing essay. Any subgroup that is 90% or higher must maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
54%(47)	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
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
Core Connections Writing Training	4th	Chris Lewis	4th grade teachers	October and November 2012	classroom walkthrough, distric writing assessment results, discussions at CPT, alignment of lesson plans	administration and support staff

Writing Through the Content Areas	K-5	Kathy Kopp	all instructional staff	August 2012	classroom walkthrough, district and classroom writing assessment results, discussions at CPT, alignment of lesson plans	Administration and support staff
Writing--A look at Florida Writes	4th	Jaime Kisner	4th grade teachers	September 2012	classroom walkthrough, district and classroom writing assessment results, discussions at CPT, alignment of lesson plans	administration and support staff

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

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

<p>1. Attendance</p> <p>Attendance Goal #1:</p>	<p>ATTENDANCE GOAL – RATE For the attendance year 2012-2013, the attendance rate will increase. If the current attendance rate is less than 90%, there will be a minimum 4% increase. If the current percentage of attendance is 90% or greater, the school will maintain or increase the percentage.</p> <p>ATTENDANCE GOAL- ABSENCES By the year 2013, there will be a decrease of students who are absent ten or more days. When 40% or more of the students have ten or more absences annually, there will be a minimum of a 4 percentage point decrease. If less than 40% of the students have ten or more absences annually, there will be a minimum of a 2 percentage point decrease</p> <p>ATTENDANCE GOAL- TARDY By the year 2013, there will be a decrease of students who are Tardy ten or more days. When 30% or more of the students have ten or more Tardies annually, there will be a minimum of a 4 percentage point decrease. If less than 30% of the students have ten or more</p>
---	---

	Tardies annually, there will be a minimum of a 2 percentage point decrease. If the current percent of Tardies is 10% or less, the school can maintain or decrease the percentage.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
96.5% (592/613)	98.5%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
119	107
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
55	43

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	Resources-lack of consistent social worker	PBS; letter sent from the school; phone calls to families offering assistance;	Administration and office staff	Monitor attendance and tardies weekly	Attendance report

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:		By the year 2013, there will be a reduction of suspensions from the previous year. If the current percentage of suspensions is 10% or less, the school will maintain or decrease the percentage. If the current percentage is between 11-49%, the school will reduce the percentage by 5%. If the current percentage is 50% or higher than the previous year, the school will reduce the percentage by 10%.			
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions		2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions			
1		1			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School		2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School			
1		1			
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions		2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions			
29		29			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School		2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School			
22		22			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Time to meet with the group	School-wide Positive Behavior Support	Positive Behavior Support Team	Positive Behavior Support agendas and	Student referral report

				meetings	
2	Implementing PBS effectively and consistently	expectations clearly communicated and use of common school language; use of PBS school-wide	PBS Team	Monthly review of discipline data	Discipline data

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Bullying Training	K-5	Susan Wilhelm	all instructional staff	on-going	Preventative classroom instruction; classroom walkthroughs	administration and teachers

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:

*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.		Based on sign-in sheets from general PTO meetings 99% of parents will attend.			
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:		2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:			
Based on sign in sheets from our general PTO our parental involvement was 98% from the 2011-2012 school year.		Based on sign in sheets from our general PTO our parental involvement will be 99% for the 2012-2013 school year.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Monitoring Compliance	Written Contract	Administration	A sign-in sheet to count the number in attendance	Sign-in sheet
2	Limited access to some parents	Connect Ed messages reminding them of the mandatory general PTO meeting	Administration	A sign-in sheet to count the number in attendance	Sign-in sheet

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Parent Information Nights	K-5	Teachers	Parents/guardians	on-going	teacher/parent conferences, climate survey	administration, teachers

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)

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
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="checkbox"/> Priority	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input checked="" 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 10/4/2012)

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
SAC funds will be used to fund afterschool tutoring for 4th grade.	\$2,900.00

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

The School Advisory Council (SAC) is the sole body responsible for final decision making at the school relating to implementation of the provisions of Sections 1001.42(16) and 1008.345, F.S. Activities and duties are described in the Guidelines and By-laws established by each School Advisory Council. These By-laws also detail the procedure for the election and appointment of Council

members.

The main functions for SAC will be to organize opportunities to increase parent involvement and to review fund allocations, schedules and professional development activities to ensure alignment with SIP focus areas and goals

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

Sarasota School District BAY HAVEN SCHOOL OF BASICS PLUS 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	89%	89%	93%	82%	353	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	74%	74%			148	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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?	68% (YES)	80% (YES)			148	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					649	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Sarasota School District BAY HAVEN SCHOOL OF BASICS PLUS 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	89%	85%	85%	77%	336	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	74%	61%			135	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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?	69% (YES)	53% (YES)			122	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					593	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested