

# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: BREAKFAST POINT ACADEMY

District Name: Bay

Principal: Denise Kelley

SAC Chair: Christine Pettys

Superintendent: William Husfelt

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 11/4/2012

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.*

<a href="#">School Grades Trend Data</a>
<a href="#">Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data</a>
<a href="#">High School Feedback Report</a>
<a href="#">K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan</a>

### 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 of Breakfast Point Academy: 2011-2012: Grade A. Reading Proficiency 70%, Math Proficiency 68%, Science Proficiency 70%, Writing Proficiency 85%, Reading LG 72% , Math LG 66%, Reading Lowest 25%: 74%, Math Lowest 25%: 71%, The White Subgroup did not meet the AMO Target in Reading; Asian, Hispanic, and White did not meet the AMO Target in Math 2010-2011: Grade A. Reading Proficiency: 83%, Math Proficiency: 84%, Science Proficiency: 64%, Reading LG: 74%, Math LG: 74%, Reading Lowest 25% LG: 62%, Math Lowest 25% LG: 75%, SWD and ED did not make AYP in reading and math.

Principal	Denise Kelley	B.S. – Elementary Education M.S. - Educational Leadership Certifications: Primary Ed. K-3, Elementary Ed. 1-6, School Principal – all levels, Endorsement: ESOL	5	13	2009-2010: Grade A. Reading Proficiency: 83%, Math Proficiency: 84%, Science Proficiency: 58%, Reading LG: 66%, Math LG: 66%, Reading Lowest 25% LG: 58%, Math Lowest 25% LG: 62%, SWD and ED did not make AYP in reading. Ed did not make AYP in math. 2008-09: Grade A. Reading Proficiency: 82%, Math Proficiency: 81%, Science Proficiency: 53%, Reading LG: 69%, Math LG: 65%, Reading Lowest 25% LG: 59%, Math Lowest 25% LG: 53%, SWD did not make AYP in reading and math. Principal of Hutchison Beach Elementary: 2007-08: Grade A. Reading Proficiency: 86%, Math Proficiency: 83%, Science Proficiency: 54%, Reading LG: 65%, Math LG: 67%, Reading Lowest 25% LG: 60%, Math Lowest 25% LG: 63%. All subgroups met AYP. 2006-07: Grade A. Reading Proficiency: 84%, Math Proficiency: 74%, Science Proficiency: 52%, Reading LG: 75%, Math LG: 65%, Reading Lowest 25% LG: 62%, Math Lowest 25% LG: 703%. All subgroups met AYP. 2005-06: Grade A. Reading Proficiency: 84%, Math Proficiency: 78%, Reading LG: 68%, Math LG: 68%, Reading Lowest 25% LG: 62%. All subgroups met AYP.
Assis Principal	Keri Weatherly	B.S. – Business Administration M.S. – Educational Leadership Certifications: Educational Leadership – all levels Elem. Ed K-6 Mathematics 5-9 Business Ed. 6-12 Endorsement: ESOL	1	3	Administrative Assistant – Mowat Middle School 2011-2012 Grade A Reading Proficiency 70%, Math Proficiency 69%, Science Proficiency 59%, Reading LG 74%, Math LG 75%, Reading Lowest 25% LG: 74%, Math Lowest 25% LG 72%, Writing Proficiency 81%; Asian, Black/African American, SWD, and ED did not meet the AMO Target in Reading; Black/African American and ED did not meet the AMO Target in Math 2010-2011 Grade A Reading Proficiency: 81%, Math Proficiency: 81%, Science Proficiency: 62% Reading LG: 64%, Math LG: 76% Reading Lowest 25% LG: 70%, Math Lowest 25% LG: 73%, SWD, Economically Disadvantaged, African American did not make AYP in Reading and 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 School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
n/a					

## 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. Principal will meet regularly with new teachers.	Principal	On-going	
2	2. New teachers will be partnered with veteran staff.	Assistant Principal	on-going	
3	3. New teachers will participate in Bay District's New Teacher Induction Program.	Assistant Principal	June 2013	
4	4. ESOL Endorsement and Reading Endorsement opportunities provided to all staff members via Bay District initiatives.	Principal	June 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
Instructional Staff - 0 Paraprofessionals - 0	

## 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
80	5.0%(4)	36.3%(29)	37.5%(30)	21.3%(17)	38.8%(31)	100.0%(80)	11.3%(9)	6.3%(5)	47.5%(38)

## 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
n/a			

## 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.

**Administrator : Denise Kelley**

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 intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS/RtI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS/RtI plans and activities.

**School Psychologist: Janice Shipbaugh**

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: Stacy Prater & Amy Ezell**

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.

**Regular Education Teachers – Amy Joyner, Rebecca Cornell, Holly Allain, Jennifer Mann, Jeanne Noda, Kelly Evans**

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.

**Regular Education Teachers - one per grade level for middle/high schools: Alison Moreira (6th), Alana Simmons (7th)**

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.

ESE Teacher: Katherine Pickrell

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.

MTSS/RtI Staff Training Specialist: Tammy Boyer

Provides guidance on K-12 reading plan; supports schools with the implementation of MTSS/RtI; shares information with administrators, provides professional development to faculty and staff based on area of need; attends School Based Leadership Team Meetings; assists with data analysis and development of intervention plans and periodically reviews MTSS/RtI folders for compliance.

Guidance Counselor: Janet Bailey, Robin Jones

Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students; assist the school and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral and social success.

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/RtI team will meet every two weeks (or more often if needed) to build consensus and make decisions about implementation. The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team will meet monthly to conduct on-going AYP, FCAT data, and other Universal Screening data to match interventions to student needs and stakeholder accountability. We will review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting or exceeding benchmarks and students who are at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the MTSS/RtI team will identify and ensure professional development. The MTSS/RtI team is responsible for school-wide implementation. The MTSS/RtI team provides training and coaching to school staff. School administrators will use individual student performance data to determine activities and the RtI structures needed to best meet the needs of their students. The MTSS/RtI process will be integrated in the District Reading Plan, District Student Progression Plan, and School Improvement Plan.

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?

MTSS/RtI team will collaborate with the School Improvement Team and School Advisory Council to help in the development of the School Improvement Plan. The team will provide data on: Tier 1, 2, and 3 targets; academic and social/emotional areas that need to be addressed; help set clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, and Relationship). The MTSS/RtI Team contributed to the Professional Development areas of plan by outlining how MTSS/RtI Professional Development will be delivered to faculty and staff.

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.

Focus, PMRN, FAIR (Kindergarten only), Ray Writes, Discovery Education, FCAT, SME5, DIBELS Next and EasyCBM, RTIB Database

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Monthly meetings with staff, MTSS/RtI Staff Training Specialist available to assist teachers.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

See Above.

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Keri Weatherly, Alison Moreira, Rebecca Cornell, Jeanne Noda, Amanda Walker, Kelly Evans, Alana Simmons, Lori Spillers,

Cheri Wroblewski, Amy Joyner, Jennifer Mann, Holly Allain, Kathy Pickrell

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

The LLT meets monthly to discuss student achievement data and the implementation of school-wide initiatives. LLT members serve as chairpersons of their respective committees which are comprised of teacher representatives from each grade level. LLT members represent each committee at monthly LLT meetings and communicate LLT initiatives with faculty on a regular basis. It is the responsibility of the LLT to implement the CRP with fidelity.

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

Use Discovery Education Network assessment data to drive instruction in reading, math, and science. Continue quarterly administration of Ray Writes. Develop and utilized school-wide instructional focus calendars for reading, math, and science.

## 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:	At least 33% of students at Breakfast Point Academy will achieve a Level 3 in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
30% (161)	33% (177)

#### 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	Funding interventions, instructional time, high mobility rate	Continue to implement the Comprehensive Reading Plan K-7.	Administration	Classroom walk through, lesson plan review, class schedules	Observation
2	Funding and planning time	Develop and implement an Instructional Focus Calendar for the 90 minute reading block including the creation and implementation of common grade level assessments for each reporting category/skill.	Classroom teachers	Collaboration with peers at weekly grade level meetings	Discovery Education data, classroom assessments
3	Funding for interventions	Identify students on the cusp of level 3. Review data to identify individual student weaknesses. Differentiate instruction based on student needs. Implement Student Engagement Strategies and CRISS strategies.	LLT, Grade Level groups, MTSS/RtI committee, Classroom teachers, Administrators.	Collaborate with peers at weekly grade level meetings.	Discovery Education, classroom assessments

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

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:	At least 41% of students at Breakfast Point Academy will score at or above a Level 4 in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
38% (204)	41% (220)

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	Funding interventions, instructional time, high mobility rate	Continue to implement the Comprehensive Reading Plan K-7.	Administration	Classroom walk-through, lesson plan review, class schedules	Observation
2	Funding and Planning Time	Develop and implement an instructional focus calendar for 90 minute reading block. Develop more rigorous instruction using higher text complexity.	Classroom Teacher	Collaboration with peers at weekly grade level meeting	Discovery Education data, classroom assessments, Discover Education data
3	Funding and Planning Time	Identify Students on the cusp of a level 4 or 5. Review data to identify individual student weaknesses. Differentiate instruction based on student needs. Implement Student Engagement Strategies and CRISS structures	LLT, Grade level groups, MTSS/RtI committee, Classroom teachers, Administrators.	Collaborate with peers at weekly grade level meetings.	FOCUS, Discovery Education data, classroom assessments, Discover Education data

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading.  Reading Goal #2b:	***
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:	At least 75% of students at Breakfast Point Academy will make learning gains in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
72% (281)	75% (293)

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	Funding interventions, instructional time, high mobility rate	Continue to implement the Comprehensive Reading Plan K-7	Administration	Classroom walk-through, lesson plan review, class schedules	Observation
2	Funding and Planning Time	Develop and implement an instructional focus calendar for 90 minute reading block	Classroom Teacher	Collaboration with peers at weekly grade level meeting	Discovery Education data, classroom assessments
3	Funding and Planning Time	Identify Students on the cusp of a level 4 or 5. Review data to identify individual student weaknesses. Differentiate instruction based on student needs	LLT, Grade level groups, MTSS/RTI committee, Classroom teachers, Administrators.	Collaborate with peers at weekly grade level meetings to develop strategies for cusp	FOCUS, Discovery Education, classroom assessments

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

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
---------------------	----------	---	---	-----------------

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:	Breakfast Point will attain high standards in reading. At least 77% of the lowest 25% will make learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
74% (71)	77% (75)

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	Funding interventions, instructional time, high mobility rate	Continue to implement the Comprehensive Reading Plan K-7and develop an instructional focus calendar for 90 minute reading block.	Administration	Classroom walk-through, lesson plan review, class schedules	Observation
2	Funding and Planning Time	Teachers will identify the students in the lowest 35% and monitor student progress. These students will receive Intensive remediation in reading.	Classroom Teachers	Collaboration with peers at weekly grade level meeting	Discovery Education data, classroom assessments
3	Funding and Planning Time	Identify cusp students , and review data to identify individual student weaknesses and differentiate instruction based on student needs.	LLT, Grade level groups,MTSS/RTI committee, Classroom teachers, Administrators.	Collaborate with peers at weekly grade level meetings to develop strategies for cusp	FOCUS, Discovery Education, 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 #					
	In six years, 83% of Breakfast Point Academy's students will score at least satisfactory in the area of Reading. 5A : Baseline Data 66%/2016-2017 83%					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	70%	72%	75%	77%	80%	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	The percentage of students scoring satisfactory in the white subgroup will increase from 70% to 73% in order to continue moving toward reducing their achievement gap.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

White: 70%			White: 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	Funding interventions, instructional time, high mobility rate	Continue to implement the Comprehensive Reading Plan K-7.	Administration	Classroom walk through, lesson plan review, class schedules	Observation
2	Funding and planning time	Develop an Instructional Focus Calendar for the 90 minute reading block including the creation and implementation of common grade level assessments for each reporting category/skill.	Classroom teachers	Collaboration with peers at weekly grade level meetings	Discovery Education data, classroom assessments
3	Funding for interventions	Identify students on the cusp of level 3. Review data to identify individual student weaknesses. Differentiate instruction based on student needs. Implement Student Engagement Strategies and CRISS strategies.	LLT, Grade Level groups, MTSS/RtI committee, Classroom teachers, Administrators.	Collaborate with peers at weekly grade level meetings.	Discovery Education, classroom assessments

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	***
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
***	***

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	***
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
***	***

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

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.  Reading Goal #5E:	***
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
Common Core Training & Planning Days	K-1	Serenity Anderson	Kindergarten and 1st Grade Teachers	August 2012	Lesson Plans/Pacing Guides	Denise Kelley
CAG	K-7	Denise Kelley	School-Wide	Monthly (after school)	GradeBook	Denise Kelley
LLT	K-7	Keri Weatherly	School-Wide	Monthly (after School)	LLT Minutes SAC Minutes	Denise Kelley
RtI/MTSS	K-7	Tammy Boyer	School-Wide	Monthly (during planning)	RtI minutes Discovery Ed Data	Denise Kelley
Common Core Overview Secondary Teachers	6-7	Margo Anderson	Secondary Teachers	September 26, 2012	Lesson Plans	Denise Kelley
Kagan Training	Aspire Teachers	Kagan Trainer	Aspire Teachers	Summer 2012	Lesson Plans	Denise Kelley

Common Assessment Planning Days	K-7	Denise Kelley; Keri Weatherly	School-Wide	October - November 2012	Common Assessments; Lesson Plans	Denise Kelley; Keri Weatherly
---------------------------------	-----	-------------------------------	-------------	-------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$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:		At least 55% of the ELL students at Breakfast Point Academy will score at the proficient level in Listening/Speaking			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
52% (20/38)					
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	High mobility rate	Classroom teachers will conduct monthly data analysis in grade groups to identify trend of students' monthly gains or loss to develop more	Administration, LLT, and classroom teachers	Student progress is assessed and monitored using DEA, SM5, Harcourt and other appropriate assessments	FCAT, DEA

		specific strategies for differentiated instruction			
2	Time constraints during the school day	Continue with creation and implementation of Focus Calendar and pacing guide for lessons reinforcing the Comprehensive Reading Plan and utilizing District Training Specialist	Administration and classroom teachers	Student progress is assessed and monitored using DEA, SM5, Harcourt and other appropriate assessments	FCAT, DEA
3	Teacher knowledge of integrating SMART technology	Incorporate SMART interactive whiteboard and other related equipment into class instruction	District Technology, TOSA	Monitor increased student engagement in classroom activities through collection of student generated data and peer evaluation data	FCAT, DEA

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:

At least 43% of the ELL students at Breakfast Point Academy will score at the proficient level in Reading

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

40% (13/38)

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	High mobility rate	Classroom teachers will conduct monthly data analysis in grade groups to identify trend of students' monthly gains or loss to develop more specific strategies for differentiated instruction	Administration, LLT, and classroom teachers	Student progress is assessed and monitored using DEA, SM5, Harcourt and other appropriate assessments	FCAT, DEA
2	Time constraints during the school day	Continue with creation and implementation of Focus Calendar and pacing guide for lessons reinforcing the Comprehensive Reading Plan and utilizing District Training Specialist	Administration and classroom teachers	Student progress is assessed and monitored using DEA, SM5, Harcourt and other appropriate assessments	FCAT, DEA
3	Teacher knowledge of integrating SMART technology	Incorporate SMART interactive whiteboard and other related equipment into class instruction	District Technology, TOSA	Monitor increased student engagement in classroom activities through collection of student generated data and peer evaluation data	FCAT, DEA

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

At least 39% of the ELL students at Breakfast Point Academy will score at the proficient level in Writing

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

36% (13/38)

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	High mobility rate	Classroom teachers will conduct monthly data analysis in grade groups to identify trend of students' monthly gains or loss to develop more specific strategies for differentiated instruction	Administration, LLT, and classroom teachers	Student progress is assessed and monitored using DEA, SM5, Harcourt and other appropriate assessments	FCAT, DEA
2	Time constraints during the school day	Continue with creation and implementation of Focus Calendar and pacing guide for lessons reinforcing the Comprehensive Reading Plan and utilizing District Training Specialist	Administration and classroom teachers	Student progress is assessed and monitored using DEA, SM5, Harcourt and other appropriate assessments	FCAT, DEA
3	Time constraints during the school day	Continue with creation and implementation of Focus Calendar and pacing guide for lessons reinforcing the Comprehensive Reading Plan and utilizing District Training Specialist	Administration and classroom teachers	Student progress is assessed and monitored using DEA, SM5, Harcourt and other appropriate assessments	FCAT, DEA

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
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00

Subtotal: \$0.00

Grand Total: \$0.00

*End of CELLA Goals*



# Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal # 1a:	At least 37% of students at Breakfast Point Academy will achieve a Level 3.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
34% (184)	37% (200)

### 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	Funding and Time restrictions	Grade levels will work together to improve vertical alignment of vocabulary and develop word problems with increased text complexity consistent with Common Core language.	Administration and classroom teachers, Math committee, MTSS/RtI resource teacher	Classroom walk through, grade level meetings, continuous classroom assessments, MTSS/RtI meetings, math committee meetings	Reports generated from classroom assessments, Discovery Education data, FOCUS, and common assessments
2	Planning Time	Implement guided math and math stations across all grade levels while integrating technology using the SmartBoard	Administration and classroom teachers, Math committee, MTSS/RtI resource teacher	Classroom walk through, grade level meetings, continuous classroom assessments, MTSS/RtI meetings, math committee meetings	Reports generated from classroom assessments, Discovery Education data, FOCUS, and common assessments
3	Planning Time	Using Student Engagement Strategies and CRISS II strategies, teachers will increase the student understanding of math concepts.	Administration and classroom teachers, Math committee, MTSS/RtI resource teacher and district TOSA	Classroom walk through, grade level meetings, continuous classroom assessments, MTSS/RtI meetings, math committee meetings	Reports generated from classroom assessments, Discovery Education data, FOCUS, and common assessments

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal # 1b:	***
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:	At least 35% of students will score at least a Level 4 in mathematics
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
32% (173)	35% (189)

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	Funding and Time restrictions	Grade levels will work together to improve vertical alignment of vocabulary and develop word problems with increased text complexity consistent with Common Core language.	Administration and classroom teachers, Math committee, MTSS/RtI resource teacher	Classroom walk through, grade level meetings, continuous classroom assessments, MTSS/RtI meetings, math committee meetings	Reports generated from classroom assessments, Discovery Education data, FOCUS, and common assessments
2	Planning Time	Implement guided math and math stations across all grade levels while integrating technology using the SmartBoard.	Administration and classroom teachers, Math committee, MTSS/RtI resource teacher	Classroom walk through, grade level meetings, continuous classroom assessments, MTSS/RtI meetings, math committee meetings	Reports generated from classroom assessments, Discovery Education data, FOCUS, and common assessments
3	Planning Time	Using Student Engagement Strategies and CRISS II strategies, teachers will increase the student understanding of math concepts	Administration and classroom teachers, Math committee, MTSS/RtI resource teacher and district TOSA	Classroom walk through, grade level meetings, continuous classroom assessments, MTSS/RtI meetings, math committee meetings	Reports generated from classroom assessments, Discovery Education data, FOCUS, and common assessments

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

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

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	69% of students will make learning gains in the area of mathematics
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
66% (258)	69% (270)

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	Planning Time	Develop and implement Common Assessments at each grade level. Students will receive intervention in areas of need. Additional use of manipulatives and hands-on activities to reinforce mathematics concepts.	Administration and classroom teachers, Math committee, MTSS/RtI resource teacher	Classroom walk through, grade level meetings, continuous classroom assessments, MTSS/RtI meetings, math committee meetings	Reports generated from classroom assessments, Discovery Education data, and FOCUS
2	Planning Time	Implement guided math and math stations across all grade levels while integrating technology using the SmartBoard.	Administration and classroom teachers, Math committee, MTSS/RtI resource teacher	Classroom walk through, grade level meetings, continuous classroom assessments, MTSS/RtI meetings, math committee meetings	Reports generated from classroom assessments, Discovery Education data, FOCUS, and common assessments
3	Planning Time	Using Student Engagement Strategies and CRISS II strategies, teachers will increase the student understanding of math concepts.	Administration and classroom teachers, Math committee, MTSS/RtI resource teacher and district TOSA	Classroom walk through, grade level meetings, continuous classroom assessments, MTSS/RtI meetings, math committee meetings	Reports generated from classroom assessments, Discovery Education data, FOCUS, and common assessments

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

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:	74% of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71% (69)	74% (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	Planning Time	Develop and implement Common Assessments at each grade level. Students will receive intervention in areas of need. Additional use of manipulatives and hands-on activities to reinforce mathematics concepts.	Administration and classroom teachers, Math committee, MTSS/RtI resource teacher	Classroom walk through, grade level meetings, continuous classroom assessments, MTSS/RtI meetings, math committee meetings	Reports generated from classroom assessments, Discovery Education data, and FOCUS
2	Planning Time	Implement guided math and math stations across all grade levels while integrating technology using the SmartBoard .	Administration and classroom teachers, Math committee, MTSS/RtI resource teacher	Classroom walk through, grade level meetings, continuous classroom assessments, MTSS/RtI meetings, math committee meetings	Reports generated from classroom assessments, Discovery Education data, FOCUS, and common assessments
3	Planning Time	Using Student Engagement Strategies and CRISS II strategies, teachers will increase the student understanding of math concepts.	Administration and classroom teachers, Math committee, MTSS/RtI resource teacher and district TOSA	Classroom walk through, grade level meetings, continuous classroom assessments, MTSS/RtI meetings, math committee meetings	Reports generated from classroom assessments, Discovery Education data, FOCUS, and common 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%.	<p align="center">Elementary School Mathematics Goal #</p> <p>In six years, 85% of Breakfast Point Academy's students will score at least satisfactory in the area of Mathematics.</p> <p>5A : Baseline 69%/2016-2017 85%</p>
--	---

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	72%	74%	77%	79%	82%	

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 identified subgroups of White, Hispanic, and Asian not making satisfactory progress will increase to the expected level of performance indicated for 2013 in order to continue reducing the achievement gap.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 71% Hispanic: 62% Asian: 65%:	White: 76% Hispanic: 67% Asian: 75%

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	Planning Time	Develop and implement Common Assessments at each grade level. Students will receive intervention in areas of need. Additional use of manipulatives and hands-on activities to reinforce mathematics concepts.	Administration and classroom teachers, Math committee, MTSS/RtI resource teacher	Classroom walk through, grade level meetings, continuous classroom assessments, MTSS/RtI meetings, math committee meetings	Reports generated from classroom assessments, Discovery Education data, and FOCUS
2	Planning Time	Implement guided math and math stations across all grade levels while integrating technology using the SmartBoard.	Administration and classroom teachers, Math committee, MTSS/RtI resource teacher	Classroom walk through, grade level meetings, continuous classroom assessments, MTSS/RtI meetings, math committee meetings	Reports generated from classroom assessments, Discovery Education data, FOCUS, and common assessments
3	Planning Time	Using Student Engagement Strategies and CRISS II strategies, teachers will increase the student understanding of math concepts	Administration and classroom teachers, Math committee, MTSS/RtI resource teacher and district TOSA	Classroom walk through, grade level meetings, continuous classroom assessments, MTSS/RtI meetings, math committee meetings	Reports generated from classroom assessments, Discovery Education data, FOCUS, and common assessments

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	***
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
***	***

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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 Training & Planning Days	K-1	Cylle Rowell	Kindergarten and 1st Grade Teachers	August 2012	Lesson Plans/Pacing Guides	Denise Kelley
MTSS/RtI	K-7	Tammy Boyer	School-Wide	Monthly (during planning)	MTSS/RtI Minutes Discovery Ed Data	Denise Kelley
CAG	K-7	Denise Kelley	School-Wide	Monthly (after school)	Grade Book	Denise Kelley
LLT	K-7	Keri Weatherly	School-Wide	Monthly (after school)	LLT Minutes SAC Minutes	Denise Kelley
Common Core Overview for Secondary Teachers	6-7	Cylle Rowell	Secondary Teachers	Sept. 25, 2012	Lesson Plans	Denise Kelley
Common Assessment Planning Day	K-7	Denise Kelley; Keri Weatherly	School-wide	October - November 2012	Common Assessments; Lesson Plans	Denise Kelley; Keri Weatherly

Mathematics Budget:

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

At least 45% of students at Breakfast Point Academy will achieve a Level 3 in Science

2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
42% (63)			45% (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	Planning Time	Integration of common core standards for reading and writing, literacy in science by incorporating expository science texts.	Administration, Classroom Teachers, Science Committee	Lesson Plans, Classroom Walk Through, a focus lesson as part of BIOSCOPE	Teacher observation, student performance on science assessments
2	Funding	Utilize hands on laboratory experiments with direct instruction and whole and small group setting, in order to incorporate STEM strategy	Administration, Classroom Teachers, Science Committee	Lesson Plans, Classroom Walk Through, a focus lesson as part of BIOSCOPE	Teacher observation, student performance on science assessments
3	Funding	Utilize technology to reinforce and enhance science standards through the implementation of STEM strategies	Administration, Classroom Teachers, Science Committee	Lesson Plans, Classroom Walk Through, a focus lesson as part of BIOSCOPE	Teacher observation, student performance on science assessments

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in 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:	At least 29% of students at Breakfast Point Academy will score a level 4 or 5 in Science.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:	



26% (39)		29% (44)			
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	Planning Time	Integration of common core standards for reading and writing, literacy in science by incorporating expository science texts.	Administration, Classroom Teachers, Science Committee	Lesson Plans, Classroom Walk Through, a focus lesson as part of BIOSCOPE	Teacher observation, student performance on science assessments
2	Funding	Utilize hands on laboratory experiments with direct instruction and whole and small group setting, in order to incorporate STEM strategy	Administration, Classroom Teachers, Science Committee	Lesson Plans, Classroom Walk Through, a focus lesson as part of BIOSCOPE	Teacher observation, student performance on science assessments
3	Funding	Utilize technology to reinforce and enhance science standards through the implementation of STEM strategies	Administration, Classroom Teachers, Science Committee	Lesson Plans, Classroom Walk Through, a focus lesson as part of BIOSCOPE	Teacher observation, student performance on science assessments

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

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
LLT	K-7	Keri Weatherly	School-Wide	Monthly (after School)	LLT Minutes SAC Minutes	Denise Kelley
RtI/MTSS	K-7	Tammy Boyer	School-Wide	Monthly (during planning)	RtI/MTSS Minutes	Denise Kelley
CAG	K-7	Denise Kelley	School-Wide	Monthly (after school)	Grade Book	Denise Kelley
STEM training, Bioscope PAEC	Science	Becky Kildow, Wroblewski	Science Teachers, Science Committee Members	June 18-22, 25-28; July 9-12, 16-19	Facilitators will share information at monthly meetings	Cheri Wroblewski— Science Committee Chairperson

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Purchase materials to enhance science curriculum		District	\$1,297.28
			Subtotal: \$1,297.28
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			<b>Grand Total: \$1,297.28</b>

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:	At least 85% of students will score a level 3 or higher on the Florida Writes Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
83% (98)	85% (100)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Planning Time	Implement writing strategies acquired through professional development with special regard to changes in lower elementary grades to writing under Common Core Standards	Administration, Classroom Teachers, Writing Committee	Lesson Plans, Classroom Walk Through, a focus lessons, Ray Writes Data	Teacher observation and feedback, Ray Writes
2	Planning Time	Implement writing in response to reading across all grade levels with higher emphasis on expository writing to a source.	Administration, Classroom Teachers, Writing Committee	Lesson Plans, Classroom Walk Through, a focus lessons, Ray Writes Data	Teacher observation and feedback, Ray Writes
3	Funding	Greater emphasis on grammar and conventions in writing across every subject area. Model editing and revising across grade levels and in all writing to check for errors in grammar and conventions.	Administration, Classroom Teachers, Writing Committee	Lesson Plans, Classroom Walk Through, a focus lessons, Ray Writes Data	Teacher observation and feedback, Ray Writes

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
MTSS/RtI	K-7	Tammy Boyer	School-Wide	Monthly (during planning)	MTSS/RtI minutes Discovery Ed Data	Denise Kelley
CAG	K-7	Denise Kelley	School-Wide	Monthly (after school)	Grade Book	Denise Kelley
LLT	K-7	Amanda Walker (K-4) Alana Simmons (5-7)	Teachers, Writing Committee Members	Monthly (after school)	LLT Minutes SAC Minutes Ray Writes Data	Amanda Walker – Writing Committee Chairperson K-4 Alana Simmons – Writing Committee Chairperson 5-7 Denise Kelley

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

## Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal # 1:	Increase average daily attendance to 96% or above for 2012-2013 as measured by Focus
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
94% (953)	96% (963)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive

Absences (10 or more)	Absences (10 or more)
43% (437)	40% (405)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
17% (169)	14% (142)

**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	Parent Support	Address attendance issues for students who demonstrate a pattern of nonattendance monthly.	Classroom teacher Guidance counselors Attendance Clerk	Monitoring of attendance	Attendance reports
2	Student noncompliance	Teach students hand washing/cover your cough lessons to prevent illness	School nurse Classroom teacher Guidance counselors	Monitoring of attendance	Attendance reports
3	Limited Computer Access	Encourage parents to use Parent Portal	Classroom teacher	Monitoring of attendance	Parent Participation Roster

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 Behavior Support	K-7	Jennifer Mann	School-Wide	Monthly(first Thursday after school)	PBS Meeting Minutes	Keri Weatherly

Attendance Budget:

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

			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$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:		Effectively use the RtIB database to track student behavior.			
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions		2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions			
26		20			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School		2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School			
19		15			
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions		2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions			
31		25			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School		2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School			
28		25			
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	Funding for Reward System	Implement Positive Behavior Support	Administration, PBS Coach, PBS Committee	PBS monthly meetings and RtIB data	End of the year report using RtIB and Focus
2	Students who are absent	Introduce to students the Digital Citizenship Videos regarding internet safety, bullying and netiquette.	Administration	RtIB and Focus	End of the year report using RtIB and Focus
3	Instructional time	Guidance counselors will deliver "Bully Proofing You School" curriculum to middle	Administration/Guidance Counselors	RtIB and Focus	End of the year report using RtIB and Focus

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 Behavior Support	K-7	Jennifer Mann	School-Wide	Monthly (first Thursday after school)	PBS Meeting Minutes	Keri Weatherly

Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$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:	
<p>1. Parent Involvement</p> <p>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</p> <p><i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i></p>	<p>Increase parent involvement hours by 3% to a total of 2548 volunteer hours.</p>
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:

2474 volunteer hours			2548 volunteer hours		
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	Funding	School Advisory Council/PTO participation	Denise Kelley	SAC Minutes/PTO Minutes	SAC/PTO Minutes and sign in sheet
2	Disconnected and incorrect phone numbers	IRIS alerts to inform parents of school functions	Denise Kelley	Parent Participation in Climate Survey	Climate Survey
3	Funding	Family Nights Sponsored by PTO	Denise Kelley	Parent Participation in Climate Survey	Climate Survey

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Positive Behavior Support	K-7	Jennifer Mann	School-Wide	Monthly (first Thursday after school)	PBS Meeting Minutes	Keri Weatherly

Parent Involvement Budget:

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



# 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:			Increase student understanding of Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math concepts as evidenced by FCAT 2.0.		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Funding	Utilize hands on laboratory experiments with direct instruction and whole and small group setting, in order to incorporate STEM strategies in math and science.	Administration, Classroom Teachers, Science Committee	Lesson Plans, Classroom Walk Through, a focus lesson as part of BIOSCOPE	Teacher observation, student performance on science assessments
2	Funding	Utilize technology to reinforce and enhance science and math standards through the implementation of STEM strategies	Administration, Classroom Teachers, Science Committee	Lesson Plans, Classroom Walk Through, a focus lesson as part of BIOSCOPE	Teacher observation, student performance on science assessments
3	Teacher certification requirements and funding	Offer critical thinking elective courses for middle school students in the areas of science, technology, engineering, and math	Administration, Classroom Teachers, Science Committee	Lesson Plans, Student Elective Forms	Middle School Master Schedule and student FCAT scores

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
STEM training, Bioscope PAEC	Science	Becky Kildow, Cheri Wroblewski	Science Teachers, Science Committee Members	June 18-22, 25-28; July 9-12, 16-19	Facilitators will share information at monthly meetings	Cheri Wroblewski— Science Committee Chairperson

## STEM Budget:

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
<b>Professional Development</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
<b>Other</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			<b>Grand Total: \$0.00</b>

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

## Additional Goal(s)

### Safety 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. Safety Goal Safety Goal #1:		93% of parents will rate Breakfast Point Academy as an "overall safe" school			
2012 Current level:		2013 Expected level:			
90% (48 out of 53)		93% (49 out of 53)			
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	Funding	PBS will help implement the Anti-bullying Plan School Wide.	Keri Weatherly	PBS Minutes	RtIB data
2	N/A	Raptor will be used to sign-in all visitors to the campus.	Receptionist – Kristin Anderson	Screen Raptor reports	Raptor Reports
3	Parent Participation	Climate Survey results will be used to make needed changes to the overall safety of BPA	Denise Kelley	Climate Survey	Climate Survey

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Positive Behavior Support	K-7	Jennifer Mann	School-Wide	Monthly (First Thursday after school)	PBS Minutes	Keri Weatherly

### Budget:

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
<b>Professional Development</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
<b>Other</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			<b>Grand Total: \$0.00</b>

*End of Safety Goal(s)*

# FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading				\$0.00
Mathematics				\$0.00
Science	Purchase materials to enhance science curriculum		District	\$1,297.28
Writing				\$0.00
Attendance				\$0.00
Suspension				\$0.00
Parent Involvement				\$0.00
STEM				\$0.00
Safety				\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$1,297.28
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading				\$0.00
CELLA				\$0.00
Mathematics				\$0.00
Science				\$0.00
Writing				\$0.00
Attendance				\$0.00
Suspension				\$0.00
Parent Involvement				\$0.00
STEM				\$0.00
Safety				\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading				\$0.00
CELLA				\$0.00
Mathematics				\$0.00
Science				\$0.00
Writing				\$0.00
Attendance				\$0.00
Suspension				\$0.00
Parent Involvement				\$0.00
STEM				\$0.00
Safety				\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading				\$0.00
CELLA				\$0.00
Mathematics				\$0.00
Science				\$0.00
Writing				\$0.00
Attendance				\$0.00
Suspension				\$0.00
Parent Involvement				\$0.00
STEM				\$0.00

Safety	\$0.00
	Subtotal: \$0.00
	Grand Total: \$1,297.28

## Differentiated Accountability

### School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------

Are you a reward school:  Yes  No

A reward school is any school that improves their letter grade or any school graded A.

No Attachment (Uploaded on 9/23/2012)

## 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
	\$0.00

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

The SAC shall review school performance data, monitor implementation of SIP, and discuss curriculum updates.

# 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

Bay School District BREAKFAST POINT ACADEMY 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	83%	84%	89%	64%	320	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"> <li>● Improve FCAT Levels</li> <li>● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5</li> <li>● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2</li> </ul>
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	62% (YES)	75% (YES)			137	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					605	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Bay School District BREAKFAST POINT ACADEMY 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	83%	84%	78%	58%	303	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	66%	66%			132	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Improve FCAT Levels</li> <li>● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5</li> <li>● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2</li> </ul>
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	58% (YES)	62% (YES)			120	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					555	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested