

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: CEDAR GROVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Bay

Principal: Joseph Campbell

SAC Chair: Pamela Clements

Superintendent: William Husfelt

Date of School Board Approval: 11-13-2012

Last Modified on: 11/8/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	J. Phillip Campbell	BS Mental Retardation; MA Educational Leadership and Administration	2	7	Mr. Campbell began his teaching career as a classroom teacher in 1997 in Bay County, Florida. He became the Administrative Assistant at West Bay Elementary in 2005-06, and the school attained a grade of 'C'. He then served as Assistant Principal at Hutchison Beach Elementary for three years. The school attained annual school grades as follows: 2006-07 'A'; 2007-08 'A'; 2008-09 'B'. In 2009-10 Mr. Campbell became Assistant Principal at Tommy Smith Elementary, and that school attained the school grade of 'B' during his service. Mr. Campbell became Principal of Cedar Grove Elementary in 2010-11 (school grade 'C'). School grade for Cedar Grove in 2011-12 was 'C'.
		BS Elementary Education, MA Educational Leadership and Administration,			Mrs. Buchanan began her teaching career as an ESE inclusion teacher in 2004 in Bay County, Florida. She has 7 years teaching

Assis Principal	Holly Buchanan	National Board Certification Literacy Early and Middle Childhood, K-6 ESOL Endorsement, ESE Certification	1	1	experience in Title 1 schools, where during that time the schools maintained an "A" grade. Mrs. Buchanan assumed the position of Administrative Assistant at Cedar Grove Elementary in March 2012; the school received a grade of "D."
-----------------	----------------	---	---	---	--

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)
Literacy	Christy Williamson	Elem Ed 1-6: MA Rdg K-12: Reading Endorsement	9	9	Ms. Williamson has served as Reading Coach for Cedar Grove since 2004. Prior to that she was a FLARE representative and a classroom teacher. while Reading Coach at Cedar Grove, 09-10 60% of all students were proficient in reading and the school received grade of 'C'; 08-09 67% of all students were proficient in reading and school received grade of 'A'; 07-08 64.8% were proficient in reading and school received grade of 'B'; 06-07 64.4% were proficient in reading and school received grade of 'C'.

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. Employ personnel to support and mentor teachers in their professional development, data analysis, classroom management and delivering instruction to students: • Literacy Coach • Crisis Intervention Teacher/Behavioral Specialist	Administrator and Title 1 District Coordinator	August 2012	
2	2. Provide staff development and parent involvement workshop stipends	Administrator and Title 1 District Coordinator	Ongoing	
3	3. Common planning times for grade groups.	Administrator	August 2012	
4	4. Small class size	Administrator	August 2012	
5	5. Provide appropriate and meaningful staff development opportunities	Administrator, Literacy Coach	Ongoing	

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
Not Applicable	

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
36	2.8%(1)	27.8%(10)	36.1%(13)	33.3%(12)	33.3%(12)	27.8%(10)	13.9%(5)	11.1%(4)	44.4%(16)

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
Hea Faircloth	Laura Murrell Heather Bennett Iris Walker Lisa Libby Ginger Chance Andrew Starr	District Mentor has primary and intermediate experience and is exemplary in her practice.	--Develop individual professional development plans (IPDP). --Meet as a group and as needed individually to dialogue about classroom organization, management, instructional strategies, and building/district procedures. --Mentors to model classroom practice for mentees. --District trainings for new teachers (Reading Frameworks, model classroom observations, Curriculum and Assessment Guidelines, etc.)

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

Services are provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through instructional/intervention programs during the school day and through after-school programs. Cedar Grove Elementary has been allocated \$218,202 to support school wide programs. Our 2012-2013 Title 1 allocation will be used to reduce the adult-student ratio, provide interventions, technology, classroom support and improve parent involvement.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Cedar Grove Elementary will continue to network with the district and various agencies to support families in need of services. Bay District Schools participates in the PAEC Consortium.

Title I, Part D

Title II

The Bay District Schools Office of Staff Development provides the school with staff development opportunities, materials, and resources related to increasing student achievement. The Bay District Schools Office of Staff Development also provides Staff Training Specialists to deliver staff development for instructional staff and administrators.

Title III

Services are provided through the district for education materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners.

Title X- Homeless

District provides resources for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI funds support activities designed to improve school grade.

Violence Prevention Programs

The Bay District School Board has an approved policy on "Bullying, Harassment, or Cyberstalking" (Policy 7.2.7). This policy is reviewed annually, during Pre-school Inservice by the administrative and instructional staff at each school. Each school has a Character Education Plan in place. Cedar Grove uses "Project Wisdom" daily on ITV announcements. Cedar Grove is implementing "Bully Proofing Our School" through weekly lessons in the classroom and reinforced on ITV. Character Education Plans support the prevention of violence and foster a drug free learning environment.

Nutrition Programs

All students who qualify for free or reduced lunch, in accordance with federal guidelines, are provided breakfast and lunch at the school site.

Housing Programs

NA

Head Start

NA

Adult Education

District provides Adult Education Services via Haney Vocational School.

Career and Technical Education

NA

Job Training

NA

Other

Cedar Grove is in the fourth year of the 5-year 21st Century Grant obtained for after-school enrichment. Approximately 160 students participate in the after-school program five days per week.

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Phillip Campbell, Principal; Holly Buchanan, Administrative Assistant; Yvonne Ammons and Christy Deese, Guidance Counselors; Christy Williamson, Literacy Coach; Select General Education Teachers as needed; Sheree Stringfellow, ESE/Interventionists; Aja Whatley and Deborah Bakanovic, Speech Language Pathologists; Dana Tutunick, Behavior Specialist; Angelina Collins, School Psychologist; Rebecca Christopher, District Instructional Specialist

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 focus of the MTSS Leadership Team is to develop and maintain a problem-solving system to bring out the best in our school, teachers and students.

The team will meet monthly. At the meetings, the team will review screening data and link results 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. The flow charts developed by this team will be

used to determine movement through Tiers 1, 2 and 3. The team will also collaborate to problem solve and evaluate implementation. The team will facilitate the process of RtI 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 facilitated the development of aligned processes and procedures that are articulated in flow charts for behavioral and academic protocol for the RtI process. These flow charts and processes conform to Florida law. The MTSS process is the basis for documenting and implementing interventions for students as outlined in the school improvement plan.

MTSS Implementation

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

Triangulation of data will be used to identify those students who could be in need of intensive interventions (MTSS). This data (pre, mid and post) can be collected through the use of Discovery Education assessments, Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), EasyCBM, DAZE, district and classroom diagnostic assessments.

The Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) online graphing system will be used to manage our tiered data. Teachers will be using the probes and graphs created by the University of Oregon to collect and display data on students who are identified as needing intervention.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional development will be provided during teachers' common planning time, after school and small sessions will occur throughout the year. Professional development will also be provided periodically in faculty meetings.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Regularly-scheduled meetings with MTSS Team and instructional staff to review student progress, student progress monitoring and evaluate strategies implemented.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Phillip Campbell, Principal
Holly Buchanan, Administrative Assistant
Christy Williamson, Literacy Coach
Jennifer Brown, Kindergarten Instructional Staff
Theresa Brown, First Grade Instructional Staff
Jennifer Newsom, Second Grade Instructional Staff
Johnette Chambers, Third Grade Instructional Staff
Kirsten Bergman, Fourth Grade Instructional Staff
Kevin Davis, Fifth Grade Instructional Staff
Sheree' Stringfellow, ESE/Interventionist
Lisa Libby, ESE Instructional Staff
Shirley Baxley, PreK Instructional Staff

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

Analyze the effectiveness of the CCRP. This is done by implementation of Reading FCIM calendars, analysis of assessment data, maintenance, tutorials, and enrichments to determine any necessary revisions to delivery of instruction. Responsible for implementation of CCRP with fidelity.

The Literacy Leadership Team meets the second Monday of each month from 2:05-2:50 P.M. Both the Principal and Literacy

Coaches are active members of the team and share the responsibility of facilitating the meetings. Using data analysis, meetings focus on areas of literacy concerns and implementation of the Comprehensive Reading Plan.

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

The major initiative of the Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) is analyzing student data. Based upon the needs reflected in the data, the LLT will develop ongoing professional development ultimately to improve student achievement. Cedar Grove's data indicates the LLT needs to continue its focus on vocabulary development and comprehension strategies using Project CRISS and Think Alouds. Professional development will focus on higher order questioning skills using Blooms Taxonomy and Webb's Depth of Knowledge. The development of these strategies is intended to improve and enrich ALL learners at Cedar Grove. The LLT will help build capacity with implementation of these strategies and serve as classroom models. The Literacy Coach and Principal will be responsible for follow up of the professional development activities.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 11/2/2012)

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

At Cedar Grove Elementary School, all incoming kindergarten students are assessed prior to or upon entering kindergarten in order to ascertain individual and group needs and to assist in the development of robust instructional/intervention programs. The following strategies assist preschoolers with low readiness rates: the state's volunteer Pre-K program, Head Start, and ESE Pre-K are programs that are currently in use to assist preschoolers. Additionally, each school has an Open House before school begins. During the Open House, students are introduced to the teacher and the school. Parent involvement and communication regarding transition programs occur at each Title 1 school. Each school sends surveys to kindergarten parents and newsletters home about transition events to inform parents with younger children. Other information about transition is provided in the community through information in school newsletters and posters/flyers in the community. There are dedicated funds in Title 1 to address the Pre-K transition strategies outlined above. Parents are involved in evaluating the effectiveness of the Pre-K transition plan. Parents assist in updating the transition plan by participating in SAC meetings, District Advisory Council and by offering feedback. Parents receive an evaluation survey and their comments are considered when updating the transition plan. The district provides all Title 1 schools with technical assistance, feedback and support.

The activities start in the spring in which children are invited to the school to participate in activities such as visits to classrooms, playground and lunchroom. They have the opportunity to play with children already in kindergarten. While the children are in the classroom, the teacher will read a story, have circle time or let the children play in the different centers. While the children are visiting the classrooms, the parents receive information on how to enroll their child in the school and how to prepare their child for kindergarten.

Staff responsible include:

Pre-K teachers—Jan Gibbons, Shirley Baxley, Darlene Jackson (CDA) and Tauheedah Bryan (CDA)
Kindergarten teachers—Beverly Bylsma, Pequetta Freeman, Jennifer Brown, Libby Leyh and Michelle Upton
Administrators—Phillip Campbell and Holly Buchanan

*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.

NA

*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?

NA

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?

NA

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](#)

NA

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:	35%(70) of students will achieve Level 3 proficiency and master AYP criteria through safe harbor in Reading in 201-13
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27%(53/200)	35%(70/200)

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	Budget constraints	Lower adult-student ratio by providing teachers and/or paraprofessionals where the need is most evident.	Principal	Review student achievement on standardized testing and class size data to ensure teachers and paraprofessionals are placed in classrooms where the need is most evident. Paraprofessionals' schedules will be flexible to accommodate delivery of intervention strategies.	Personnel assignments and class size data
2	Students have limited language and comprehension skills	Implement CRP, Grades K-5, with emphasis on vocabulary development and comprehension.	Literacy Coach	Lesson plans showing appropriate vocabulary building activities (i.e., word wall, read alouds, CRISS and QAR strategies)	Lesson plans Student performance
3	Appropriate diagnosis of student needs	Triangulate assessment data using district and grade-level specific assessments.	Classroom teachers	Teacher will monitor student data. Teacher and principal data chats.	Student profile sheet
4	Student engagement and coaching	Implement Kagan Strategies schoolwide across the curriculum	Classroom teachers	Teacher will monitor student data; Teacher and principal data chats; Grade level/team meeting; Kagan Coaches site visits	CWTs Observations Student performance Grade Level meeting notebook:

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:	20%(40/200) of students will achieve at or above Level 4 proficiency and master AMO criteria in Reading in 2012-13.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
15% (30/200)	20%(40/200)

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	Skill level of teachers in high-order questioning techniques	Engage students in high-order questioning and activities across the curriculum	Principal Classroom teachers Literacy Coach	Administrative observation and collegial discussions with grade level and/or academic area teams	CWTs Lesson plans Teacher observation Meeting notes
2	Students lack confidence in their ability to reason or problem solve independently.	Model and practice think aloud processes across the curriculum	Classroom teachers Administration	Student work and teacher observations	Lesson plans CWTs
3	Classroom and school programs focus on Levels 1 & 2	Differentiated activities such as, but not limited to, incorporating technology, hands-on projects, presentations, etc.	Classroom teachers	Lesson plans Student work Kagan Structures	Student generated products Lesson plans reflecting differentiation

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:	68% (136) of students will make learning gains in Reading in 2012-13.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
65% (130/200)	68%(136/200)

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	Budget constraints	Lower adult-student ratio by providing teachers and/or paraprofessionals where the need is most evident.	Principal	Review student achievement on standardized testing and class size data to ensure teachers and paraprofessionals are placed in classrooms where the need is most evident. Paraprofessionals' schedules will be flexible to accommodate delivery of intervention strategies.	Personnel assignments and class size data
2	Students have limited language and comprehension skills	Implement CRP, Grades K-5 with emphasis on vocabulary development and comprehension.	Literacy Coach	Lesson plans showing appropriate vocabulary building activities (i.e., word wall, read alouds, CRISS, QAR and Larry Bell strategies)	Student performance Lesson Plans
3	Ineffective application of data analysis	Instructional lessons addressing weakest assessment reporting categories by grade levels.	Classroom teachers	Analyze assessment data for growth and further emphasis; adjust instruction based upon data analysis.	Lesson plans Meeting notes Student performance

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:	90% (36) of students in lowest 255 will make learning gains in Reading in 2012-2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
87%(35/40)	90%(36/40)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of early detection of learning needs	Early detection of learning needs and remediate/enrich as necessary . (MTSS Process)	Classroom teachers Principal Literacy Coach	Review student achievement data to ensure flexible grouping and scheduling to target needs of students based upon assessments.	District mandated progress monitoring tools and universal assessments
2	Ineffective utilization of lab	Operation of two computer labs for SM5 and other computer assisted instruction	Classroom teachers	Target all third grade students and Levels 1 & 2 4th and 5th grade students	SM5 ;managemen reports, progress reports and data from other computer applications

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.			Reading Goal # 5A : <input type="text" value="55%"/>			
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text" value="51%"/>	<input type="text" value="55%"/>	<input type="text" value="60%"/>	<input type="text" value="64%"/>	<input type="text" value="69%"/>	<input type="text"/>

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.	66% of White students and 49%of Black students will achieve Level 3 proficiency and master AMO Reading criteria
--	---

Reading Goal #5B:	in 2012-13.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White 63% (62/98) Black 46% (38/83)	White 66% (65/98) Black 49% (41/83)

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	Release time for classroom teachers	Collaboration among Literacy Coach, classroom teachers, district crisis intervention teacher and administration to develop appropriate interventions for students who have not achieved proficiency in Reading.	Principal District Intervention Teacher Literacy Coach Classroom Teachers	Triangulation of data	Student 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:	21% (10) of SWD will achieve Level 3 proficiency and master AMO Reading criteria in 2012-13.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
18% (9)	21% (10)

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	Release time for classroom teachers.	Collaboration among Literacy Coach, classroom teachers, District ESE RT, School ESE RT, Guidance and administration to develop appropriate goals and objectives for students with disabilities who have not achieved proficiency in Reading	IEP Team	Triangulation of data	Student 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:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	55% (103/187) of Economically disadvantaged students will achieve Level 3 proficiency and master AMO Reading criteria in 2012-13.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
52% (97)	55% (103)

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	Release time for classroom teachers	Collaboration among Literacy Coach, classroom teachers, district crisis intervention teacher and administration to develop appropriate interventions for students who have not achieved proficiency in Reading.	Principal District Intervention Teacher Literacy Coach Classroom Teachers	Triangulation of data	Student assessments
2	Parent participation	Implementation of Parent Involvement Plan	Principal Teachers Parent Liaison	PIP documentation	Documentation of parent attendance and participation at school and in classrooms, etc.

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
Literacy Leadership Team	K-5, Reading	Christy Williamson	Grade-level Representation	Ongoing throughout the year	Minutes Agendas Meeting notes	Literacy Coach

CRISS I & II Training	K-5, Reading	Christy Williamson	Selected teachers K-5	2012-13	Lesson plans and classroom visits	Literacy Coach
Discovery Education	K-5, Reading	Christy Williamson	Teachers K-5	Ongoing 2012-2013	Follow-up sessions to model and analyze test results	Literacy Coach
Reading Frameworks	K-5, Reading	District Personnel	Newly employed teachers K-5	Ongoing throughout the year	Lesson plans and classroom visits.	Principal and Literacy Coach
Framework for Understanding Poverty	K-5, All	Title 1 RT	All newly employed teachers and staff K-5	December 2012	Lesson plans and classroom visits	Principal
Bay County Reading Assn Annual Conf	K-5, Reading	BCRA	Teachers and staff	January 2013	Share best practices in faculty meetings	Literacy Coach
QAR Now	K-5, Reading	Christy Williamson	Teachers and Administrators	2012-13	Lesson Plans	Literacy Coach
Kagan Structures	K-5, All	Kagan Coaches and District Personnel	Teachers K-5 (including ESE, Special Areas)	2012-13	Lesson plans, observations	Literacy Coach Principal

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
1(a)1	Additional Teachers and Paraprofessionals	Title 1 (School and District)	\$200,370.00
			Subtotal: \$200,370.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
2(a)3	Technology, Supplemental Instructional materials	Title 1 (school and district); School budget	\$7,400.00
			Subtotal: \$7,400.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
1(a)4	Substitutes for teachers to participate in PD, Kagan Coaches' Site Visits and follow-up	Title 1 (School and district) School Budget	\$24,281.00
			Subtotal: \$24,281.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
1(a)3	Student Planners	Title 1	\$3,500.00
			Subtotal: \$3,500.00
			Grand Total: \$235,551.00

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:

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	28% (56) of students will achieve Level 3 proficiency and master AMO criteria in Mathematics in 2012-13.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
21% (42/201)	28% (56/201)

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	Budget constraints	Lower adult-student ratio by providing teachers and/or paraprofessionals where the need is most evident.	Principal	Review student achievement on standardized testing and class size data to ensure teachers and paraprofessionals are placed in classrooms where the need is most evident. Paraprofessionals' schedules will be flexible to accommodate delivery of intervention strategies.	Personnel assignments and class size data
2	Manipulatives not being utilized	Increase use of manipulatives and hands-on activities to teach vocabulary and math concepts from concrete, to representational to abstract.	Principal and Classroom teachers	Administrative observation, collegial discussions with grade level and/or Math Leadership Team	CWTs, Lesson Plans, Meeting notes
3	Students' inability to comprehend and carry out multi-step problems.	Implement reading and writing strategies during math instruction. Increase use of word problems.	Principal and Classroom teachers	Administrative observation, collegial discussions with grade level and/or Math Leadership Team	CWTs, Lesson Plans, Meeting notes
4	Student engagement and coaching	Implement Kagan Strategies schoolwide across the curriculum	Classroom teachers	Teacher will monitor student data; Teacher and principal data chats; Grade level/team meetings; Kagan Coaches site visits	CWTs, Observations, student performance, grade level meeting notebook:

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:	18% (36) of students will achieve at or above Level 4 proficiency and master AMO criteria in Mathematics in 2012-13.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
11% (22/201)	185 (36/201)

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	Students are not being challenged.	Integrate technology into instruction and Math Centers (YouTube, Music, Smart Boards)	Classroom teachers, Principal	Daily classroom instruction, utilize TOSA	Lesson Plans Student Performance
2	Manipulatives not being utilized	Increase use of manipulatives and hands-on activities to teach vocabulary and math concepts from concrete, to representational, to abstract.	Principal and Classroom teachers	Administrative observation, collegial discussions with grade level and/or Math Leadership Team	CWTs, Lesson Plans, Meeting notes

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:	57% (115) of students will make learning gains in Mathematics in 2012-13.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
54% (109/201)	57% (115/201)

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	Students gain proficiency at different rates in different areas.	Early detection of learning needs and remediate/enrich as necessary. (MTSS process)	Classroom teachers, Principal	Review student achievement/assessment data to ensure flexible grouping to target needs of students.	Progress of all students on assessments including Discover: Ed.
2	Ineffective utilization of lab	Operation of two Computer Labs for SM5 and other computer assisted instruction.	Classroom teachers	Target all third grade students and Levels 1 & 2 fourth & fifth grade students	SM5 Management Reports, progress reports and data from other computer applications
3	Manipulatives not being utilized	Increase use of manipulatives and hands-on activities to teach vocabulary math concepts from concrete, to representational to abstract.	Principal and Classroom teachers	Administrative observation, collegial discussions with grade level and/or Math Leadership Team	CWTs, Lesson Plans, Meeting notes
4	Students' inability to comprehend and carry out multi-step problems	Implement reading and writing strategies during math instruction. Increase use of word problems.	Principal and Classroom teachers	Administrative observation, collegial discussions with grade level and/or Math Leadership Team	CWTs, Lesson Plans, Meeting notes

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:	60% (30) of students in lowest 25% will make learning gains in Mathematics in 2012-13.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
57% (28/50)	60% (30/50)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of early detection of learning needs	Early detection of learning needs and remediate/enrich as necessary. (MTSS process)	Classroom teachers, Principal	Review student achievement/assessment data to ensure flexible grouping to target needs of students.	Progress of all students on assessments including Discover Ed.
2	Ineffective utilization of computer lab	Operation of two Computer Labs for SM5 and other computer assisted instruction.	Classroom teachers	Target all third grade students and Levels 1 & 2 fourth & fifth grade students	SM5 Management Reports, progress reports and data from other computer applications
3	Manipulatives not being utilized	Increase use of manipulatives and hands-on activities to teach vocabulary and math concepts from concrete, to representational to abstract.	Principal and Classroom teachers	Administrative observation, collegial discussions with grade level and/or Math Leadership Team	CWTs, Lesson Plans, Meeting notes

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 #					
	46%					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	40%	46%	51%	57%	62%	

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:	55% (54) of White and 38% (32) of Black students will achieve Level 3 proficiency and master AMO Mathematics criteria in 2012-13.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
52% (51) White 35% (29) Black	55% (54) White 38% (32) Black

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	Students gain proficiency at different rates in different areas.	Provide intensive intervention to students not making AMO targets. (MTSS Process)	Principal, District Title I Director	Progress monitoring data of targeted students	Progress of targeted students on assessments
2	Manipulatives not being utilized	Increase use of manipulatives and hands-on activities to teach vocabulary and math concepts.	Principal and Classroom teachers	Administrative observation, collegial discussions with grade level and/or Math Leadership Team	CWTs, Lesson Plans, Meeting notes

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:	Not available
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Not available	Not available

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:	23% (11) of SWD will achieve Level 3 proficiency and master AMO Mathematics criteria in 2012-13.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
20% (10)	23% (11)

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	Manipulatives not being used.	Increase use of manipulatives and hands-on activities to teach vocabulary and math concepts.	Principal and Classroom teachers	Administrative observation, collegial discussions with grade level and/or Math Leadership Team	CWTs, Lesson Plans, Meeting notes
2	Students gain proficiency at different rates in different areas.	Provide intensive intervention to students not making AMO targets.	Principal, Classroom Teachers	Progress monitoring data of targeted students	Progress of targeted students on assessments (Discovery Ed)
3	Students gain proficiency at different rates because of varying disabilities	ESE teachers to develop individual plans and counsel with children who have issues that interfere with mathematics.	Principal District Title 1 Director	Ongoing monitoring of individual plan(s).	Progress of all Individual student plan(s); anecdotal notes

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:	46% (86) of economically disadvantaged students will achieve Level 3 proficiency and master AMO Mathematics criteria in 2012-13.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
43% (80/187)	46% (86/187)

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	Students gain proficiency at different rates in different areas.	Teachers will use student performance data to identify specific skill areas of need and use to guide instruction.	Principal	Review student achievement on standardized testing. Daily classroom instruction.	Progress of all students on assessments including Discover Ed.
2	Lack of time for reteaching/remediation	Utilize instructional paraprofessionals for additional small group math remediation and instructional support	Principal and Classroom Teachers	Small group instructional support by paraprofessionals	Progress monitoring using Chapter Tests
3	Manipulatives not being utilized	Increase use of manipulatives and hands-on activities to teach vocabulary and math concepts.	Principal and Classroom teachers	Administrative observation, collegial discussions with grade level and/or Math Leadership Team	CWTs, Lesson Plans, Meeting notes

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.

			Target Dates (e.g.,	
--	--	--	---------------------	--

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)	early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Math Leadership Team	K-5, Math	Wendy Whiting	Grade Level Representation	Ongoing throughout the year	Agenda and/or minutes	Principal Wendy Whiting
Thinking Math	K-5, Math	District Math RT/Coach	K-5 Teachers	Ongoing 2012-13	CWT's Lesson Plans, Grade Level Meetings	Administration
Discovery Education Assessment	K-5, Math	School Personnel	K-5 Teachers	Fall 2012	Baseline, Mid-Year, and End of Year Data	Principal Math Leadership Team Leader Title 1 RT
Harcourt Go Math Training	K-5, Math	District Personnel	K-5 Teachers (as needed)	2012-13	CWTs Lesson Plans	Principal Admin Asst
Kagan Structures	K-5, All	Kagan Coaches and District Personnel	K-5 Teachers (including ESE and Special Areas)	Ongoing throughout 2012-13 year	Lesson plans Observations	Principal Admin Asst Literacy Coach

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
1(a)1	Additional teachers and paraprofessionals	Title 1 (School and District)	\$98,229.00
			Subtotal: \$98,229.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
2(a)1	Technology supplemental supplies and materials	Title 1 (school and district); School budget	\$7,400.00
			Subtotal: \$7,400.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
1(a)4	Substitutes for teachers to participate in PD, Kagan Coaches' Site Visits and Follow-up	Title 1	\$3,500.00
			Subtotal: \$3,500.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$109,129.00

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:	27% (18) students will achieve Level 3 in Science in 2012-13.
--	---

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

24% (16/66)			27% (18/66)		
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	Lack of exposure to subject matter	Integrate science into other subject areas across grade levels	Classroom teachers Science team and Principal	Lesson plans	Teacher observation Student performance
2	Reading deficits inhibit ability to comprehend science text	Teach science on students' grade levels utilizing Kagan Structures, QAR, CRISS, and other comprehension strategies.	Classroom teachers, science team and Principal	Lesson plans	Teacher observation Student performance
3	Lack of science lab/materials	Utilize hands-on approach to Science instruction	Classroom teachers, science team, and Principal	Lesson plans	Teacher observation Student performance
4	Ineffective application of data analysis	Instructional lessons addressing weakest assessment reporting categories by grade levels	Classroom teachers, science team, and Principal	Analyze assessment data for growth and further emphasis; adjust instruction based upon data analysis	Lesson plans, meeting notes, student performance.

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:	*4 students using alt assess
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:	11% (8) will achieve at or above Level 4 in Science in 2012-13.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

8% (5/66)			11% (8/66)		
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	Lack of professional development in technology	Incorporate STEM into instruction	Classroom teachers	Schedules Lesson plans	Student performance
2	Lack of a Science lab/materials.	Increased utilization of hands-on/project-based instruction	Classroom teachers	Lesson plans	Student performance
3	Transportation and/or child care	Host Family Night Out for Science	Science Leadership Team	Parent Sign-in Communication to home	Survey

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:	* 4 students on alt assess			
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
Science Leadership Team	K-5, Science	Kenya Williams	Grade Level Representation	Ongoing throughout year	Agenda and/or minutes	Principal
Book Study: Writing Science in Action	K-5, Science	Denise Simonson Kenya Williams	Science Leadership Team	2012-2013	Sign-in sheets, work samples	Science Leadership Team Chair

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
1	Instructional Personnel	Title 1	\$63,585.00
1	Manipulatives and hands-on activities materials	Title 1	\$800.00
1	Consumable Science Materials	District Textbook budget	\$600.00
			Subtotal: \$64,985.00
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: \$64,985.00

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.		62% (47) of students will achieve FCAT Level 3.0 and higher proficiency in Writing in 2012-13.			
Writing Goal #1a:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
61% (46/76)		62% (47/76)			
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	Students are not familiar with the timed 60-minute writing process format.	School-wide Cedar Grove Writes! to enhance skills in focus, organization, support and conventions K-2 will teach process pre and mid-year and test at end of year. 3-5 will test pre-mid-	Classroom teachers and Literacy Team	Student samples of Level 1-2, Level 3 and Level 4,5,6 work. Lesson plans	Student performance on Cedar Grove Writes! and FCAT Writing

		year and end of year.			
2	Students do not know the format to thoroughly answer written response questions which impedes their comprehension.	Improve comprehension across the curriculum by requiring students to use QAR, CRISS, Kagan, Legos and Smartboard strategies to analyze questions, text, provide correct answers, support their answers and respond in complete sentences	Classroom teachers Literacy Team	Sample student work Lesson plans QAR, CRISS, Kagan, Legos and Smartboard Strategies	Student writing samples Lesson Plans
3	Students lack vocabulary, speaking and conventions skills	Utilize clear and concise oral communication skills with expression schoolwide.	Administration, faculty and staff	Student work samples Lesson plans utilizing QAR, CRISS, Kagan, Legos and Smartboard strategies	Student Samples Lesson Plans
4	Scheduling issues to allow collaboration among teachers	Provide opportunities for grade groups to collaboratively grade Cedar Grove Writes! to ensure consistency in feedback and assessing of student writings.	Administration	Student work samples; comparisons of grading conformity throughout year; share results with all grades/faculty	Schedule of collaboration sessions; TDY forms; Meeting notes

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
Literacy Leadership Team (Communications)	Literacy with emphasis on communications	Kirsten Bergman	K-5 grade level representation	Ongoing throughout the year	Agendas and/or minutes	Principal

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
1, 2, 3, 4	Substitutes for teachers to attend PD and collaborate	Title 1 (School and district)	\$1,386.00
			Subtotal: \$1,386.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$1,386.00

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		Decrease by ten percentage points the number of students with excessive absences and tardies.			
Attendance Goal #1:					
2012 Current Attendance Rate:		2013 Expected Attendance Rate:			
94% (488/520) ADA		95% (494/520) ADA			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)			
37.5% (195/520)		34% (175/520)			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)			
21% (110/520)		19% (99/520)			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of	Evaluation Tool

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	Transportation	Implement Parent Involvement Plan including Parent-Teacher Compacts	Classroom Teachers	Daily Attendance	AS400 attendance reports
2	Parent Involvement	Convene Child Study Team meeting for students with five (5) absences.	Principal Guidance	Monitoring daily attendance	CST Report Attendance Report
3	Lack of accurate communication information	Utilize attendance clerk and classroom teachers to notify parents of excessive absences and tardies	Classroom teachers Principal	Records of communication and attempts	Attendance reports

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
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:		The number of incidents resulting in in-school suspensions and out-of-school suspensions will decrease by 10% for 2012-2013.			
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions		2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions			
35		31			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School		2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School			
29		26			
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions		2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions			
70		63			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School		2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School			
41		37			
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	Understanding of PBS principles	Ensure common understanding of PBS principles for faculty and staff	Admin PBS Team	Dissemination of PBS information to staff	ODRs
2	Differentiating classroom management behavior; professional development	Identify repeat offenders and place in appropriate behavioral interventions	Classroom Teachers Guidance Counselors	Progress monitoring	MTSS documentation ODRs RTIB Database
3	Inequitable reward of positive behavior	Increase opportunities for rewarding appropriate behavior. Emphasize community building and classroom awards.	Classroom teachers PBS Team Behavior Specialist	Classroom incentives, Tiger Paws	Participation in ROAR Day activities
4	Lack of knowledge of character education principles	Implementing daily character education message (Project Wisdom) and Bullyproofing curriculum	Principal Admin Asst Classroom teachers	Broadcast on morning ITV announcements a daily thought for the day that addresses character education	Observations of students incorporating character traits

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
Bullyproofing PBS Training	K-5	PBS Team	Schoolwide	Faculty meetings ongoing throughout year		Administration PBS Team

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
1	Rewards and incentives for students	School budget, SAC funds	\$1,000.00
1	Crisis Intervention Teacher	Title 1	\$22,550.00
			Subtotal: \$23,550.00
			Grand Total: \$23,550.00

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
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						

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
5	Parent Liaison	Title 1	\$11,000.00
5	Communication	Title 1	\$405.00
5	Supplies, Family Night Out, Refreshments	Title 1, School Budget	\$3,000.00
			Subtotal: \$14,405.00
			Grand Total: \$14,405.00

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		Implementing the Engineering is Elementary (EIE) curriculum from the museum of Science, Boston, MA			
STEM Goal #1:					
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Funding for additional EIE curriculum units (1-5)	Implement EIE curricular unit themes grades 1-5, schoolwide.	Science and Mathematics Team Leaders	Delivery of instruction Lesson plans Collaboration Team Meeting Reports	Student performance and work samples Lesson plans

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
EIE Curricular Units	Gr 1-5, STEM	Mathematics and Science Team Leaders, EIE Personnel	Teachers 1-5	Summer 2012 Ongoing	CWTs Teacher feedback Lesson plans	Principal Team Leaders

STEM Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
1	EIE Curricular Unit Themes, grs 1-5	Title 1, School Budget, Private grants	\$6,856.00
			Subtotal: \$6,856.00
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: \$6,856.00

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:	The number of students referred to the office for discipline will decrease by 10% for 2011-2012.
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
247	222

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	Differentiating classroom management behavior; professional development	Identify repeat offenders and place in appropriate behavior interventions	Classroom teachers, Guidance Counselors, Behavioral Spec	Progress monitoring	RtI documentation ODRs
2	Inequitable reward of positive behaviors	Increase opportunities for rewarding appropriate behaviors with emphasis on community building	Classroom teachers, PBS Team	Classroom incentives, Tiger Paws, etc.	Participating in ROAR Day activities
3	Lack of knowledge of character education principles	Implementing daily character education message (Project Wisdom) and Bullyproofing curriculum	Admin Classroom Teachers	Broadcast on morning ITV announcements a thought for the day that addresses character education	Observations of students incorporating character traits

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

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

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

Budget:

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

End of Safety Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	1(a)1	Additional Teachers and Paraprofessionals	Title 1 (School and District)	\$200,370.00
Mathematics	1(a)1	Additional teachers and paraprofessionals	Title 1 (School and District)	\$98,229.00
Science	1	Instructional Personnel	Title 1	\$63,585.00
Science	1	Manipulatives and hands-on activities materials	Title 1	\$800.00
Science	1	Consumable Science Materials	District Textbook budget	\$600.00
STEM	1	EIE Curricular Unit Themes, grs 1-5	Title 1, School Budget, Private grants	\$6,856.00
				Subtotal: \$370,440.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	2(a)3	Technology, Supplemental Instructional materials	Title 1 (school and district); School budget	\$7,400.00
Mathematics	2(a)1	Technology supplemental supplies and materials	Title 1 (school and district); School budget	\$7,400.00
				Subtotal: \$14,800.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	1(a)4	Substitutes for teachers to participate in PD, Kagan Coaches' Site Visits and follow-up	Title 1 (School and district) School Budget	\$24,281.00
Mathematics	1(a)4	Substitutes for teachers to participate in PD, Kagan Coaches' Site Visits and Follow-up	Title 1	\$3,500.00
Writing	1, 2, 3, 4	Substitutes for teachers to attend PD and collaborate	Title 1 (School and district)	\$1,386.00
				Subtotal: \$29,167.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	1(a)3	Student Planners	Title 1	\$3,500.00
Suspension	1	Rewards and incentives for students	School budget, SAC funds	\$1,000.00
Suspension	1	Crisis Intervention Teacher	Title 1	\$22,550.00
Parent Involvement	5	Parent Liaison	Title 1	\$11,000.00
Parent Involvement	5	Communication	Title 1	\$405.00
Parent Involvement	5	Supplies, Family Night Out, Refreshments	Title 1, School Budget	\$3,000.00
				Subtotal: \$41,455.00
				Grand Total: \$455,862.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

j _n Priority	j _n Focus	j _n Prevent	j _n NA
-------------------------	----------------------	------------------------	-------------------

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 11/2/2012)

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
The SAC elected to use 2012-13 funds to enhance student incentives/awards and enrich the PBS program in place at our school.	\$483.00

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

Cedar Grove's School Advisory Council (SAC) meets a minimum of four (4) times each school year. The SAC provides input and approves the annual School Improvement Plan and all subsequent progress reports required to supplement the SIP, assists in building and approving the school's annual budget and the annual Title 1 budget, devises a system annually to equitably fund requests made by the instructional staff for the use of SAC funds that may become available based upon need, SSS and strategies contained in the SIP. when necessary the SAC also meets and acts upon items brought before it at special meetings called by the chairperson. Our SAC members are also involved in many activities in our school in addition to service on the SAC.

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 CEDAR GROVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	68%	56%	88%	33%	245	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	54%	39%			93	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	47% (NO)	50% (YES)			97	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					435	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Bay School District CEDAR GROVE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	71%	70%	75%	44%	260	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	54%	49%			103	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	66% (YES)	50% (YES)			116	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					479	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested