

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

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

School Name: BRENTWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Sarasota

Principal: John Weida

SAC Chair: Caroline Robertson

Superintendent: Lori White

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/8/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	John Weida	BA, Simpson College, degree in Elementary Education and Mental Disabilities; MS, Drake University, degree in Behavior Disorders; Ed.S, Nova University, degree in Educational Leadership, Florida and Iowa certified in K-12 mental disabilities and mental disorders; Ed Leadership	6	11	Principal 2010-Present Achieved AYP in 2010-2011. Assistant Principal of Brentwood Elementary 2006-2010. Maintained A school grade all 4 years. Achieved AYP in 2007-08. Percent of students making high standards in Reading: 06-07 -84%; 07-08 -85%; 08-09 -84%; 09-10 -79%. In Math: 06-07 -77%; 07-08 -81%; 08-09 -82%; 09-10 -85%; 11-12 In Science: 06-07 -58%; 07-08 -54%; 08-09 -58%; 09-10 -66%.
		BS, Norfolk State University, degree in			

50	4.0%(2)	4.0%(2)	52.0%(26)	40.0%(20)	90.0%(45)	0.0%(0)	16.0%(8)	16.0%(8)	62.0%(31)
----	---------	---------	-----------	-----------	-----------	---------	----------	----------	-----------

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
Cindy Rasmussen	Rex Ingerick	1st year counselor with district support	Mentor and mentee are meeting weekly to discuss strategies and facilitation skills.
Heidi Thompson	Laurie Labsan	1st year teacher with mentor	Mentor and mentee will meet weekly to discuss instructional strategies.

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I is a federally funded program designed to address the academic needs of low performing students in schools with a high percentage of economically disadvantaged students and to assist them in meeting the state's high standards, particularly in the areas of reading, writing, science and mathematics. The district coordinates with Title II in ensuring staff development needs are provided and with Title IV 21st Century Community Learning Centers grants to provide after school programs.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

The district supports a Migrant Identifier/Recruiter who provides referral services and support to migrant students and families. The ID& R person coordinates with the Title I and other programs to ensure student and family needs are met.

Title I, Part D

The district receives funds to provide students in alternative schools with services needed to make a successful transition from at-risk programs to further schooling or employment.

Title II

Funds from Title IIA are used for teacher and principal quality training. Professional development activities are provided to improve the knowledge of teachers, principals and paraprofessionals, as appropriate. Instruction is provided to teach children with different learning styles and/or children with disabilities and special learning needs. Professional development activities are provided to improve behavior in the classroom. Training is provided to make all teachers highly qualified.

Title III

Supplemental services and materials are provided to improve the academic achievement and language acquisition of immigrant and English Language Learner students throughout the district.

Title X- Homeless

Homeless education case managers provide resources (clothing, school supplies, social service referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education. Program provides on-going outreach, training and tutoring.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school for Level 1 readers, support reading teachers at schools and offer credit retrieval and dropout prevention programs for high school students

Violence Prevention Programs

The district provides violence and drug prevention programs that incorporate bullying prevention, suicide prevention, internet

safety and personal safety. Both intentional and unintentional injury prevention programs are provided.

Nutrition Programs

Free and Reduced Lunch Program through federal funds.

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The school based RtI Leadership team is comprised of general education personnel that facilitate RtI/MTSS as a related but distinct process from the CARE (Children At-Risk in Education) eligibility determination process. At Brentwood Elementary School the RtI Leadership Team is composed of:

The Principal, Assistant Principal, School Counselor, School Psychologist and School Social Worker: Provides support in data disaggregation, progress monitoring and training.

Select General Education Teachers and Title I Resource Teacher: Monitor and provide interventions for tier 2 and 3 students.

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 team meets once a week to engage in the following activities: The team will review summative and formative data to identify school, grade, team, and class level academic needs. Individual student information will be reviewed. Based on the data review, instructional strategies will be identified and a timeline of implementation will be constructed. Student progress will be monitored and individual cases reviewed periodically to determine progress and reassess further instructional interventions.

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 school-based RtI Leadership Team will employ continuous improvement process to create the SIP as outlined in this document. Input will be gathered from the grade level teams, the SAC/SDMT and district teams composed of specialists in the areas of instructional need.

On a monthly basis, Team Leaders in collaboration with Support Staff will oversee the implementation of the SIP 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.

The school uses a variety of reports produced by the district Office of Research, Assessment and Evaluation on the academic achievement of students at all Tiers. Disaggregated AYP subgroup data by reading, mathematics, science and writing is utilized. In addition, we have a school based data management system that includes scores from the following: FAIR Reading assessment, Formative Math Benchmark Test, FOCUS Science Test, District Writing Assessment, StoryTown Theme Test, EnVision Math Assessment, Oral Reading Fluency, Running Records, SuccessMaker Math and Reading and FCAT Testmaker Science to summarize data for students at Tier 1, 2, and 3.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Monthly collaborative planning half day will provide opportunity for continuous professional development.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The school based team will meet once a month to follow up on any training that was conducted before the meeting. The team will share results of the training and what needs to change in the coming month.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

John Weida, Brandon Johnson,

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

Meet bi-monthly to review current reading data.

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

Disaggregating FAIR, SuccessMaker data, Running Records and Oral Reading Fluency data as well as developing and assisting in implementing one-on-one and small group interventions.

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.

At the end of each school year, students transitioning from preschool to kindergarten programs are discussed at SWST/CARE team meetings to plan for their needs at local elementary schools.

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for Level 3 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 3 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 3 - 30%(86) Level 3,4,5 - 66%(190)	Level 3 -34% Level 3,4,5 - 70%

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	Teachers have experienced difficulty allocating time for small group and 1:1 instruction in Reading and Math.	To provide time for small group or individualized instruction for students experiencing difficulty in reading and math.	Principal, Assistant Principal,	SuccessMaker data reviewed weekly, FAIR data 3x a year and EnVision reports at the completion of topics.	FAIR, SuccessMaker (Reading and Math), Formative Math Benchmark Test
2	1.2. The need to have specific progress monitoring data that is standardized from child to child, classroom to classroom.	1.2. The school will implement the FAIR assessments to monitor student progress	1.2. Principal, Assistant Principal, Classroom Teacher	1.2. Review of FAIR data reports to ensure teachers are following assessment schedule	1.2. FAIR data reports
3	1.3. Teachers ability to focus on specific skills in order to intervene and remediate	1.3. The school will implement the SuccessMaker Program to monitor student progress	1.3. Principal, Assistant Principal,	1.3. Review of SuccessMaker data reports to ensure teachers are following assessment schedule and identify specific developmental needs of students	1.3. SuccessMaker data reports
4	1.4. Need to develop a sense of urgency to develop and implement interventions.	1.4. Develop specific block of time reserved for one-on-one and small group intervention	1.4. Principal, Assistant Principal	1.4. Lesson plans will indicate instructional groups during intervention block. Classroom walk-throughs will focus on interventions.	1.4. Effectiveness will be determined by growth as evidenced by progress monitoring using FAIR and SuccessMaker.

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	
--	--

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students, when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a one percentage point increase for Level 4,5 students where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). If 90% or more students are proficient, the school can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No overall proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 4,5 - 36%(102) Level 3,4,5 - 66%(190)	Level 4,5,- 38% Level 3,4,5 - 70%

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	2.1. The need to have specific progress monitoring data that is standardized from child to child, classroom to classroom	2.1.The school will implement the FAIR assessments to monitor student progress	2.1.Principal, Assistant Principal,	2.1.Review of FAIR data reports to ensure teachers are following assessment schedule	2.1. FAIR data reports
2	2.2. Teachers ability to identify and focus on specific skills in order to enrich and extend curriculum.	2.2. The school will implement SuccessMaker to monitor student progress	2.2.. Principal, Assistant Principal,	2.2. Review of SuccessMaker data reports to ensure teachers are following assessment schedule and identify specific developmental needs of students	2.2. SuccessMaker data reports
3	2.3. Students scoring level 4 or 5 are in need of enrichment and extension	2.3. Include evidence of Differentiated Instruction in lesson plans	2.3. Principal, Assistant Principal	2.3 Review of lesson plans bi-quarterly and during classroom walkthroughs	2.3 Documented differentiated instruction in lesson plans. Classroom walk-through logs will determine frequency of Differentiation.
	2.4 Need to develop a sense of urgency for students to show	2.4 Develop specific block of time reserved for one-on-one and small	2.4 Principal, Assistant Principal	2.4 Lesson plans will indicate instructional groups during	2.4 Effectiveness will be determined by growth as

4	learning gains above proficiency.	group intervention		intervention block. Classroom walk throughs will focus on interventions.	evidenced by progress monitoring using FAIR and SuccessMaker.
---	-----------------------------------	--------------------	--	--	---

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (at identified level). There will be a minimum of a one percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (at identified level).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100%(10)	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	Teachers encounter a wide range of instructional levels within classroom setting	Unique Learning Systems	Principal, Assistant Principal, or ESE Liaison	Review teacher data collection to ensure students are working towards their IEP goals	Teacher data collection and Teacher observation
2	The need to have specific progress monitoring data that is standardized from child to child, classroom to classroom with FAA students.	TeachTown	Principal, Assistant Principal, ESE Liaison	Review of TeachTown data reports to ensure teachers are following assessment schedule	TeachTown data reports

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67%(122)	71%

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	3.1. The need to have specific progress monitoring data that is standardized from child to child, classroom to classroom	3.1. The school will implement the FAIR assessments, Running Record and SuccessMaker to monitor student progress, with focus on specific sub-groups that did not make	3.1. Principal, Assistant Principal,	3.1. Review of FAIR data reports, Running Records reports and SuccessMaker reports to ensure teachers are following focus calendars and assessment schedule	3.1. FAIR data reports, SuccessMaker data reports and Running Record reports

		gains.			
2	3.2 The need to break away from whole group instruction to identification of individual academic needs and prescriptive instruction, regardless of subgroup or achievement level.	3.2 Develop specific block of time reserved for one-on-one and small group intervention	3.2 Principal, Assistant Principal	3.2 Lesson plans will indicate instructional groups during intervention block. Classroom walk throughs will focus on interventions.	3.2 Effectiveness will be determined by growth as evidenced by progress monitoring using FAIR and SuccessMaker.

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase in the number of students demonstrating a learning gain in the lowest quartile.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67%(32)	71%

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	4.1. The need to have specific progress monitoring data that is standardized from child to child, classroom to classroom	4.1. The school will implement the FAIR assessments, Running Record reports and SuccessMaker to monitor student progress, with focus on specific sub-groups that did not make gains.	4.1.Principal, Assistant Principal,	4.1.Review of FAIR data reports, Running Record reports and SuccessMaker reports to ensure teachers are following focus calendars and assessment schedule as well as identify specific developmental needs of students	4.1. FAIR data reports, SuccessMaker data reports and Running Record reports
	4.2. Students in sub groups not making	4.2 Include evidence of Differentiated Instruction	4.2 Principal, Assistant Principal	4.2 Review of lesson plans bi-quarterly and	4.2 Documented differentiated

2	learning gains in Reading.	in lesson plans		during classroom walkthroughs	instruction in lesson plans. Classroom walk-through logs will determine frequency of Differentiation.
3	4.3 The need to break away from whole group instruction to identification of individual academic needs and prescriptive instruction, regardless of subgroup or achievement level.	4.3 Develop specific block of time reserved for one-on-one and small group intervention	4.3 Principal, Assistant Principal	4.3 Lesson plans will indicate instructional groups during intervention block. Classroom walk throughs will focus on interventions.	4.3 Effectiveness will be determined by growth as evidenced by progress monitoring using FAIR and SuccessMaker.

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Reading Goal # The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your school's total population for SY 2012-2013 and the 5 year project ion (2016-2017) is				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	67	70	73	76	79	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Black 48%(11) Hispanic 66%(35) White 68%(127)	Black 47% Exceeded AMO Target Hispanic 63% White 74%

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 in sub groups not making learning gains in Reading.	Include evidence of Differentiated Instruction in lesson plans	Principal, Assistant Principal	Review of lesson plans bi-quarterly and during classroom walkthroughs	Documented differentiated instruction in lesson plans. Classroom walk-through logs will determine frequency of 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 subgroup:

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

	non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41%	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	Teachers ability to focus on specific skills in order to intervene and remediate	ELL Storytown Leveled Readers and Strategic Intervention	Principal, Assistant Principal, or ESOL Liaison	Lesson plans will indicate instructional groups during intervention block. Classroom walk throughs will focus on interventions.	Effectiveness will be determined by growth as evidenced by progress monitoring using FAIR and SuccessMaker

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41%	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
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:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
62%	63%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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
SuccessMaker – Disaggregating Data	All Grade levels Reading	Principal, Assistant Principal or Marla Myers	All grade levels	September 2012	Weekly data review in collaborative planning meetings	Principal or Assistant Principal
Response to Literature	All Grade levels Reading	Principal, Assistant Principal, or Staff	All grade levels	on-going	Monthly Professional Development Meetings	Principal or Assistant Principal

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Intervention Labs for individualized instruction	Lab teacher	Title I	\$15,000.00
			Subtotal: \$15,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
SuccessMaker Intervention Labs	Headphones for each computer for fluency	PTO	\$2,400.00
			Subtotal: \$2,400.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Thinking Maps	An instructional tool to teach critical thinking skills and how to map out your thinking	Title I	\$5,000.00
			Subtotal: \$5,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$22,400.00

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.

1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.
CELLA Goal #1:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2. Students scoring proficient in reading.
CELLA Goal #2:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.
CELLA Goal #3:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

CELLA Budget:

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 3 - 34%(98) Level 3,4,5 - 61%(173)	Level 3 - 38% Level 3,4,5 - 64%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teachers have experienced difficulty allocating time for small group and 1:1 instruction in Reading and Math.	To provide time for small group or individualized instruction for students experiencing difficulty in reading and math.	Principal, Assistant Principal,	SuccessMaker data reviewed weekly, FAIR data 3x a year and EnVision reports at the completion of topics.	FAIR, SuccessMaker (Reading and Math), Formative Math Benchmark Test
2	1.3. Teachers encounter a wide range of instructional levels within classroom setting	1.3. Include evidence of Differentiated Instruction in lesson plans	1.3. Principal, Assistant Principal	1.3. Review of lesson plans bi-quarterly and during classroom walkthroughs	1.3. Documented differentiated instruction in lesson plans. Classroom walk-through logs will determine frequency of Differentiation.
3	1.2. Teachers are unable to focus on specific skills immediately in order to remediate	1.2. The school will implement SuccessMaker to monitor student progress; areas of difficulty, custom courses, prescriptive scheduling	1.2. Teacher, Principal, Assistant Principal, Title I Resource Teacher and Classroom Teachers	1.2. Review of SuccessMaker data reports to ensure teachers are following assessment schedule and identifying developmental needs of students	1.2. SuccessMaker data reports

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1b:	
---	--

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	By the year 2012, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency.
---	--

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

Level 4,5 - 26%(75) Level 3,4,5 - 61%(173)	Level 4,5 - 28% Level 3,4,5 - 63%
---	--------------------------------------

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.2. Students scoring level 4 or 5 are in need of enrichment and extension	2.2 Include evidence of Differentiated Instruction in lesson plans	2.2 Principal, Assistant Principal	2.2 Review of lesson plans bi-quarterly and during classroom walkthroughs	2.2 Documented differentiated instruction in lesson plans. Classroom walk-through logs will determine frequency of Differentiation.
2	2.1. Teachers are unable to focus on specific skills immediately in order to remediate	2.1. The school will implement the SuccessMaker to monitor student progress; areas of difficulty, custom courses, prescriptive scheduling	2.1. Teacher, Principal, Assistant Principal,	2.1. Review of SuccessMaker data reports to ensure teachers are following assessment schedule and identifying developmental needs of students	2.1. SuccessMaker data reports

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

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

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

--	--

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating an annual learning gain.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
60% (109)	64%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3.2. Teachers encounter a wide range of instructional levels within classroom setting	3.2. Include evidence of Differentiated Instruction in lesson plans	3.2. Principal, Assistant Principal	3.2. Review of lesson plans bi-quarterly and during classroom walkthroughs	3.2. Documented differentiated instruction in lesson plans. Classroom walk-through logs will determine frequency of Differentiation
2	3.1. Teachers are unable to focus on specific skills immediately in order to remediate	3.1. The school will implement the SuccessMaker to monitor student progress; areas of difficulty, custom courses, prescriptive scheduling	3.1. Teacher, Principal, Assistant Principal,	3.1. Review of SuccessMaker data reports to ensure teachers are following assessment schedule and identifying developmental needs of students	3.1. SuccessMaker data reports

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase in the number of students demonstrating a learning gain in the lower quartile.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
59%(27)	63%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	4.2. Teachers encounter a wide range of instructional levels within classroom setting	4.2. Include evidence of Differentiated Instruction in lesson plans	4.2. Principal, Assistant Principal	4.2. Review of lesson plans bi-quarterly and during classroom walkthroughs	4.2. Documented differentiated instruction in lesson plans. Classroom walk-through logs will determine frequency of Differentiation
2	4.1. Teachers are unable to focus on specific skills immediately in order to remediate	4.1. The school will implement the SuccessMaker to monitor student progress; areas of difficulty, custom courses, prescriptive scheduling	4.1. Teacher, Principal, Assistant Principal,	4.1. Review of SuccessMaker data reports to ensure teachers are following assessment schedule and identifying developmental needs of students	4.1. SuccessMaker data reports

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Elementary School Mathematics Goal #					
	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your school's total population for SY 2012-2013 and the 5 year project ion (2016-2017) is					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	67	70	73	76	79	

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

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

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Black 36% Hispanic 58%(33) White 71%(122)	Black 47% Hispanic 65% White 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	Teachers are unable to focus on specific skills immediately in order to remediate	The school will implement the SuccessMaker to monitor student progress; areas of difficulty, custom courses, prescriptive scheduling	Teacher, Principal, Assistant Principal	Review of SuccessMaker data reports to ensure teachers are following assessment schedule and identifying developmental needs of students	SuccessMaker data reports

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

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

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56%	63%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
48%	46% Exceeded AMO Target

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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	The FLDOE has identified the target goals for the AMOs each year from SY 2012-1013 to 2016-1017 for this population. The target for your this subpopulation(s) for SY 2012-2013 is indicated below. If your schools percent proficient is at or above 95%, the school can maintain that percentage. Your school can also achieve their goal by reducing the percent non-proficient within this population by 10% (Safe Harbor).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56%	63%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Math Strategies	All	District Math Specialist	school-wide	November, 2012	PLC	Administration

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Intervention labs for individualized instruction	Lab Teacher	Title I	\$14,000.00
			Subtotal: \$14,000.00
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: \$14,000.00			

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:		By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5) Any subgroup that is 90% or higher can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
Level 3 - 36% (107) Level 3,4,5 - 47% (139)		Level 3 - 40% Level 3,4,5 - 51%			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Ability to monitor student progress	1.1.The school will implement the FCAT TestMaker assessments to monitor student progress	1.1.Principal, Assistant Principal,	1.1.Review of FCAT TestMaker data reports to ensure teachers are following assessment schedule and identifying developmental needs of students	1.1. FCAT TestMaker data reports
2	1.2. Application of Differentiated Instruction in Science	1.2.Include evidence of Differentiated Instruction in lesson plans	1.2. Principal, Assistant Principal	1.2. Review of lesson plans bi-quarterly and during classroom walkthroughs	1.2. Documented differentiated instruction in lesson plans. Classroom walk-through logs will determine frequency of Differentiation.
3	1.3. Pace and scope of Science instruction	1.3. Use the district provided Instructional Focus Calendar	1.3. Classroom Teachers, Team Leaders	1.3. Review of data from strand based assessments using FCAT TestMaker in collaborative planning meetings.	1.3. FCAT TestMaker

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.		By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 70% are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5). There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 70% or more are currently demonstrating proficiency (across Levels 3,4,5) Any subgroup that is 90% or higher can maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% (across Levels 3,4,5) for any subgroup.			
Science Goal #2a:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
Level 4,5 - 11% (32) Level 3,4,5 - 47% (139)		Level 4,5 - 15% Level 3,4,5 - 51%			
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	2.1. Ability to monitor student progress	2.1 The school will implement the FCAT TestMaker assessments to monitor student progress	2.1.Principal, Assistant Principal,	2.1 Review of FCAT TestMaker data reports to ensure teachers are following assessment schedule	2.1 FCAT TestMaker data reports
2	2.2. Application of Differentiated Instruction in Science	2.2.Include evidence of Differentiated Instruction in lesson plans	2.2. Principal, Assistant Principal	2.2. Review of lesson plans bi-quarterly and during classroom walkthroughs	2.2. Documented differentiated instruction in lesson plans. Classroom walk-through logs will determine frequency of Differentiation.
	2.3. Pace and scope of Science instruction	2.3. Use the district provided Instructional	2.3. Classroom Teachers, Team	2.3. Review of data from strand based	2.3. FCAT TestMaker

3		Focus Calendar	Leaders	assessments using FCAT TestMaker in collaborative planning meetings.
---	--	----------------	---------	--

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
IFC Science	All Grade Levels	Brad Porinchak	school-wide	September, 2012	PLC Meetings	Administration

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
FCAT TestMaker	Test item database		\$0.00
Mad Science	Science Enrichment and activities	Title I Part A	\$6,800.00
			Subtotal: \$6,800.00
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: \$6,800.00

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 75% are currently demonstrating 3.0 or higher on the writing essay. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 75% or more are currently demonstrating 3.0 or higher on the writing essay. Any subgroup that is 90% or higher must maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% for any subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
79%(71)	81%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Lack of tools for evaluating student writing	1.1. Using Collaborative Planning Time to share student writing and breaking down components of writing. Emphasis on both the Science and Art of writing	1.1. Classroom teachers, team leaders, Principal, Assistant Principal	1.1. Students complete four district prompts. Teachers evaluate student writing samples. WriteScore will also evaluate student writing samples. Teachers will compare evaluations.	1.1. WriteScore and district progress monitoring instrument.
2	1.2. Writing instruction needs to be consistent across all grade levels	1.2. Include evidence of WriteReflections writing program in teacher lesson plans K-5.	1.2. Principal and Assistant Principal	1.2. Review of lesson plans bi-quarterly and during classroom walkthroughs	1.2. Lesson Plans

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	By the year 2013, there will be a minimum of a four percentage point increase for all student subgroups when less than 75% are currently demonstrating 4.0 or higher on the writing essay. There will be a minimum of a two percentage point increase for all student groups where 75% or more are currently demonstrating 4.0 or higher on the writing essay. Any subgroup that is 90% or higher must maintain or demonstrate an increase in the percent proficient. No proficiency target will be less than 35% for
--	---

		any subgroup.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
26%(23)		30%			
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	Writing instruction needs to be consistent across all grade levels	Response to Literature	Principal and Assistant	Review of lesson plans bi-quarterly and during classroom walkthroughs	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
WriteScore	All	Principal, Assistant Principal	All Grade Levels	October, on-going	Principal will follow up with individual grade levels during collaborative planning meetings	Administration
Write and Beyond	All	Caroline Robertson	All Grade Levels	On-going	Principal, Assistant Principal	Administration

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
Write Score Authentic Assessment/formative Assessment	WriteScore	Title I	\$2,664.00
			Subtotal: \$2,664.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Write and Beyond; Narrative and Expository	Thinking Maps Writing	Title I	\$6,617.00
			Subtotal: \$6,617.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:		<p>ATTENDANCE GOAL – RATE For the attendance year 2012-2013, the attendance rate will increase. If the current attendance rate is less than 90%, there will be a minimum 4% increase. If the current percentage of attendance is 90% or greater, the school will maintain or increase the percentage.</p> <p>ATTENDANCE GOAL- ABSENCES By the year 2013, there will be a decrease of students who are absent ten or more days. When 40% or more of the students have ten or more absences annually, there will be a minimum of a 4 percentage point decrease. If less than 40% of the students have ten or more absences annually, there will be a minimum of a 2 percentage point decrease</p> <p>ATTENDANCE GOAL- TARDY By the year 2013, there will be a decrease of students who are Tardy ten or more days. When 30% or more of the students have ten or more Tardies annually, there will be a minimum of a 4 percentage point decrease. If less than 30% of the students have ten or more Tardies annually, there will be a minimum of a 2 percentage point decrease. If the current percent of Tardies is 10% or less, the school can maintain or decrease the percentage.</p>			
2012 Current Attendance Rate:		2013 Expected Attendance Rate:			
95.1% (611/643)		97.1%			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)			
200		187			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)			
95		82			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. number of students tardy to school	1.1. Monitor number of days tardy, as well as length of tardiness. Contact with parents before tardiness becomes excessive.	1.1. guidance counselor, registrar, attendance committee	1.1. Review of data showing number of days tardy.	1.1. AS400 attendance data
	1.2. Number of	1.2. Monitor number of	1.2. guidance	1.2. Review number of	1.2. AS400

2	students signed out of school early	days tardy, as well as length of tardiness.	counselor, registrar, attendance committee	days tardy	attendance data
3	1.3. Number of students with excessive absences	1.3 Monitor attendance data and plan interventions	1.3 guidance counselor, registrar, attendance committee	1.3 Review number of days absent.	1.3 AS400 attendance data

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

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

1. Suspension Suspension Goal # 1:	By the year 2013, there will be a reduction of suspensions from the previous year. If the current percentage of suspensions is 10% or less, the school will maintain or decrease the percentage. If the current percentage is between 11-49%, the school will reduce the percentage by 5%. If the current percentage is 50% or higher than the previous year, the school will reduce the percentage by 10%.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
14	14
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
12	12
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
22	22
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
15	15

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Proactive levels of support to change behavior	1.1. Positive Behavior Support plan	1.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, PBS committee	1.1. AS400 data	1.1. AS400 data
2	1.2. Lack of sense of belonging to school community.	1.2. Community of Caring	1.2. Community of Caring Committee	1.2. PTO Community service projects, school community service projects, developing the 5 cores values: Family, Respect, Responsibility, Caring, Trust, Infusion of core values in classroom instruction	1.2. Sign in sheets, agendas lesson plans,
3	1.3. emotional instability of students and families	1.3. Lunch Bunch Guidance Groups, Pet Therapy,	1.3. School Counselor	1.3. Number of students signed into session for groups.	1.3. Feedback from therapy groups and families

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						

Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Community of Caring	Affect/Character Ed	SAC	\$500.00
			Subtotal: \$500.00
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: \$500.00

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:		On average, 80% of all parents will attend parent activities and provide input.			
*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.					
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:		2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:			
n/a		n/a			
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	1.1 Literacy skills of parents	1.1. Partners in Print	1.1. Parent Involvement Coordinator	1.1. Number of parents that participate in the program, feedback from parent surveys.	1.1. Sign in sheets, agendas
2	1.2. Involvement by Fathers	1.2. Brentwood's Active Dads	1.2. Principal and Assistant Principal	1.2. Opportunities are provided for Brentwood's Dads to come to school and be involved with their child. During these activities, Dads are given instruction on the importance of their participation in their child's education as well as how to be more involved. Guided conversations are supported from Tony Dungy's All Pro Dads website.	1.2. Sign in sheets, agendas
3	1.3. Families involved in the community.	1.3. Community of Caring	1.3. Community of Caring Committee	1.3. PTO Community service projects, developing the 5 core values: Family, Respect, Responsibility, Caring, Trust	1.3. Sign in sheets, agendas
4	1.4 Inclusion of special needs and ESOL families	1.4 ESE and ESOL Literacy Nights	1.4 ESE and ESOL Liaisons	1.4 Early intervention and implementing researched based reading strategies at home will increase student achievement.	1.4 Sign in sheets, agendas
5	Oral language skills of parents	OLLIE - Oral Language Learning in Education	Principal and Assistant Principal	Research based program designed to foster and develop oral language skills. Effectiveness will be determined by decrease in SuccessMaker Areas of difficulties in Morphology skills.	SuccessMaker Areas of difficulties in Morphology skills

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
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Intervention Labs for individualized instruction	Lab teacher	Title I	\$15,000.00
Mathematics	Intervention labs for individualized instruction	Lab Teacher	Title I	\$14,000.00
Science	FCAT TestMaker	Test item database		\$0.00
Science	Mad Science	Science Enrichment and activities	Title I Part A	\$6,800.00
Suspension	Community of Caring	Affect/Character Ed	SAC	\$500.00
				Subtotal: \$36,300.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	SuccessMaker Intervention Labs	Headphones for each computer for fluency	PTO	\$2,400.00
Writing	Write Score Authentic Assessment/formative Assessment	WriteScore	Title I	\$2,664.00
				Subtotal: \$5,064.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Thinking Maps	An instructional tool to teach critical thinking skills and how to map out your thinking	Title I	\$5,000.00
Writing	Write and Beyond; Narrative and Expository	Thinking Maps Writing	Title I	\$6,617.00
				Subtotal: \$11,617.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
				Grand Total: \$52,981.00

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 10/4/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

The majority of the SAC members are not employed by the school district. The SAC is composed of the principal and an appropriately balanced number of teachers, education support employees, students (for middle and high school only), parents, and other business and community citizens who are representative of the ethnic, racial, and economic community served by the school. Please verify the

statement above by selecting "Yes" or "No" below.

✓ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
Support our Community of Caring activities	\$500.00
Support literacy initiatives; books	\$1,000.00
Support our positive behavior support plan and renaissance program	\$1,000.00

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

Budget, School Improvement Plan, Title I Compact and Title I Parent Involvement Plan .

AYP DATA

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2011-2012
 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2010-2011
 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2009-2010

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Sarasota School District BRENTWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	82%	86%	81%	53%	302	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%	67%			133	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?	44% (NO)	68% (YES)			112	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					547	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Sarasota School District BRENTWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	79%	85%	78%	66%	308	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	58%	64%			122	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?	52% (YES)	57% (YES)			109	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					539	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested