

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: S. A. HULL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Duval

Principal: Angela Lott

SAC Chair: Shawn Ferrell

Superintendent: Ed Pratt-Dannals

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/15/2012

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: S. A. Hull Elementary School 2011-2012 School Grade: C % High Achieving Reading 60% % High Achieving Math 70% % High Achieving Writing 85% % High Achieving Science 26% % Gains Reading 56% % Gains Math 65% % Lowest 25% Reading 43% % Lowest 25% Math 73% AYP: NO Black and Economically Disadvantaged Sub-groups need improvement in Reading. Principal: S. A. Hull Elementary School 2010-2011 School Grade: C % High Achieving Reading 60% % High Achieving Math 70% % High Achieving Writing 85% % High Achieving Science 26% % Gains Reading 56% % Gains Math 65% % Lowest 25% Reading 43% % Lowest 25% Math 73%

Principal	Angela Lott	B. S. Early Childhood Education M. Ed. Leadership	4	21	<p>AYP: NO Black and Economically Disadvantaged Sub-groups need improvement in Reading.</p> <p>Principal: S. A. Hull Elementary School 2009-2010 School Grade A % High Achieving Reading 69% % High Achieving Math 65% % High Achieving Writing 94% % High Achieving Science 38% % Gains Reading 69% % Gains Math 73% % Lowest 25% Reading 53% % Lowest 25% Math 77% AYP: NO Black and Economically Disadvantaged Sub-groups need improvement in Reading and Math</p> <p>Principal: Stonewall Jackson Elementary School</p> <p>2008-2009 School Grade B % High Achieving Reading 72 % High Achieving Math 56 % High Achieving Writing 88 % High Achieving Science 56 % Gains Reading 65 % Gains Math 58 % Gains Lowest 25% Reading 53 % Gains Lowest 25% Math 67 AYP NO Black and ESE Students Did Not Make AYP in Reading/Math</p> <p>Principal: Stonewall Jackson Elementary School</p> <p>2007-2008 School Grade C % High Achieving Reading 72 % High Achieving Math 67 % High Achieving Writing 50 % High Achieving Science 44 % Gains Reading 67 % Gains Math 59 % Gains Lowest 25% Reading 60 % Gains Lowest 25% Math 63 AYP NO Black Students Did Not Make AYP in Reading/Math</p> <p>Principal: Stonewall Jackson Elementary School</p> <p>2006-2007 School Grade A % High Achieving Reading 79 % High Achieving Math 74 % High Achieving Writing 91 % High Achieving Science 43 % Gains Reading 74 % Gains Math 70 % Gains Lowest 25% Reading 75 % Gains Lowest 25% Math 63 AYP YES</p> <p>Principal: Stonewall Jackson Elementary School</p> <p>2005-2006 School Grade B % High Achieving Reading 76 % High Achieving Math 59 % High Achieving Writing 84 % Gains Reading 64 % Gains Math 56 % Gains Lowest 25% Reading 63 AYP PROVISIONAL</p>
-----------	-------------	---	---	----	--

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide assessment performance (Percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)

Reading	Margarett Lynch Roberts	B. S. Elementary Education/Education of Mentally Handicapped M. Ed. Specific Learning Disabilities Educational Leadership Elem. Ed. 1-6 Specific Learning Disabilities K-12 Mentally Handicapped K-12 Reading Endorsement ESOL Endorsement	4	10	<p>Coach: S. A. Hull Elementary School 2011-2012 School Grade: C % High Achieving Reading 60% % High Achieving Math 70% % High Achieving Writing 85% % High Achieving Science 26% % Gains Reading 56% % Gains Math 65% % Lowest 25% Reading 43% % Lowest 25% Math 73% AYP: NO Black and Economically Disadvantaged Sub-groups need improvement in Reading.</p> <p>Coach: S. A. Hull Elementary School 2010-2011 School Grade: C % High Achieving Reading 60% % High Achieving Math 70% % High Achieving Writing 85% % High Achieving Science 26% % Gains Reading 56% % Gains Math 65% % Lowest 25% Reading 43% % Lowest 25% Math 73% AYP: NO Black and Economically Disadvantaged Sub-groups need improvement in Reading.</p> <p>Coach: S. A. Hull Elementary School 2009-2010 School Grade A % High Achieving Reading 69% % High Achieving Math 65% % High Achieving Writing 94% % High Achieving Science 38% % Gains Reading 69% % Gains Math 73% % Lowest 25% Reading 53% % Lowest 25% Math 77% AYP: NO Black and Economically Disadvantaged Sub-groups need improvement in Reading and Math</p> <p>Coach: Stonewall Jackson Elementary School 2008-2009 School Grade B % High Achieving Reading 72 % High Achieving Math 56 % High Achieving Writing 88 % High Achieving Science 56 % Gains Reading 65 % Gains Math 58 % Gains Lowest 25% Reading 53 % Gains Lowest 25% Math 67 AYP NO Black and ESE Students Did Not Make AYP in Reading/Math</p> <p>Coach: Stonewall Jackson Elementary School 2007-2008 School Grade C % High Achieving Reading 72 % High Achieving Math 67 % High Achieving Writing 50 % High Achieving Science 44 % Gains Reading 67 % Gains Math 59 % Gains Lowest 25% Reading 60 % Gains Lowest 25% Math 63 AYP NO Black Students Did Not Make AYP in Reading/Math</p> <p>Coach: Stonewall Jackson Elementary School 2006-2007 School Grade A % High Achieving Reading 79 % High Achieving Math 74 % High Achieving Writing 91 % High Achieving Science 43 % Gains Reading 74 % Gains Math 70 % Gains Lowest 25% Reading 75 % Gains Lowest 25% Math 63 AYP YES</p>
---------	----------------------------	---	---	----	---

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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. New teachers meet regularly with the principal. 2. New teachers are assigned a mentor on their grade level with whom they work throughout the year 3. Professional Development Facilitator meets weekly with new teachers to assist them with completion of the Teacher Induction Program. 4. Mentor/Lead Teacher and Reading Coach meet regularly with new teachers to assist with curriculum, data and planning 5. Mentor/Lead Teacher and Reading Coach model instructional strategies to provide in-depth, one on one professional development in the classroom. 	Principal Mentor Professional Development Facilitator Professional Development Facilitator Mentor/Lead Teacher Reading Coach Mentor/Lead Teacher Reading Coach	Ongoing August 2012- June 2013 Ongoing August 2012- June 2013 Ongoing August 2012- June 2013 Ongoing August 2012- June 2013 Ongoing August 2012- June 2013
---	---	---	---

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
0	N/A

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
22	0.0%(0)	22.7%(5)	27.3%(6)	50.0%(11)	54.5%(12)	100.0%(22)	13.6%(3)	0.0%(0)	18.2%(4)

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
Girleaner Rouse-Mingo Audrey Dixon Margarett Roberts	N/A	Mrs. Mingo, Mrs. Dixon, and Mrs. Roberts are Highly Qualified and CET Trained	N/A

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

The School Reading Coach, Reading Interventionist, Math Interventionist, PreK teacher, and Prek para are funded through Title I Funds. Supplemental Education Services are provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through after school programs.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

District receives supplemental funds for improving basic education programs through purchase of small equipment to supplement education programs. New technology in the classrooms will increase the instructional strategies provided to students.

Title III

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

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI Funds will be coordinated with Title I Funds to provide after school tutoring for students not meeting benchmarks.

Violence Prevention Programs

Foundations/CHAMPS

Nutrition Programs

Breakfast in the Classroom

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.

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

- Margaret Lynch Roberts Reading Coach: Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches; identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk"; assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.
- Julie Everett RtI Facilitator: Participates on Building Leadership Team; acts as liaison for implementation of RTI at the school level; receives ongoing RtI training and delivers information to school; provides direct intervention services to an identified group of students and tracks student progress; guides school in using data to make decisions about interventions and strategies that support RtI.
- Julie Everett Counselor: Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students; link community agencies to schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success; provides consultation services to general and special education teachers, parents, and administrators; provides group and individual student interventions; and conducts direct observation of student behavior.
- Audrey Dixon, Melissa Maxwell, Tracey Antzaklis, Girleaner Rouse-Mingo, and Julie Skinner - Classroom Teachers: Provide information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; delivers Tier 1 instruction/interventions; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 interventions; and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.
- Jeffry Carter Exceptional Student Education Teacher: Participates in student data collection; assists in determination for further assessment; integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 instruction; and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching, facilitation, and consultation.
- Jeffry Carter Foundations Team Chair: Provides information about school wide and class wide behavior curriculum and instruction; participates in behavioral data collection; provides professional development principles of Foundations to faculty and staff; and collaborates with staff to implement behavioral interventions.
- Terry M. Butts School Technology Contact: Develops or brokers technology necessary to manage and display data; provides professional development and technical support to teachers and staff regarding data management and display.
- Dama Lake School Psychologist: Participates in collection, interpretation, analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning and program evaluation; facilitates data-based decision making.
- Gwen Decatur Speech Language Pathologist: Educates the team in the role language plays in curriculum, assessment, and instruction as a basis for appropriate program design; assists in the selection of screening measures and helps identify systemic patterns of student need with respect to language skills.

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 RtI Leadership Team will attend all district RtI trainings and provide professional development received from the district to teachers and staff at S. A. Hull. The Leadership Team will meet weekly and focus meetings around the Problem Solving Process for Response to Intervention

1. Define the Problem
2. Problem Analysis
3. Plan Implementation
4. Evaluate

At RtI meetings, the Leadership Team will review screening data, diagnostic data and progress monitoring data to identify students not meeting benchmarks. After determining that effective Tier I Instruction is in place, the team will use the problem solving process to develop hypothesis of problem, plan intervention strategies, establish implementation of Tier 2 and Tier 3 Interventions and evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention. The team will review the implementation of all interventions at weekly meetings and determine if the interventions are being implemented with fidelity. The team will also determine if the interventions should be continued, increased or terminated.

Members of the RtI Leadership Team will be assigned to grade level teams. These teams will meet weekly to review progress-monitoring data at grade level and classroom level.

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 meet with the School Advisory Council to develop the School Improvement Plan. Previous year's data, information on Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 targets and deficit areas will be topics for discussion. Included will be FCAT achievement data, learning gains, AYP and subgroups, and mentoring and tutoring services.

MTSS Implementation

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

Baseline data:

- Baseline data:
 - Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)
 - Curriculum Based Measurement
 - Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR)
 - Duval County Benchmarks
 - Duval County On Demand Writing Assessments
 - Duval County Math Progress Monitoring Assessments
 - Diagnostic Reading Assessment (DRA2)
 - Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN)
 - Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)
 - Office Discipline Referrals
 - Retentions
 - Absences
 - Referrals

Midyear data:

- Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR)
- Diagnostic Reading Assessment (DRA2)
- Duval County Benchmarks
- Duval County On Demand Writing Assessments
- Duval County Math Progress Monitoring Assessments
- Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN)

End of year data:

- Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)
- Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR)
- Diagnostic Reading Assessment (DRA2)
- Duval County Math Progress Monitoring Assessments
- Referrals
- Absences
- Retentions

Frequency of required Data Analysis and Action Planning Days:

- Once within a cycle of instruction (refer to appropriate focus calendar)

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The school-based RTI Team will attend district provided training on RTI. Team members will deliver training to the faculty during early dismissal training days, grade level meetings, faculty meetings and professional learning communities. Specific topics for training will include The Problem Solving Process; Using Data to Drive Instruction; Progress Monitoring; Scientific Based Interventions; Consensus Building, and Selecting and Implementing Research Based Interventions.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The MTSS Team will be provided with TDE leave to attend, plan, and deliver training. Time will be provided during Early Dismissal trainings for the team to share information with the faculty.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Angela Lott, Principal
Margarett Roberts, Reading Coach
Terry Butts, Media Specialist

Jeffrey Carter, ESE
Nefertiti Harris, Title I Reading Interventionist
Melissa Maxwell, Primary Teacher
Girleaner Rouse-Mingo, Intermediate Teacher

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

The district's reading/language arts philosophy is clear in suggesting that a successful reading teacher not only teaches a child how to read, but also incorporates strategies that foster a love of reading and prepares the student to enjoy a lifetime of reading." In support of the district's reading goals and our school based reading goals, we have established a monthly literacy team data review meeting to assist us in aligning with DCPS Comprehensive K-12 Reading Plan. Team members, review current and longitudinal data to ensure the successful implementation of the core reading series and research based strategies for supporting students in the core curriculum.

We further meet to assess faculty professional development needs and to formulate plans on effective implementation of targeted reading goals within our surrounding community. Our main goal is to continuously address the instructional rigor in our reading curriculum and the manner in which it is being delivered across content and grade levels to provide next steps for improving the reading achievement of our students.

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

The LLT will focus on transition to Common Core State Standards, instructional alignment and grade level trajectory, and RTI Implementation.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 10/15/2012)

*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.

Within the first 45 days of enrollment, kindergarten students are given the Florida Kindergarten Readiness Screening to obtain a reading benchmark. This assessment is comprised of two sub-tests. ECHOS or the Early Childhood Observation System which is a whole child-oriented measure based on national standards in seven domains: Language and Literacy, Mathematics, Social and Personal Skills, Science, Social Studies, Physical Development and Fitness and Creative Arts, and FAIR. The data is used to group students for differentiated instruction and obtain strategies for immediate intensive intervention. A 1 ½ hour literacy block is in place in all kindergarten classrooms to provide instruction in phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary and comprehension. At the end of the 45 day period, students are reassessed to determine their progress

*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:	47% (55 of 118)of students tested will score at achievement Level 3 on the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
37% (44 of 119)scored at Level 3 on the 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment.	47% (55 of 118)of students tested will score at achievement Level 3 on the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment.

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.A.1. Lack of differentiated instruction in Readers Workshop	1A.1. Provide differentiated instruction during Tier I Reading	1A.1. Principal and Reading Coach	1A.1. Classroom Walk Throughs Principal review lesson plans	1A.1. Classroom Monitoring Rubric/ Teacher Lesson Plans
2	1A.2.Students lack vocabulary and fluent reading skills	1A.2. Provide explicit vocabulary instruction in all classrooms and conduct read alouds on a regular basis to model what fluent reading sounds like	1A.2. Principal and Reading Coach	1A.2. Administration will be aware of the IFC's upcoming focus and monitor implementation through classroom walkthroughs. 1A.2. Classroom Walk Throughs Principal review lesson plans	1A.2. Classroom Monitoring Rubric/ Teacher Lesson Plans
3	1A.3. Insufficient time spent on reading at students' independent levels	1A.3. Increase amount of time students spend reading independently daily	1A.3.Principal and Reading Coach	1A.3.Review of students independent reading logs	1A.3. Student Reading Logs
4	1A.4. Students lack comprehension strategies for complex texts	1A.4. Implement Close Reading	1A.4. Principal	1A.4.Classroom Walk-throughs Observations	1A.4. Monitoring Rubric

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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	28% of students tested will score at or above achievement Level 4 on the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
18% (22 of 119) of students tested scored a Level 4 or 5 on the 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment.	28% of students tested will score at or above achievement Level 4 on the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment.

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	2A.1.Lack of differentiation in Readers Workshop	2A.1. Provide differentiated instruction during Tier I Reading	2A.1. Principal and Reading Coach	2A.1. Classroom Walk Throughs Principal review lesson plans	2A.1. Classroom Monitoring Rubric/ Teacher Lesson Plans
2	2A.2.Limited use of challenging texts/materials	2A.2. Implement use of non-fiction texts, literature circles, book clubs, book talks to foster higher level reading skills	2A.2. Principal and Reading Coach	2A.2. Classroom Walk Throughs Principal review lesson plans/Review of Student Work	2A.2. Classroom Monitoring Rubric/ Teacher Lesson Plans/Student Work

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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	70% of students tested will make learning gains on the 2013 Spring FCAT Reading Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
61% (34 of 56)of students tested demonstrated learning gains on the 2012 Reading FCAT.	70% of students tested will make learning gains on the 2013 Spring FCAT Reading Assessment.

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	3A.1. Lack of strategy instruction in readers workshop	3A.1. Develop and implement focus calendars targeting strategy instruction in areas of need	3A.1.Principal and Reading Coach	3A.1.Principal review lesson plans	3A.1. Focus Calendars/Lesson Plans
2	3A.2.Students lack decoding skills	3A.2.Provide on site professional development for teachers on Word Study. Monitor use of these strategies in classrooms.	3A.2. Principal and Reading Coach	3A.2. Principal review lesson plans	3A.2.Lesson Plans
3	3A.3Insufficient time for classroom teachers to provide intensive remedial instruction.	3A.3. Implement RtI; Remediation from Reading Interventionist	3A.3Principal	3A.3. FCAT Results	3A.3. FCAT Assessment

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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.	60% of students in the lowest 25% will demonstrate learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment.
---	--

Reading Goal #4:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
43% (11 of 26)of the lowest 25% demonstrated learning gains on the 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment.	60% of students in the lowest 25% will demonstrate learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment.

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	4A.1. Students lack vocabulary and comprehension skills required to be successful on grade level reading passages.	4A.1. Develop vertical grade level teams to create instructional alignment and learning trajectories to ensure that skills are being taught and mastered at the appropriate grade level.	4A.1. Principal	4A.1. Review of lesson plans	4A.1. Lesson plans
2	4A.2. Lack of differentiated instruction in Reading Instruction.	4A.2. Determine core instructional needs by reviewing FCAT and FAIR data for all students not making AYP. Plan differentiated instruction based on data that will be delivered in the literacy block and interventions that will be delivered by Title I Interventionist	4A.2. Principal and Reading Coach	4A.2. Principal monitor lesson plans/Coach meets with grade level teams and interventionist	4A.2. Lesson plans
3	4A.3 Inconsistent implementation of Tier 2 and 3 Interventions.	4A.3. Provide Tier 2 and 3 RtI Interventions daily.	4A.3.MTSS Leadership Team SES On Site Facilitator	4A.3. MTSS team monitors RtI Implementation	4A.3. Monitoring form

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 achievement gap will reduce by 50% within the next 6 years.					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	50% of black students will demonstrate learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41% (41 of 119)of black students tested demonstrated adequate yearly progress on the 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment	50% of black students will demonstrate learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment.

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	5B.1.Students in the black sub-group have difficulty answering questions with cognitive complexity.	5B.1. Embed complex questions in daily reading instruction.	5B.1. Principal and Reading Coach	5B.1.Benchmark results/FCAT Results	5B.1. Interim Benchmarks and FCAT
2	5B.2. Lack of outside resources for students to increase reading performance.	5B.2. Supplemental Education Services/Saturday School offered to all students in black sub-group not meeting AYP	5B.2. Principal and Reading Coach	5B.2. Attendance at afterschool and Saturday School tutoring	5B.2. Attendance forms
3	5B.3. Students discouraged due to low performance over time	5B.3.Provide mentor with who student will meet on regular basis	5B.3. Principal and Reading Coach	5B.3.Meeting Log	5B.3.FCAT results

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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

			Person or	Process Used to	
--	--	--	-----------	-----------------	--

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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:	51% of students in the economically disadvantaged subgroup will make satisfactory progress on the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41% (49 of 119) of students in the economically disadvantaged subgroup demonstrated adequate yearly progress on the 2012 Reading FCAT.	51% of students in the economically disadvantaged subgroup will make satisfactory progress on the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment.

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	5E.1. Students in the economically disadvantaged sub-group have difficulty answering questions with cognitive complexity.	5E.1. Embed complex questions in daily reading instruction.	5E.1. Principal and Reading Coach	5E.1. Benchmark results/FCAT Results	5E.1. Interim Benchmarks and FCAT
2	5E.2. Lack of outside resources for students to increase reading performance.	5E.2. Supplemental Education Services/Saturday School offered to all students in black sub-group not meeting AYP	5E.2. Principal and Reading Coach	5E.2. Attendance at afterschool and Saturday School tutoring	5E.2. Attendance forms
3	5E.3. Students discouraged due to low performance over time	5E.3. Provide mentor with who student will meet on regular basis	5E.3. Principal and Reading Coach	5E.3. Meeting Log	5E.3. FCAT results

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
Word Study	K-5	Rob Kelly	School-Wide	Bi-monthly Early release dates	Teacher Lesson Plans, Classroom Walk-throughs and observations	Angela Lott, Principal
Transition to Common Core Standards/Vertical Alignment and Learning Trajectory Training	K-5	Margarett Roberts	School-Wide	Bi-monthly Early release dates	Teacher Lesson Plans, Classroom Walk-throughs and observations	Angela Lott, Principal Margarett Roberts, Reading Coach

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Provide explicit vocabulary instruction in all classrooms and conduct read alouds on a regular basis to model what fluent reading sounds like	Books of the Month	5100510	\$1,000.00
			Subtotal: \$1,000.00
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: \$1,000.00

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.		N/A		
CELLA Goal #1:				
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:				
N/A				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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:

N/A

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

N/A

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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:	58% of students tested will score at achievement level 3 on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
37% (44 of 119) students tested scored at Level 3 on the 2012 FCAT Math Assessment.	58% of students tested will score at achievement level 3 on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment.

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	1A.1. Students do not have quick recall of basic addition/subtraction and multiplication/division facts which are necessary to accurately complete multi-step, complex math problems	1A.1. Conduct daily math minutes and provide rewards for students mastering the basic facts	1A.1. Principal and Classroom Teachers	1A.1. Student work	1A.1. Progress charts and FCAT results
2	1A.2. Lack of differentiated instruction in math workshop	1A.2. Conduct small group instruction during math workshop	1A.2. Principal and MTSS Leadership Team	1A.2. Teacher lesson plans and student progress charts/graphs	1A.2. Lesson plans/Student monitoring forms
3	1A. 3. Students lack conceptual understanding of mathematics	1A 3. Remediation will be provided by Title I Math Interventionist	1A.3. Principal	1A.3. Curriculum Based Assessments	1A.3. FCAT Results

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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

of improvement for the following group:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	25% of students tested will score at or above Achievement Levels 4 or 5 on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
18% (21 of 119)of students tested scored a Level 4 or 5 on the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Assessment.	25% of students tested will score at or above Achievement Levels 4 or 5 on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment.

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.A.1. Underutilization of technology in the classroom	2.A.1. Implement regular use of FCAT Explorer, Gizmos in classroom instruction	2.A.1. Teachers	2.A.1. Lesson Plans	2.A.1. Student Log Ins
2	2A.2. Lack of differentiation in Tier 1	2A.2. Develop and implement lessons with higher complexity levels	2A.2. Principal	2A.2. Principal review lesson plans and classroom walk throughs	2A.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:

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	72% of students tested will demonstrate learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
68% (38 of 56)of students tested demonstrated learning gains on the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Assessment.	72% of students tested will demonstrate learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment.

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	3A.1. Students require additional time to master math concepts	3A.1. Refer students to Title I Math Interventionist, SES Tutoring, and Saturday School	3A.1. Teachers and Principal	3A.1. Interim Benchmark and FCAT Progress	3A.1. Benchmark Assessment and FCAT Assessment
2	3A.2. Lowest proficiency in geometry and measurement reporting categories	3A.2. Analyze data and develop Instructional Focus Calendars that are FCAT reporting category specific	3A.2. Principal	3A.2. Administration will be aware of the IFC's upcoming focus and monitor implementation through classroom walkthroughs.	3A.2. FCAT Performance
3	3A.3. Lack of conceptual understanding	3A.3. Provide teachers with professional development on teaching mathematical concepts	3A.3. Principal	3A.3. Classroom Walk Throughs	3A.3. Lesson Plans Monitoring Rubric

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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	75% of the students in the lowest 25% will demonstrate learning gains on the 2013 FCAT mathematics Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71% (12 of 17) of the lowest 25% of students demonstrated learning gains on the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Assessment.	75% of the students in the lowest 25% will demonstrate learning gains on the 2013 FCAT mathematics Assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
		Person or	Process Used to	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	4A.1. Students lack prerequisite skills to complete multi-step math problems	4A.1. Develop vertical grade level teams to create instructional alignment and learning trajectories to ensure that skills are being taught and mastered at the appropriate grade level.	4A.1. Principal	4A.1. Review of learning trajectories and lesson plans	4A.1. Lesson plans
2	4A.2. Lack of differentiated instruction in math workshop	4A.2. Conduct guided math Groups in Math Workshop with students in the bottom 25%.	4A.2. Principal and MTSS Leadership Team	4A.2. Review of lesson plans and progress monitoring forms	4A.2. Lesson plans and RtI progress monitoring
3	4A.3. Inconsistent implementation of Tier 2 and 3 Interventions	4A.3. Provide Tier 2 and 3 RtI Interventions daily.	4A.3. MTSS Leadership Team	4A.3. Team will monitor student progress with interventions	4A.3. Monitoring Form

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 achievement gap will reduce by 50% within the next 6 years.				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	60% of students in the black subgroup will demonstrate learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
55% (65 of 119) of students in black sub-group scored proficient on the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Assessment.	60% of students in the black subgroup will demonstrate learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment.

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	5B.1 Students require additional time to master math concepts	5B.1. Refer students to Title I Math Interventionist, SES Tutoring, and Saturday School	5B.1. Teachers and Principal	5B.1. Interim Benchmark and FCAT Progress	5B.1. Benchmark Assessment and FCAT Assessment
2					

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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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:	60% (71 of 118)of economically disadvantaged students will demonstrate learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
57% (65 of 115)of students in the economically disadvantaged sub-group met AYP on the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Assessment.	60% (71 of 118)of economically disadvantaged students will demonstrate learning gains on the 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment

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	5E.1. Students require additional time to master math concepts	5A.1. Refer students to Title I Math Interventionist, SES	5A.1. Teachers and Principal	5A.1. Interim Benchmark and FCAT Progress	5A.1. Benchmark Assessment and FCAT Assessment

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
Transition to Common Core Standards/Vertical Alignment and Learning Trajectory Training	PK-5	Margarett Roberts	School-wide	Bi-monthly early release dates.	Teacher Lesson Plans, Classroom Walk-throughs and observations	Angela Lott, Principal
Using Math Investigations to teach mathematical concepts	PK-5	Kristina Knox	School-wide	Bi-monthly early release dates.	Teacher Lesson Plans, Classroom Walk-throughs and observations	Angela Lott, Principal

Mathematics Budget:

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

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement

Level 3 in science. Science Goal # 1a:	31% of students tested will score Level 3 on the 2013 FCAT Science Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
26% (12 of 46) of students tested scored at Level 3 on the 2012 FCAT Science Assessment.	31% of students tested will score Level 3 on the 2013 FCAT Science Assessment.

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	1A.1. Lack of Fidelity of Instruction across grade levels	1A.1. Lack of Fidelity of Instruction across grade levels	1A.1. Principal	1A.1. Classroom Walk Throughs Lesson Plans	1A.1. Monitoring forms
2	1A.2. Students require instruction to build background knowledge.	1A.2. Implement P-SELL Science Curriculum in 5th grade.	1A.2. Principal/District Science Coaches	1A.2. Classroom Walk Throughs	1A.2. Monitoring Form

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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal # 2a:	12% of students tested will score at or above Level 4 or 5 on the 2013 FCAT Science Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
7% (3 of 44) of students tested scored Level 4 or 5 on the 2012 FCAT Science Assessment.	12% of students tested will score at or above Level 4 or 5 on the 2013 FCAT Science Assessment.

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	2A.1.Lack of differentiated activities to challenge high performing students	2A.1. Use technology to provide students with more complex science activities (Gizmos, etc.)	2A.1. Principal	2A.1.Monitoring of Lesson Plans	2A.1.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:

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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
P-SELL Science Training	5th	District Science Coaches	Melissa Younge, 5th grade science teacher	Quarterly meeting dates	Review of lesson plans and student performance on Interim Benchmarks and FCAT	Angela Lott, Principal

Science Budget:

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

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

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:	90% of students tested will score at Achievement Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT writing assessment. 80% of students tested will score at or above 3.5 on the 2013 FCAT writing assessment.
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
83% (30 of 36)) of students tested scored Level 3.0 and higher on the 2012 FCAT Writing Assessment.	90% of students tested will score at Achievement Level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT writing assessment. 80% of students tested will score at or above 3.5 on the 2013 FCAT writing assessment.

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	1A.1. Students lack basic writing skills upon entering fourth grade	1A.1. Create grade level alignments and trajectories to ensure that skills are being taught at appropriate grade level	1A.1. Teachers and Principal	1A.1. Classroom Walk Throughs	1A.1. Monitoring Form
2	1A.2. Need for using data to form guided writing groups	1A.2. Administer District Writing Prompts 5 times annually/conduct meetings to analyze student work	1A.2. Teachers and Principal	1A.2. Student work	1A.2. District Writing Prompts and FCAT results
3	1A.3. Students lack extensive vocabulary needed to add figurative language to writing pieces	1A.3. Use authentic literature to read aloud to students daily to expose them to a variety of authors craft and vocabulary	1A.3. Teachers and Principal	1A.3. Lesson plans	1A.3. District Writing Prompts and FCAT results

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.	N/A			
Writing Goal #1b:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
N/A	N/A			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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
Transition to Common Core Standards/Vertical Alignment and Learning Trajectory Training	K-5	Margarett Roberts	School-Wide	Bi-monthly early release dates	Teacher Lesson Plans, Classroom Walk-throughs and observations	Angela Lott, Principal

Writing Budget:

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

Subtotal: \$0.00

Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	The percentage of students with 10 or more absences will decrease from 35% to 30%; the percentage of students with 20 or more absences will decrease from 12% to 10%.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
35% (103 of 292) students had 10 or more absences during the 2012 school year. 12% (35 of 292) Students had 20 or more absences during the 2012 school year.	The percentage of students with 10 or more absences will decrease from 35% to 29%; the percentage of students with 20 or more absences will decrease from 12% to 10%.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
35% (103 of 292) students had 10 or more absences during the 2012 school year.	29% (70 of 245) students will have 10 or more absences during the 2012-2013 school year.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
27% (77 of 279) of students had excessive tardies during the 2012 school year.	24% (68 of 279) will have excessive tardies during the 2013 school year.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Parents fail to understand the importance of attendance and timeliness	1.1. Conduct parent workshops to explain the importance of being at school and on time each day.	1.1. Principal	1.1. Attendance Records	1.1. Oncourse
2	1.2 Students miss important instruction.	1.2. Refer students with excessive absences to MTSS.	1.2 MTSS Team	1.2 Attendance Records	1.2 Oncourse

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
PLC School,						

Family, Community Partnerships: Your Handbook for Action by Joyce Epstein	PK-5	Various facilitators	School-wide	Before and after school monthly meetings	Increase in attendance rates	CRT/Oncourse
---	------	----------------------	-------------	--	------------------------------	--------------

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 students with suspensions will decrease from 12 suspensions in 2012 to 3 suspensions in 2013.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
0	0
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
0	0
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
12	3

2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School		2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School			
9		3			
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 Fidelity of Implementation of Foundations/CHAMPS in correlation to RtI.	1.1.Professional development on RtI Behavior Interventions and Procedures	1.1.Foundations Team RtI Team	1.1.Rate of suspensions/referrals/absences	1.1.Oncourse Genesis

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
Foundations/CHAMPS	K-5	Jeffry Carter	School-Wide	Monthly faculty meetings	Implementation of Foundations/CHAMPS	Angela Lott, Principal Jeffry Carter, Foundations Chair

Suspension Budget:

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

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:		The number of parents attending home school events will increase from 47 to 65 during the 2012-2013 school year.			
<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:			
47 parents attended home school events during the 2011-2012 school year.		The number of parents attending home school events will increase from 47 to 65 during the 2012-2013 school year.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Minimal parent attendance at parent events.	1.1. Parent nights will be scheduled to promote programs that will provide parents with tips on helping their children succeed academically. Teachers and para-professionals will provide child care services during the after school meetings.	1.1. Principal	1.1. Attendance at parent events	1.1. Sign In Sheets
2	1.2.Lack of strategies to involve parents in school activities	1.2.Title I Liaison will plan meetings at various times (before, during, and after school) for parents unable to attend evening workshops in an attempt to increase parent participation.	1.2.Title I School Liaison	1.2.Parent Attendance	1.2. Parent Sign In Sheets School Climate Survey Results

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)

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 percentage of students that feel safe at school will increase from 26.7% to at or above 50% as indicated by the 2012-2013 School Climate Survey.		
2012 Current level:			2013 Expected level:		
26.7% of students surveyed on the 2011-2012 School Climate Survey indicated they always feel safe at school.			The percentage of students that feel safe at school will increase from 26.7% to at or above 50% as indicated by the 2012-2013 School Climate Survey.		
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.Poor student awareness of safety measures taken.	1.1.Hold assembly to inform students of school safety plans. (fire/tornado/intruder/lock down)	1.1.Principal and Safety Leaders	1.1.Results of 2013 Student school climate survey	1.1.School Climate survey
2	1.2. Poor student awareness of safety measures taken.	1.2 Classroom guidance counseling sessions will include ways to ensure personal safety	1.2 Principal and Guidance Counselor	1.2.Results of 2013 Student school climate survey	1.2.School Climate survey

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Safety Procedures	School-wide	Principal	All faculty and staff	Morning faculty meetings	Implementation of safety procedures	Principal

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	Provide explicit vocabulary instruction in all classrooms and conduct read alouds on a regular basis to model what fluent reading sounds like	Books of the Month	5100510	\$1,000.00
				Subtotal: \$1,000.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
				Grand Total: \$1,000.00

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.

[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 10/15/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

The majority of the SAC members are not employed by the school district. The SAC is composed of the principal and an appropriately balanced number of teachers, education support employees, students (for middle and high school only), parents, and other business and community citizens who are representative of the ethnic, racial, and economic community served by the school. Please verify the statement above by selecting "Yes" or "No" below.

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
SAC funds will be used to provide supplemental school materials.	\$3,200.00

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

The School Advisory Council will assist in preparing and evaluating the School Improvement Plan the Parent Involvement and other school-wide reforms. In addition, the SAC will participate in The Problem Solving Response to Intervention by reviewing relevant data, identifying problem areas, developing improvement strategies, monitoring their impact and begin the process again once targets have been met.

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

Duval School District S. A. HULL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	60%	70%	85%	26%	241	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	56%	65%			121	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?	43% (NO)	73% (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					478	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Duval School District S. A. HULL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	69%	65%	94%	38%	266	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	69%	73%			142	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?	53% (YES)	77% (YES)			130	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					538	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested