

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: BEACHLAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Indian River

Principal: Caroline Barker

SAC Chair: Todd Peyton

Superintendent: Dr. Frances J. Adams

Date of School Board Approval: September 27, 2011

Last Modified on: 10/4/2012

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	Caroline Barker	B.S. in Special Education M.Ed in Education (Leadership)	5	7	five consecutive "A" grades AYP 3/5 previous years
Assis Principal	Theresa Wagner	B.S. in Elementary Education. M.Ed in Guidance & Counseling. Spec. in EDS in Elementary Ed. Leadership Cert.	2	12	Made AYP one out of last three years.

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	Jennifer Gabbard	B.S. in Education Endorsement in Reading	2	7	2 years at current school - "A" Grade

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	Beachland has a long history of teacher retention. Teachers are highly satisfied due to the level of parent and administrative support. There is relatively little turn-over of the faculty.	Caroline Barker & Theresa Wagner	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
2 New teachers	Teacher mentoring and peer teacher support.

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
42	4.8%(2)	14.3%(6)	40.5%(17)	40.5%(17)	35.7%(15)	95.2%(40)	2.4%(1)	7.1%(3)	78.6%(33)

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
Terri Beckham	Susan Brown and Margaret Pitz	new teachers to Beachland	Instruct in procedures particular to this school.

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Principal, Assistant Principal, Student Support Specialist, Resource Specialist, Reading Coach, Speech/Language Pathologist and School Psychologist

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 Beachland Core Leadership Team meets weekly to conduct data analysis of District benchmark assessments and other state assessments. In addition, the Team identifies students who need specific academic and/or behavioral interventions. The Team works with instructional staff to develop Tier III interventions and provides support by coaching teachings throughout the intervention process.

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 Core Leadership Team evaluates school and student data regarding student achievement that directly impacts the School Improvement Plan. The Team provides feedback and ongoing strategies to enable the school to meet School Improvement goals.

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.

READING, MATH, SCIENCE & WRITING:
Tier I - PM2 (Performance Matters); FCAT scores; FAIR; Success Maker; FLKRS

READING:
Tier II- AIMS; READING ORAL FLUENCY; MAZE COMPREHENSION (bi-weekly)

READING:
Tier III- AIMS; READING ORAL FLUENCY; MAZE COMPREHENSION (weekly)

BEHAVIOR:
Tier I- ODR (Office Discipline Referral Data)
Tier II- ODR (Office Discipline Referral Data).
Tier III- Individual Charts and Graphs

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

There is ongoing training regarding RtI at Faculty Meetings and in monthly curriculum meetings conducted by the Assistant Principal and Reading Coach.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Tier I - Evidence based core curriculum and instruction, assessment system and data based decision making, Second Step support for positive student behavior, Positive Behavior Support (PBS).

Tier II - Supplemental targeted skills interventions, small group instruction, and frequent process monitoring to guide intervention design.

Tier III - More supplemental targeted skill intervention, customized interventions, frequent process monitoring to guide intervention design.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, Speech and Language Specialist, Media Specialist, and Kindergarten teacher.

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

Beachland's Literacy Leadership Team reviews Reading Benchmark data and application of School District Literacy Plan.

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

District Common Core training through staff development through staff development and PD360.
District Marzano Training through staff development opportunities and PD360.
Foundations for K-2.

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.

N/A

*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:	76% (243) of Beachland's students will score on or above Achievement Level 3 in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71% (228) scored on or above Grade Level	76% (243) of Beachland's students will score on or above Achievement Level 3 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
1	Students' reading readiness at each grade level	Identify students & provide tiered instruction	Teachers; Reading Coach; Administration	Weekly and BiWeekly assessment	AIMS WEB, ORF and Maze assessments, FAIR, and district benchmarks.
2	Students' lack of experience & vocabulary	Tier I Instruction to include Isabel Beck Vocabulary in K -5.	All Teachers	Students' use of enriched vocabulary in daily oral language	FAIR & ultimately, FCAT

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:	Grade 3- 61% (63) Grade 4- 60% (66) Grade 5- 62% (67)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Grade 3- 60% (60) Grade 4- 52% (52) Grade 5- 52% (52)	Grade 3 - 61% (63) Grade 4- 60% (66) Grade 5- 62% (67)

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	The expectation involves no recognizable barrier.	RtI Model for Advanced students using literacy circles, Accelerated Reader Program; enrichment centers during reading block	Teachers; Reading Coach; Administration	Data Analysis Monthly	Reading Benchmark Assessments & FAIR

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	76% (243) of Beachland students will make learning gains in reading
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71% (221) of Beachland students met high standards in reading	75% (243) will meet high standards in reading

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			Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, and teachers	The goal is to increase by 3% () the number of students who move from FCAT Reading Level 1 to Level 2 and to increase the percentage of students scoring who move from FCAT Reading Level 3 () to Level 3+ by 10%.	FCAT
2	Readiness readiness skills for FCAT expectations	RtI for all students - fully implemented	Teachers; Reading Coach; Administration	Weekly data analysis	AIMS; Benchmark Assessments; FAIR

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:	60% (48) is the NCLB goal
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56%	60% (48) is the NCLB goal

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 will progress but not enough to close the gap	PSRtI with fidelity	Teachers; Reading Coach; Administrators	Weekly data collection and analysis	AIMS; FAIR; Benchmark Assessments

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Reading Goal # 76% (243)					
Baseline data 2010-2011		2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	71%	76%	79%	83%	87%		

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	African American students (47)- 57% (27)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
(50) 50% (25)	African American students (47)- 57% (27)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Parent Involvement; Lack of students' vocabulary	Third Grade Reading Night in October; Parent Conferences in person and phone; Monday folder communications & Connect-Ed; teach robust vocabulary; RtI vocabulary groups based on data	Teachers; Reading Coach; Administrators	Number of parents participating in events; graphing of vocabulary progress	Observation of parent participation; CBM vocabulary measures
2	Lack of Vocabulary for K-5	Use "Liz Beck Vocabulary"	Leadership Team	FAIR Scores will increase and students will be better prepared, ultimately, for FCAT	FAIR & CBM

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:	84% (15) (13)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
82% (15)	84% (15) (13)

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	Parents' limited command of the English Language	Interpreters at Conference Nights and for phone communication	Administration	Number of parent contacts made	Parent Conference Summary Forms

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:	47% (20)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41% ()	47% (20)

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	Inability to make adequate progress to close the gap	Specialized Instruction including small groups; RtI; and, modified assignments	ESE Teacher; Gen. Ed Teachers; Resource Specialist	Data Analysis; examination of IEP goals	Benchmark Assessments; ESE Quarterly Reports
2	Students pulled out - lack of exposure to classroom curriculum	Push in model	ESE teachers	Data Analysis; examination of IEP goals	Benchmark Assessments; ESE Quarterly 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:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	69% (124) (86)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
66% (121) (80)	69% (124) (86)

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	Basic Needs of Students are sometimes unmet	Backpack Buddies (food for the weekends); Uniform closet (to provide uniforms); Scholarships for Field Trips	Cafeteria Manager; PTA; Administration	Children making adequate yearly progress.	Grades and Smiles

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
incorporate reading and literacy instruction into subject areas to extend and build discussions of text in order to deepen understanding? Include detail regarding how teachers will address the transition from NGSSS to Common Core Standards in all content classrooms.	K - 5	Reading coach, teachers with common core training	school-wide	early release days	Teachers and the reading coach will collaborate to assure that each student is provided instruction and materials at the appropriate level.	Principal, assistant principal and reading coach
Comprehensive Core Reading Program (CCRP), Supplemental Intervention Reading Program (SIRP), and Comprehensive Intervention Reading Program (CIRP)	K-5	Reading coach, principal, assistant principal, and teachers.	school-wide	early release days	Teachers and the reading coach will collaborate to assure that each student is provided instruction and materials at the appropriate level.	Principal, assistant principal, and reading coach

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Lessonpop booklets	common core resources K-5	Internal	\$409.61
Rewards booklets	Phonics enhancement	Internal	\$439.80
Isabel Beck elements of reading	vocabulary enhancement	Internal	\$4,455.06
			Subtotal: \$5,304.47
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

Florida Ready Reading Extensions in reading	Comprehension activity booklets	Internal	\$900.00
			Subtotal: \$900.00
			Grand Total: \$6,204.47

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.		44% (23) (10) Proficient in listening and speaking			
CELLA Goal #1:					
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
39% Proficient in listening and 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
1	Lack of English language proficiency.	Isabel Beck Vocabulary instruction during Tier 1 instruction for all grade levels K-5.	Teachers	Fidelity checks	Benchmark tests, FAIR, and FCAT.
2	Lack of English language proficiency.	ESOL assistant push-in model during small group instruction utilizing Language for Thinking.	Teachers	Fidelity checks.	Benchmark tests, FAIR, and FCAT.

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.		39% (23) (9) Proficient in reading.			
CELLA Goal #2:					
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:					
33% 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
1	Lack of English language proficiency	Ability grouping use of ELL strategies.	Teachers	Progress monitoring, increasing of student scores.	FAIR, benchmark tests, FCAT.
2	Lack of English language proficiency	ESOL assistant push-in to small group instruction utilizing Language for Thinking.	Teachers	Progress monitoring, increasing of student scores.	FAIR, benchmark tests, FCAT.

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:			22% Proficient in writing.		
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:					
22% 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
1	Lack of English language proficiency	ESOL assistant push-in model during small group instruction	Teachers	Progress monitoring, increase in student scores.	Writing Prompts, FAIR, and FCAT.
2	Lack of English language proficiency.	Fundations K-2.	Teachers	Progress monitoring, increase in student scores.	Writing Prompts and FAIR.

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:	Grade 3 (103) 19% (25); Grade 4 (109) 24% (26); Grade 5 (107) 30% (32)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Grade 3 (109) 16% (17); Grade 4 (98) 21% (21); Grade 5 (104) 26% (27)	Grade 3 (103) 19% (25); Grade 4 (109) 24% (26); Grade 5 (107) 30% (32)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of Student Progress	In-service for Teachers	District Math Coordinator; School Math Coordinators	Ongoing Assessment and Fidelity checks.	Benchmark assessments and FCAT.

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

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:	Grade 3 (103) 52% (54); Grade 4 (109) 44% (48); Grade 5 (107) 45% (48)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Grade 3 (109) - 46% (50); Grade 4 (98) - 43% (42); Grade 5 (104) - 41% (43)	Grade 3 (103) 52% (54); Grade 4 (109) 44% (48); Grade 5 (107) 45% (48)
---	--

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of Student Progress	Teacher Inservice on Big Ideas	District Math Coordinator; School Math Coordinators	Fidelity Checks by Administration	Benchmark Assessments

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

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

Mathematics Goal #2b:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.

73% (319) (233)

Mathematics Goal #3a:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

64% (311) (200)

73% (319) (233)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of Student Progress	Teacher Inservice on Big Ideas	District math Coordinator; School Math Coordinators	Monthly fidelity checks by administration	Benchmark Assessments

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment:
 Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.
 Mathematics Goal # 3b:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.
 Mathematics Goal #4:

68% (81) (55)

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

58% ()

68% (81) (55)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of Student Progress	Ability Grouping for Small Group Instruction to provide Enrichment and Remediation	Classroom Teachers; Math Coordinator & Administration	Student Success	Benchmark Assessments; CBM
2	Lack of Student Progress	Do The Math for 5th grade	5th grade teachers	Student Success	Benchmark Assessments; CBM

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 #

73% (319) (233)

5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	64%	73%	78%	82%	86%	

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:	48% (114) (55)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
42% ()	48% (114) (55)

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' lack of basic math skills & number sense	FASTT Math	Classroom Teachers & Administration	Student Progress	FASTT Math Graphs

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:	(15) 76% (11)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
73%	(15) 76% (11)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of Student Progress in Basic Skills & Number Sense	FASTT Math	Teachers; Math Coordinator; Administration	Student Progress	FASTT Math Graphs

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:	(30) 53% (16)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
48%	(30) 53% (16)

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' Lack of Progress in Basic Facts & Number Sense	Small Group Instruction in GO-MATH Intensive Intervention	ESE Teacher; Administration	On-Line Tutorial Progress Monitoring	Benchmark Assessments
2	Students' lack of progress in basic facts & number sense	Do The Math for Tier 3 for 5th grade	ESE Teacher; Administration	Student Progress	Benchmark Assessments and FCAT.

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:	Goal = 67% (77)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
63%	Goal = 67% (77)

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' lack of number sense & basic math Facts	Small group instruction; GO-MATH Strategic Intervention	Teacher	Fidelity Checks	Benchmarks

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
No Data Submitted						

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Do The Math	Addition, subtraction, mult. and division resources	Internal	\$5,471.80
Extensions in Math/florida Ready math	supplemental math skills	Internal	\$900.00
			Subtotal: \$6,371.80
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: \$6,371.80

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:			45% (107) (49)		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
39% (104)(41)			45% (107) (49)		
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' lack of background knowledge	Integrate science content books into the reading block	Classroom Teachers; District Science Coordinator	Classroom walk-through; Lesson Plan checks	Science Benchmarks
2	Students' lack of background knowledge	Utilize STEM activities	Classroom teachers	Classroom walk-through; Lesson Plan checks	Science Benchmarks

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b:	?
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
?	?

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	35% (107) (38)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
20% (104) (21)	35% (107) (38)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of Scientific Background Knowledge	Use Science Lab regularly; Participation in District Science Fair	Science Coordinator	Science Fair Participation; Fidelity checks for use of science lab	Science Fair Awards; Science Benchmarks
2	Lack of Scientific Background knowledge	Utilization of STEM activities	Classroom teachers	Classroom walk-through; Lesson Plan checks	Science Benchmarks

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
STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics)	K-5	District science coordinator	all teachers and all grade levels	October 19th teacher workday	Classroom observation and requirement of teachers reporting 2 completed STEM activities.	assistant principal, and 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% (109) (99)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
86% (96) (83)	90% (109) (99)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of adequate time to develop writing skills	Examine instructional schedule	Administration	Classroom Walkthroughs; Use of Rubric	Periodic essay practice; District Writing Prompts 4 x per year

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

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					

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
Writing	4th grade	PD360	4th grade teachers	February	Review of teachers completed training on PD360	Principal and Assistant 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:		Decrease the number of students who have more than 10 absences & reduce the number of students who have more than ten tardies..			
2012 Current Attendance Rate:		2013 Expected Attendance Rate:			
Population - 617 Avg. Present Count- 589.78 Avg. Absence Count- 27.22		Expected Attendance Rate- 589.78			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)			
29% (159)		23% (140)			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)			
11% (60)		8% (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	Family Vacations	Inform parents of importance of attendance	Theresa Wagner	Rates of attendance	School Absence Rate

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:	Reduce the number of in-school and out-of-school suspensions.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
12	10
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
8	7

2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions				
22	20				
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School				
14	12				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of compliance to school & classroom rules	Instruct students with PBS strategies & Second Step Social Skills	Teachers	Suspension rates	SWIS 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						

Suspension Budget:

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

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	95% (617) (587) of Beachland parents will participate in one parent conference or parent activity during the 2011-2012 school year.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
85% () of parents attended parent conferences in the 2010-2011 school year	95% (617) (587) of parents will attend parent conferences or a parent activity during the 2011-2012 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	Parent work schedules & demands	Conduct phone conferences & arrange conference times before/after the regular work day	Teachers and Staff	Attendance records	Teacher records
2	Parent work schedules, transportation, and demands.	Conduct reading nights at Beachland and offsite at Gifford and The Palms of Vero.	Teachers and Administration.	Attendance records	Teacher records

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:		Teachers will use a minimum of 2 district identified STEM projects (1 per semester) in order to increase science FCAT scores from 60% (104) (62) to 82% (107) (87).			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of a deep understanding of what STEM is.	Mandatory district training.	Site admin, science dept. chair/coord., science spec.	Site admin, science dept. chair/coord., science specialist will review STEM projects undertaken by classroom teachers.	Science FCAT 2.0 scores.

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

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

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

Lack of a deep understanding of what STEM is.	K-5	District science specialist	K-5	October teacher work day.	Science dept. chair/coord., district science specialist will review STEM projects undertaken by classroom teachers.	Science dept. chair/coord., district science specialist
---	-----	-----------------------------	-----	---------------------------	---	---

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	Lessonpop booklets	common core resources K-5	Internal	\$409.61
Reading	Rewards booklets	Phonics enhancement	Internal	\$439.80
Reading	Isabel Beck elements of reading	vocabulary enhancement	Internal	\$4,455.06
Mathematics	Do The Math	Addition, subtraction, mult. and division resources	Internal	\$5,471.80
Mathematics	Extensions in Math/florida Ready math	supplemental math skills	Internal	\$900.00
				Subtotal: \$11,676.27
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
Reading	Florida Ready Reading Extensions in reading	Comprehension activity booklets	Internal	\$900.00
				Subtotal: \$900.00
				Grand Total: \$12,576.27

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.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
-------------------------------------	--------

No data submitted

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

The SAC will meet five times this year. The SAC will purchase the following resources to assist instruction with reading: Lessonpop booklets common core resources K-5, Reading Rewards booklets Phonics enhancement, Reading Isabel Beck elements of reading vocabulary enhancement. The SAC will purchase the following resources to assist instruction in math: Mathematics Do The Math Addition, subtraction, mult. and division resources and Mathematics Extensions in Math/florida Ready math supplemental math skills.

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

Indian River School District BEACHLAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	88%	86%	92%	74%	340	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	72%	65%			137	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?	56% (YES)	58% (YES)			114	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					591	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Indian River School District BEACHLAND ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	90%	88%	92%	74%	344	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	72%	73%			145	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?	57% (YES)	66% (YES)			123	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					612	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested