FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: SAN MATEO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Duval

Principal: Lindsay P. Sharp

SAC Chair: Celeste Stevens

Superintendent: Ed Pratt-Dannals

Date of School Board Approval: November 5, 2012

Last Modified on: 12/3/2012

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)
Assis Principal	Shelley S. Johnston	Bachelor of Arts in Elementary Education, Masters of Arts in Teaching in Computer Sciences Certification State of Florida: Elementary Education (Grades 1-6), Computer Science (K-12), Educational Leadership (All Levels) and School Principal	1	3	2011-2012: School Grade: "B" High Performing – Reading 69%, Math 62%, Writing 77%, and Science 69%. Gains – Reading 67%, Mathematics 57%. Lowest Quartile – Reading 66%, Mathematics 49% As Assistant Principal Of Crown Point Elementary: 2010-2011: School Grade: "B" High Performing – Reading 79%, Math 77%, Writing 65%, and Science 59%. Gains – Reading 66%, Mathematics 53%. Lowest Quartile – Reading 55%, Mathematics 47% 2009-2010: School Grade: "A" High Performing – Reading 80%, Math 81%, Writing 84%, and Science 56%.

					Gains – Reading 69%, Mathematics 63%. Lowest Quartile – Reading 64%, Mathematics 73% AYP: 2012: N/A; 2011: No; 2010: No
Principal	Lindsay P. Sharp	Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education, Master's in Educational Leadership Certification State of Florida: Elementary Education (Grades 1-6), Educational Leadership (All Levels) and School Principal (All Levels)	6	2	2011-2012: School Grade: "B" High Performing – Reading 69%, Math 62%, Writing 77%, and Science 69%. Gains – Reading 67%, Mathematics 57%. Lowest Quartile – Reading 66%, Mathematics 49% 2010-2011: School Grade: "A" High Performing – Reading 79%, Math 84%, Writing 45%, and Science 68%. Gains – Reading 61%, Mathematics 76%. Lowest Quartile – Reading 57%, Mathematics 68% AYP: 2012: N/A; 2011: No; 2010: No; 2009: Yes; 2008: No; 2007: Yes; 2006: Yes; 2005: Yes As Assistant Principal of San Mateo Elementary from 2005-2010: School Grade: "A"

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)
All	Brandi Heath	Bachelor of Science in Psychology and Sociology Certification State of Florida: Pre-K through Grade 3, K through Grade 6			None as an Instructional Coach

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	Weekly Professional Learning Communities with grade levels and monthly vertical grade levels	Principal, Assistant Principal, Instructional Coach and PDF	Ongoing through June 2013	
2	Instructional Coach models and provides instructional strategies and support to new teachers in understanding and implementing the curriculum and standards.	Instructional Coach	Ongoing through June 2013	
3	Professional Development Facilitator(PDF) meets with new teachers one-on-one to assist with MINT program.	PDF	Ongoing through June 2013	
4	Representative Interview Team plans and conducts interviews, and provides input in decision-making process	Principal Assistant Principal Interview Teams from Grade levels (GLs)	As determined by hiring needs	
5	All faculty new to San Mateo will meet with administration quarterly to assess and respond to the unique needs of personnel and establish a culture of learning norms at San Mateo	Principal Assistant Principal	Ongoing through June 2013	

6	Conduct Professional Learning Communities with small groups of teachers based on the work of Charlotte Danielson and the CAST rubric.	Principal Assistant Principal	Ongoing through December 2012	
7	Instructional Coach supports teachers by providing feedback after Focus walks, including areas of strength and resources to help with areas needing attention.	Instructional Coach	Ongoing through June 2013	
8	Instructional Coach models lessons for teachers, as needed.	Instructional Coach	Ongoing through June 2013	
9	Implement the DCPS Collaborative Assessment System for Teachers (CAST)with fidelity	Principal Assistant Principal	As determined by DCPS policy	

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
None	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
45	0.0%(0)	20.0%(9)	57.8%(26)	22.2%(10)	26.7%(12)	100.0%(45)	2.2%(1)	8.9%(4)	35.6%(16)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program/plan by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Michelle Smith	Sarah Johnson	Mrs. Smith is a Highly Qualified Teacher with all of her experience in early childhood (K-2). She has good student growth results.	Regularly scheduled meetings with PDF and District Cadre member to successfully complete the Mentoring and Induction of Novice Teachers (MINT) program. Observation opportunities scheduled. Mentees and Mentors will meet monthly to establish goals, strategies for implementation, as well as next steps. Data review activities will assist individuals with differentiated activities.

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

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

San Mateo is a non-Title 1 School.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

N/A

Title I, Part D

N/A

Title II

N/A

Title III

N/A

Title X- Homeless

N/A

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

N/A

Violence Prevention Programs

N/A

Nutrition Programs

N/A

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

Other

N/A

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The members of the school-based MTSS/RtI Leadership Team are:

- Lindsay Sharp, Principal
- Rachel Whorton, Chairperson--Speech and Language Pathologist
- Jessica Highsmith, Kindergarten
- Rebecca Edwards, 1st grade
- Michelle Smith, 2nd grade
- Katherine Toban, 2nd grade
- Sue Denoyer, 3rd grade
- Theresa Sheridan, 4th grade
- Angela Godwin, 5th grade
- Duane Monte, Guidance
- Ginny Raynolds, ESE

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?

RtI functions through a three level system: Grade levels meet regularly to identify students, plan interventions/activities and determine place and instructors. This year, there is a designated school-wide RtI block, with students grouped by needs-- below grade level, on grade level and above grade level. The groups are fluid as student needs change. The grade level representative on the RtI Cadre then reports to the Cadre regarding students and interventions/activities. The Cadre supports the grade levels by providing material and additional ideas and supplies. The Cadre chairperson reports to the Leadership Team at monthly meetings where student progress is reviewed and monitored. Members of the RtI Cadre, faculty, District Level representatives, guidance counselor and other appropriate individuals will meet monthly in the form of a Collaborative Problem Solving Team (CPST). The CPST will provide support, guidance, monitoring and deeper problem solving of the RtI process for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.

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 RtI Cadre provided input and feedback regarding data submitted by grade levels. The Cadre discussed strategies and implementation in order to develop and support the school-wide plan. The team will review the plan quarterly and recommend additions or changes needed to support student growth.

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
Tier 1:
FLKRS, Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Diagnostic Reading Assessment-2 (DRA-2), District Benchmark Assessments as appropriate, Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT Reading, PMAs;
Teachers administer curriculum aligned assessments identified within the DCPS Learning Schedules
Student Portfolios

Teachers use data-tracking sheets to manage data.

Tier 2/3:
Progress monitoring assessments designed by grade levels

Managed by school RtI monitoring forms

Mathematics
Tier 1:
District Benchmark Assessments, Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT Mathematics), Common Core K-2 Diagnostic Assessment, LSAs, PMAs;
Envision/Investigations and Everyday Calendar Math curriculum aligned assessments identified within the DCPS Learning Schedules

Teachers use data-tracking sheets to manage data.

Tier 2/3:
Progress monitoring assessments designed by grade levels

Managed by school RtI monitoring forms

Science
Tier I: District Benchmark Assessments, Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT Science), LSAs, PMAs;
Teachers administer curriculum aligned assessments identified within the DCPS Learning Schedules

Teachers use data-tracking sheets to manage data.

Tier 2/3: District Benchmark Assessments, LSAs, PMAs

Teachers use data-tracking sheets to manage data.

Writing
Tier 1:
District Writing Prompts, Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT Writes);
Teacher-created rubrics for daily writing

Teaching-Learning Rubrics and Student Portfolios

Tier 2/3:
Writing prompt results

Conference log reflects high frequency of teacher/student conferences

Behavior
Tier 1:
Daily attendance, tardies and early checkouts; Student conduct grades

Managed by Classroom Management Systems/Discipline Plans/CHAMPs

Behavior Tier 2/3:
Daily attendance, tardies and early checkouts, Office visits, Student Incident Reports, Guidance referrals, Individualized Goal Setting and Behavior Modification Plans

Managed by Attendance Reports (OnCourse), Discipline Reports (Genesis), and Office Visits Tracking Cards

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Staff will be trained during an ERD workshop presented by members of the RtI Cadre. Members will work with their grade level to support RtI. Additional materials, forms and strategies will be placed in the share folder for access by all staff.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Each grade level provides data and instructional resources they are using for RtI Team review and input. The grade levels will provide clarification and progress updates as requested by the team. The CPST will provide next steps for students needing additional support.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The members of the school-based Literacy Leadership Team are:

• Shelley Johnston, Assistant Principal
• Elesha Cox, Chairperson-5th grade
• Deborah Hendrix, Kindergarten
• Bonnie McCarthy, 1st grade
• Terrie Williams, 2nd grade
• Michelle Mikell, 3rd grade

- Melanie Crabtree, 3rd grade
- Tiffany Powell, 4th grade
- Media Specialist

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

Reading Cadre (LLT) is a vertically aligned committee that meets at least monthly and then as needed. Members report back to their grade levels with information and ideas. The chairperson, Elesha Cox, will represent the Reading Cadre (LLT) at monthly Leadership meetings.

The LLT is responsible for assisting in the monitoring of common core/standards-based strategies in all classrooms. The team monitors the elements of the Reading Standards/Common Core Standards. Team members help assure successful implementation of all elements of Readers Workshop. The team carefully and thoughtfully examines students' progress in reading as measured by FAIR, teacher assessments, district assessments, portfolios, and FCAT. Each member of the team is responsible for assisting grade level members in developing a clear understanding of the standards-based strategies necessary to ensure student growth.

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

1. Read It Forward, Jax Campaign, also a district Initiative.
2. Focus on integrating reading strategies into all content areas not just literacy (Reading/Writing) lessons.
3. Increase learning gains and percentage of students proficient in Reading.
4. Adopt Common Core Standards – Kindergarten through second grade with gradual rollout to intermediate grades
5. Assure proper levels of text complexity are used
6. 25 Book/1,000,000 Word Campaign
7. Coordinate the Reading Kick-Off
8. Coordinate end of year reading Celebration
9. Book of the Month Implementation

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.

N/A

*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?

N/A

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?

N/A

Postsecondary Transition

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the <u>High School Feedback Report</u>

N/A

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:	37% (131) of all students in grades 3-5 will achieve proficiency (Level 3) on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test. This is a 2% increase over last year's level of performance. Note: In 2011-12, there were 338 students in 3rd-5th grade. In 2012-13, there are 355 students in 3rd-5th grade.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
35% - (117)	37% (131)

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. All teachers are not implementing Reader's Workshop with rigor and fidelity.	1a.1. Regular classroom visits to monitor teacher implementation of the workshop format	1a.1. Principal Assistant Principal Instructional Coach	1a.1. Monthly Focus Walks Weekly Walk-throughs Lesson Plan Monitoring	1a.1. Focus Walks Checklist CAST rubric
2	1a.2. Teachers are not knowledgeable of how to implement components of Readers Workshop.	1a.2. Select teachers participate in the Reading Academy and share knowledge. Create model classrooms and allow time for teachers to visit.	1a.2. Reading Academy participants Instructional Coach	1a.2. Monthly Focus Walks Weekly Walk-throughs Lesson Plan Monitoring	1a.2. Focus Walks Checklist CAST rubric Log of teachers visiting model classrooms

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				
			Person or	Process Used to

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	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 group:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	38% (135) of all students in grades 3-5 will achieve above proficiency (Level 4 and 5) on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test. This is a 2% increase over last year's level of performance. Note: In 2011-12, there were 338 students in 3rd-5th grade. In 2012-13, there are 355 students in 3rd-5th grade.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
36% - (122)	38% (135)

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2a.1. All teachers not being able to effectively plan to provide students with challenging, cognitively complex lessons.	2a.1. Teacher of the Gifted will make resources available to support critical thinking activities.	2a.1. Teacher of the Gifted	2a.1. Classroom Walk-throughs Monitor Benchmark data	2a.1. Classroom Walk-through Checklist Benchmark assessments FCAT
2	2a.2. Targeted instruction for high achieving students is limited.	2a.2. Implement daily RtI time to provide enrichment activities/instruction.	2a.2. RtI Cadre	2a.2. RtI database of student groups and activities	2a.2. Benchmark assessments 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:

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

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	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 group:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	In grades 4-5, 69% (164) of all students will make Learning Gains on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Reading Test. This is a 2% increase over last year's level of performance. Note: 2011-2013--There were 232 students in grades 4 and 5. 2012-2013--There are 238 students in grades 4 and 5.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67% (155)	69% (164)

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	Common goal: Limited vertical collaboration and integration of subjects	Implement Book of the Month to create a community approach to the implementation of the Super Six reading strategies and integration of reading into other content areas.	Instructional Coach Reading Cadre	Classroom visits Discussion with grade levels	Classroom visit logs FCAT FAIR
2	3a.1. Teachers do not consistently use data and observations to drive guided reading groups.	3a.1. Teachers will receive support, and training as needed, to form Guided Reading groups that are specific to students' needs.	3a.1. Classroom teachers Instructional Coach	3a.1. Classroom observations and lesson plans	3a.1. Class Data, Lesson plan reviews, and Focus Walk forms
3	3a.2. Time constraints on common planning time	3a.2. Continue WOW Wednesdays, expanding calendar to allow for more WOW days for each grade level. Implement small group faculty meetings (K-2 and 3-5). Designate one Early Release Day a month to be used for grade level collaboration and data review.	3a.2 Principal Classroom teachers	3a.2. Collect regular feedback from teachers	3a.2. GL WOW Agendas/Minutes Surveys

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
1	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 group:

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	In grades 4-5, 71% (50) of all students in the Lowest Quartile will make Learning Gains on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test. Note: 2011-2012--There were 62 bottom quartile students. 2012-2013--There are 60 bottom quartile students.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
66% - (41)	71% - (50)

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	4.1. Teachers have difficulty identifying needs of students in Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3.	4.1. Monthly grade level data chats will be monitored and supported by knowledgeable staff in order to ensure data-driven meaningful instruction.	4.1. RtI Cadre	4.1. RtI database of interventions and student groups	4.1. Progress Monitoring Assessments
2	4.2 Teachers do not consistently meet with students in Guided Reading groups.	4.2 Monitor classroom instruction to ensure Guided Reading groups are in place, with students working below grade level meeting more frequently. Provide teachers with tools to assist in planning and monitoring of groups.	4.2. Principal Assistant Principal Instructional Coach	4.2. Classroom visits Discussion at WOW and Cadre	4.2. Log of classroom visits Minutes from grade levels and WOW
3	4.3 Students not receiving remediation in needed areas.	4.3. Students who scored Level 1 or 2 on the Spring 2012 FCAT will be invited to participate in afterschool tutoring.	4.3. Assistant Principal	4.3. Assessments during tutoring sessions	4.3. Assessment data FCAT

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 # Increase number of proficient students on Reading FCAT by 3 % from 67% to 70% 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	67%	70%	73%	76%	79%	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	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 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:	Decrease the number of Students with Disabilities not proficient on FCAT Reading by 7% (1) from 59% (10) to 52% (9).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
59% (10)	52% (9)
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	5D.1. ESE and inclusion teachers are not planning together to meet students' needs	5D.1. ESE and inclusion teachers attend training on collaborative planning. Teachers will plan collaboratively every two to three weeks	5D.1. Assistant Principal	5D.1. Discussion Evaluation of training Review of goals at each meeting	5D.1. Evaluation results Minutes from meetings FCAT Benchmark Assessments
2	5D.2. Students not aware of own strengths and weaknesses	5D.2. Teachers meet with students to create goals in math and plan ways to meet them.	5D.2. ESE teacher	5D.2. Interim checks through the year on goals	5D.2. FCAT Benchmark Assessments
3	5D.3. Students feel excluded from class	5D.3. Provide peer pair sharing groups so students feel included in learning process.	5D.3. ESE teacher	5D.3. Observation Discussion	5D.3. End of year survey

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	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
Data Analysis	K-5 and ESE teachers	Malinda Bachelor	School-wide	9/27/2012 and 10/01/2012	Contact with facilitator and STC	Admin Team
Guided Reading	K-5 and ESE teachers	Instructional Coach and Assistant Principal	School-wide	ERD on 11/7/2012	Classroom Walk throughs	Principal Assistant Principal
					Monitoring of	

Professional Reading	K-5 and ESE teachers	Reading Cadre Chair	Reading Cadre members	Monthly meetings	Reading Cadre minutes for sharing out of using ideas	Assistant Principal

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Printing of professional journal articles and district readers workshop resources	Various articles, workshop format templates, student work time activities	Operating budget	$100.00
			Subtotal: $100.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Presentation by District DAT Team member	Substitutes	Operating budget	$560.00
			Subtotal: $560.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Tutoring for Level 1 and 2 students	Tutors	SAI funds	$1,600.00
			Subtotal: $1,600.00
			Grand Total: $2,260.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	N/A				
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
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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:	37% (131)of all students in grades 3-5 will achieve proficiency (Level 3) on the 2013 FCAT Math Test. This is a 4% increase over last year's level of performance. Note: In 2011-12, there were 338 students in 3rd-5th grade. In 2012-13, there are 355 students in 3rd-5th grade.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33% (112)	37% (131)

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. Teachers struggle to balance dual curricula to meet students' needs with a high level of rigor.	1.1. Designate a block of time during WOW and one grade level meeting per month for math planning. Compile and share a list of grade level math resources.	Math Cadre members Instructional Coach	Lesson Plans Monitor discussions at WOW and grade level meetings	Lesson Plans WOW and grade level minutes
2	1.2. Teachers are not allowing enough time for student-led discussion of math topics.	1.2. Conduct CAST PLC focusing on discussion and questioning techniques. Provide opportunities for teachers to observe peers who successfully facilitate student-led discussions.	Principal Assistant Principal	Classroom observations	CAST rubric Log of classroom visits

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

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 group:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	34% (121)of all students in grades 3-5 will achieve above proficiency (Level 4 and 5) on the 2013 FCAT Math Test. This is a 4% increase over last year's level of performance. Note: In 2011-12, there were 338 students in 3rd-5th grade. In 2012-13, there are 355 students in 3rd-5th grade.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
30% (101)	34% (121)

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2a.1. Teachers lack depth of knowledge of math content.	2a.1. Identify teachers to attend math content training and provide opportunity for sharing with colleagues.	2a.1. Principal	2a.1. Classroom visits Monitor assessment scores for student growth	2a.1. Log of classroom visits Assessment results
2	2a.2. Teachers not differentiating instruction to meet the needs of the higher level thinkers	2a.2. Teachers will provide varied assignments during work time to meet the needs of students. Use math jornals daily to record student thinking.	2a.2. Admin Team	2a.2. Review of student work	2a.2. Lesson plans Student journals
3	2a.3 Students not given enough opportunities to work with students on thier level.	2a.3. Students in Extended day will be invited to particapte in project-based enrichment activities one afternoon a week.	2a.3. Data Team	2a.3. Review of student work	2a.3. Project 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:

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:**

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

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 group:

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	In grades 4-5, 71% (169) of all students will make Learning Gains on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Math Test. Note: 2011-2013--There were 232 students in grades 4 and 5. 2012-2013--There are 238 students in grades 4 and 5.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
62% (136)	71% (169)

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Common goal: Limited vertical collaboration and integration of subjects	Implement Book of the Month to create a community approach to the implementation of the Super Six reading strategies and integration of reading into other content areas.	Instructional Coach Reading Cadre	Classroom visits Discussion with grade levels	Classroom visit logs FCAT FAIR
2	3a.1. Small group instruction does not take place.	3a.1. Train teachers on how to implement small group instruction during Math Workshop. Develop model classrooms.	3a.1. Instructional Coach Model classroom teachers	3a.1. Classroom visits Reflection with Instructional Coach after visiting a model classroom	3a.1. Classroom visit logs Log of reflections
3	3a.2. Limited vertical collaboration on math instruction and standards	3a.2. Conduct small group faculty meetings (K-2, 3-5) to allow more focus on relevant instructional topics. Pilot monthly grade level meetings between 4th and 5th grades to discuss strengths, weaknesses, and instructional approaches.	3a.2. Principal Assistant Principal Instructional Coach	3a.2. Discussion and feedback from meetings	3a.2. Surveys

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:
v	N/A

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	54% (32) of all students in the Lowest 25% will make learning gains on the 2012 Math FCAT. This goal was acquired by taking 10% of those not making gains on the 2012 FCAT to determine the increase of students making learning gains in math. 2011-2012--There were 62 bottom quartile students. 2012-2013--There are 60 bottom quartile students.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
49% (28)	54% (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	4.1. Teachers do not explicitly instruct students on how to use a variety of strategies for problem solving.	4.1. Instructional Coach will provide teachers with resources that will assist teachers in better understanding a variety of strategies. Teachers will incorporate explicit instruction of strategies during small group instruction.	4.1. Instructional Coach Classroom teachers	4.1. Classroom visits Assessments	4.1. Log of classroom visits Assessment results CAST rubric
2	4.2. Teachers do not include an appropriate amount of high order questions and wait time to allow all students time to process.	4.2. Conduct CAST PLC focusing on questioning techniques and wait time. Participants will share with grade level strategies learned at PLC. Teachers will monitor their ratio of high order questions to low order questions in lessons, aiming for at least 1/3 of the questions being high order.	4.2. Principal Assistant Principal Classroom Teachers	4.2. Classroom visits Discussion at PLC Discussion on grade level	4.2. Log of classroom visits CAST rubric Artifacts shared at PLC Grade level minutes
3	4.3. Students not receiving remediation in needed areas.	4.3. Students who scored Level 1 or 2 on the Spring 2012 FCAT will be invited to participate in afterschool tutoring.	4.3. Assistant Principal	4.3. Assessments administered during tutoring session	4.3. Assessment data FCAT

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goal #

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	5A :	Increase number of students proficient on the Math FCAT by 3% from 68% to 71%

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	68%	71%	74%	77%	80%	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	Decrease the number of students not proficient on FCAT Math by 5% (12) from 33% (70) to 28% (58) for White students and by 19% (21) from 49% (53) to 30% (32) for Black students.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 33% (70) Black: 49% (53) Hispanic: N/A Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A	White: 28% (58) Black: 30% (32) Hispanic: N/A Asian: N/A American Indian: 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	5B.1. Students lack understanding of math vocabulary.	5B.1. Implement concept-based math word walls.	5B.1. Classroom Teachers	5B.1. Focus Walks Classroom visits	5B.1. Focus Walk checklist Log of classroom visits
2	5B.2. Students lack understanding of math skills and strategies.	5B.2. Teachers will implement effective charting of strategies, concepts, and skills. Teachers will display/store charts for future reference.	5B.2. Classroom teachers	5B.2. Focus Walks Classroom observations Achievement on assessments	Focus Walk Checklist Log of classroom visits Assessment scores

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:	Decrease the number of Students with Disabilities not proficient on FCAT Math by 15% (3) from 72% (12) to 57% (9).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
72% (12)	57% (9)

	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	5D.1. ESE and general education teachers not planning together to meet students' needs	5D.1. ESE and inclusion teachers attend training on collaborative planning. Teachers will plan collaboratively every two to three weeks	5D.1. Assistant Principal	5D.1. ESE and inclusion teachers attend training on collaborative planning. Teachers will plan collaboratively every two to three weeks	5D.1. Evaluation results Minutes from meetings FCAT Bechmark Assessments
2	5D.2. Students not aware of own strengths and weaknesses	5D.2. Teachers meet with students to create goals in math and plan ways to meet them.	5D.2. ESE teacher	5D.2. Interim checks through the year on goals	5D.2. FCAT Benchmark Assessments
3	5D.3. Students feel unsuccessful	5D.3. Create lessons that scaffold into smaller chunks of learing and instrucitonal access. Monitor and adjust assignment expectations for students.	5D.3. ESE teacher	5D.3. Observations Discussions with students	5D.3. FCAT 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 subgroup:

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:	Decrease the number of Economically Disadvantaged students not proficient on FCAT Math by 10% (14) from 50% (67) to 40% (53).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (67)	40% (53)

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	5E.1. Teachers are not adjusting instructional practices for our changing student population.	5E.1. During the first semester, work with other schools who have a high population of ED students performing at a	5E.1. Principal	5E.1. Classroom observations Assessments	5E.1. Log of classroom observations Assessment results

		satisfactory level in order to determine best practices. Teachers will incorporate at least one of these best practices into their daily routines.			
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
CAST PLC	Volunteers from all grade levels and resource teachers	Principal Assistant Principal	Selected participants at each grade level	4 week sessions open from September - December 2012	Follow-up discussions for grade level members Teacher evaluations	Principal Assistant Principal
Guided Math	K-5	Instructional Coach	School-wide	January 2013	Focus Walks Grade level discussions	Instructional Coach Math Cadre members
Professional Reading	K-5 and ESE teachers	Math Cadre Chair	Math Cadre members	Monthly meetings	Monitoring of Cadre minutes for sharing out of using ideas	Instructional Coach

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
CAST PLC	Substitutes	Operating budget	$1,600.00
			Subtotal: $1,600.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $1,600.00

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:	53% (68) of all students in grade 5 will score at Achievement Level 3 on the 2013 FCAT Science Test. This is a 2% increase over the previous year. Note: 2011-2012: There were 110 5th grade students. 2012-2013: There are 128 5th grade students.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
51% (56)	53% (68)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1a.1. Teachers need to engage students in more hands-on labs that walk through each phase of the scientific process.	1a.1. Teachers will facilitate hands-on labs at least once a week with gradual release of steps of the scientific method.	1a.1. Principal	1a.1. Focus Walks Classroom visits Tracking of progress on assessments	1a.1. Focus Walk checklist Log of classroom visits Assessment data
2	1a.2. Student participation in previous Super Science Saturdays was low.	1a.2. School will accommodate Science Lab Days (Weird Science Wednesdays) to reinforce skills associated with low performing benchmarks.	1a.2. Science Cadre members	1a.2. Monitor student performance on benchmarks after covered at each event.	1a.2. Assessment data
3	1a.3. Students not experiencing the scientific process from beginning to end.	1a.3. Students in grades K-3 will create a class scinece fair project.	1a.3. Science Cadre member	1a.3. Teacher observation Assessments during the process	1a.3. Project 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 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

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 group:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	20% (26) of all students in grade 5 will score at or above Achievement Level 4. This is a 2% increase over the previous year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
18% (20)	20% (26)

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. Students do not discuss and write about scientific reasoning using appropriate vocabulary on a regular basis.	2a.1. Teachers will have students maintain a science journal in which they will write about daily scientific findings. Teachers will maintain a concept word wall.	2a.1. Admin Team	2a.1. Focus Walks Classroom visits	2a.1. Focus Walk checklist Log of classroom visits
2	2a.2. Students need more opportunities to participate in the science inquiry process.	2a.2. Students in grade 4 will create group Science fair projects. Students in grade 5 will create individual Science Fair projects.	2a.2. Science Cadre	2a.2. Check points for projects	2a.2. Project 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:

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
1	N/A	v	N/A	N/A	N/A

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
Professional Reading	K-5	Science Cadre Chair	Science Cadre members	Monthly meetings	Monitoring of Science Cadre minutes for sharing out of using ideas	Instructional Coach

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:	In 4th grade, 85% (94) of students will achieve adequate yearly progess (FCAT Level 3.0 and higher) on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Writing Test. 45% (50) of students will achieve adequate yearly progess (FCAT Level 4 and higher) on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Writing Test. This is a 5% increase over the previous year. NOTE: 2011-2012: There were 120 4th grade students.

			2012-2013: There are 110 4th grade students.	

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
77% (92) Level 3 and above 32% (39) Level 4 and above	85% (94) Level 3 and above 45% (50) Level 4 and above

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. All teachers are not implementing Writer's Workshop with fidelity.	1a.1. Implement a 60 minute Writer 's Workshop in every classroom K – 5th. Students will use the writing process daily; all writing will be dated, and recorded in a journal, notebook, or work folder for monitoring of growth across time. Teachers will share students' writing in grade level meetings and discuss practices for teaching author's craft.	1a.1. Admin Team	1a.1. Focus Walks Monitoring of Lesson plans Grade Level Discussions	1a.1. Focus Walk checklist Lesson plans Grade level minutes
2	1a.2. Teachers need a better understanding of the state's scoring process in order to align classroom assessment to state expectations.	1a.2. Work with teachers to help them become more familiar with anchor pieces in order to guide instruction and build student understanding. Teachers will development rubrics with student input to offer students a guide for expectations.	1a.2. Instructional Coach	1a.2. Focus Walks Classroom visits District Writing prompts	1a.2. Focus Walk checkllist Log of classroom visits District Writing prompts data FCAT scores
3	1a.3. Students consistently score low in the area of conventions.	1a.3. Teachers will conduct writing conferences daily, making sure to address conventions. Teachers will set expectations for convention use in all subject areas.	1a.3. Admin Team	1a.3. Monitoring of conference logs Discussion of student work Monitor District Writing prompts	1a.3. Conference logs Grade level/WOW minutes District Writing prompt data

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing 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
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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
Understanding of State Writing Expectations	Writing	Joanne Kresge	4th grade teachers	October 17, 2012	Grade level discussions of student work	Principal Assistant Principal
Professional Reading	Writing	Writing Cadre Chair	K-5 teachers	Monthly meetings	Monitoring of Writing Cadre minutes for sharing out of using ideas	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:	Increase average daily attendance during the 2012-2013 school year to 96.5% (695). This is a 1% increase. Decrease number of students with excessive absences by 2%(17)from 233 to 216. Reduce excessive absences/tardies by 2% (12) from 77 to 65.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
95.5% (688)-Average daily attendance rate	96.5% (695)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
233	216
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
77	65

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. Family and economic factors, including lack of parental involvement, affordable transportation, and varied education priorities contribute to excessive absences and tardies.	1.1. Clearly communicate the importance of the academic day with families during Orientation and Open House messages. Give examples of how absences and tardies equate into large amounts of lost instructional time. Meet with parents to discuss strategies to improve attendance. Develop a focused emphasis on collaboration with community organizations to assist families as needed. Teachers call parents after a child has been absent for three days in a row to inquire about the absences. Develop and distribute Student Handbook which explains all policies and procedures for our school.	1.1. Assistant Principal CRT Attendance officer Classroom teachers	1.1. Monitoring of attendance in OnCourse and Genesis	1.1. OnCourse and Genesis reports

		Send reminders home with every child who arrives after 8:45 am, which is the beginning of the RtI block.			
2	1.2. Students do not recognize importance of being at school.	1.2 Recognize students who are present every day at quarterly and end of year award programs. Recognize students with most improved attendance each quarter.	1.2 CRT	1.2 Monitoring of att4endance in OnCourse and Genesis	1.2. OnCourse and Genesis reports

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Parent Conferences	Family engagement	Assistant Principal	School-wide	September faculty meetings	Grade level discussions	Principal Assisstant Principal

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)

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 goal for 2012-2013 is to decrease the number of suspensions/students suspended by at least one student in each area.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
5	4
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
5	4
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
6	5
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
4	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 interventions for students struggling with behavior issues	1.1. Teachers will become familiar with and use resources such as The Teacher Encyclopedia of Behavior Management, The Tough Kid Tool Box, Interventions, and The Teacher's Resource Guide. Teachers will develop behavior contracts with students as needed. Utilize district and county programs and resources for students with behavior issues including SOS and Child Guidance.	1.1. Principal Assistant Principal Foundations Team	1.1. Monthly and quarterly tracking of number and type of referral data, classroom observations Monitoring of behavior contracts	1.1. Collect and analyze referral data Behavior contract data
2	1.2. Teachers are not aware of triggers for student behavior.	1.2. Utilize RtI Cadre to bring patterns, trends and data to quarterly faculty meetings Conduct RtI/B meetings as needed to address individual student	1.2. RtI Cadre MTSS Team	1.2 Quarterly reports to faculty as well as monthly Cadre meetings FBAs	1.2 Collect and analyze referral data Data for FBAs

					needs.
3	1.3. Expectations for student behavior during various classroom activities were unclear	1.3. Teachers will implement CHAMPs in the classroom.	1.3. Classroom Teachers	1.3. Focus Walks Classroom visits	1.3. Focus Walk checklists Log of classroom visits Referral 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
CHAMPs	Classroom Management	Carolyn Novelly	School-wide	Pre-planning	Focus Walks Classroom visits	Principal Assistant Principal Instructional Coach

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: *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	Our goal is to increase parental involvement by 2% from 75% (539) of our parents participating in school activities to 77% (554).
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	**2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:**
75% (539)	77% (554)

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. Delivery of information about various parent involvement opportunities at the school and within the community was not done well.	1.1. Schedule activities on consistent day of the week and times. Offer incentives for attendance at school events. Event invitations will be sent home on colorful flyers at least three times before the scheduled event in addition to the monthly newsletter. Events will be posted on school website at least one month in advance.	1.1. Principal Assistant Principal Instructional Coach	1.1. Collection of attendance Collect feedback informally from parents as to the effectiveness of the program Parent Surveys	1.1. Data from parent surveys Documented attendance (sign-in and participation data)
2	1.2. Scheduling conflicts with outside activities make it difficult for families to attend school events	1.2. Upload short videos to school website that cover topics from school events for parents to view at their leisure.	1.2. Principal Webmaster	1.2. Discussions with parents	1.2. Surveys

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:	Reduce student accidents on the playground by 10% from 15 incidents in 2011-12 to 13 in 2012-13 as measured by the number of student accident reports on file.
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
2% (15) of student population	1.8% (13) of student population

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 Teachers are not supervising students sufficiently.	1.1. Teachers will circulate throughout the playground regularly as outlined in our Foundations Playground Common Area plan.	1.1. Classroom teachers Foundations Cadre members	1.1. Common area observations	Data from Common area observations Data on playground accidents

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
Guidelines for Success and Common Area Plans	Safe and Civil Schools	Foundations Cadre Chair	School-wide	Pre-planning and one ERD	Common area observations	Foundations Cadre

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	Printing of professional journal articles and district readers workshop resources	Various articles, workshop format templates, student work time activities	Operating budget	$100.00
				Subtotal: $100.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Presentation by District DAT Team member	Substitutes	Operating budget	$560.00
Mathematics	CAST PLC	Substitutes	Operating budget	$1,600.00
				Subtotal: $2,160.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Tutoring for Level 1 and 2 students	Tutors	SAI funds	$1,600.00
				Subtotal: $1,600.00
				Grand Total: $3,860.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

jn Priority	jn Focus	jn Prevent	jn NA

Are you a reward school: jn Yes   jn No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 9/24/2012)

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
Fund after school tutoring for students who scored Level 1or 2 on 2012 FCAT	$1,450.00

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

- Review the School Improvement Plan three times a year
- Review of school data monthly
- Brainstorm ways to involve parents and community members in school events
- Brainstorm ideas to address the improvement of our schools' reading, math, writing and science programs
- Work collaboratively with feeder schools, Oceanway Middle School and First Coast High School, and other schools in our area
- Review and provide input for the fall and spring budgets

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Duval School District
SAN MATEO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	79%	84%	45%	68%	276	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	61%	76%			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?	57% (YES)	68% (YES)			125	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 = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Duval School District
SAN MATEO ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	87%	81%	84%	72%	324	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%	67%			136	3 ways to make gains: • Improve FCAT Levels • Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 • Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	66% (YES)	79% (YES)			145	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					605	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested