

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: HIGHLANDS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Duval

Principal: Kimberlee Hayward

SAC Chair: Paula Kellum

Superintendent: Ed Pratt-Dannals

Date of School Board Approval: November 5, 2012

Last Modified on: 11/6/2012

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)
					Mrs. Kimberlee Hayward is an experienced educator. She has a total of 24 years as a professional educator in Duval County and is a graduate of University of North Florida. Mrs. Hayward began her career at Finnegan Elementary where she taught second grade and was successful in achieving gains among her students. Mrs. Hayward also taught at John Love Elementary, Chimney Lakes Elementary and Enterprise Learning Academy. During her tenure at Enterprise Learning Academy she was also a model classroom teacher. She also served as a Standards Coach at Enterprise Learning Academy where she implemented several initiatives that produced student gains. Following her experience at Enterprise, she served as an Assistant Principal at Biscayne Elementary for four years where she continued to set high expectations for the students and teachers and helped them achieve these goals. Mrs. Hayward spent a year working for the Florida Department of Education

Principal	Kimberlee Hayward	BA-Elementary Education University of North Florida 1989; Masters in Educational Leadership, University of North Florida 2006	2	6	<p>where she worked as a Regional Reading Coordinator and assisted failing schools. She assisted in implementing researched based strategies and helped to increase the school grades in the schools she provided services. Mrs. Hayward served as the Principal of Highland's Elementary during the 2011-2012 school year where she set high expectations for the staff and students and assisted in moving the school from an "F" to an "A".</p> <p>2011-2012 Highlands Elementary School, Principal School Grade A Reading Mastery 45%, Math Mastery 46%, Writing Mastery 83%, Science Mastery 44%</p> <p>Reading Gains 69%, Math Gains 73%, Lowest 25% Reading Gains 82%, Lowest 25% Math Gains 73%</p> <p>2010-2011: Florida Department of Education Regional Office Regional Reading Coordinator Pinedale Grade A Long Branch Grade A North Shore Grade D</p> <p>2009-2010: Assistant Principal of Biscayne Elementary Grade C. Reading Mastery: 67%, Math Mastery: 53%, Science Mastery: 20%, Writing Mastery: 78% AYP: 79%, Black and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in Reading or Math. 2008-2009: Assistant Principal of Biscayne Elementary Grade C. Reading Mastery: 61%, Math Mastery: 52%, Science Mastery: 22%, Writing Mastery: 79% AYP: 87%, Black and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in reading. Black and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in math.</p> <p>2007-2008: Grade C, Reading Mastery: 67%, Math Mastery: 51%, Science Mastery: 23%, Writing Mastery: 62% AYP: 85%, All subgroups met AYP in reading. Black and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in math.</p> <p>2006-2007: Grade B, Reading Mastery: 63%, Math Mastery: 49%, Science Mastery: 17%, Writing Mastery: 84% AYP: 100%, All subgroups met AYP in both reading and math.</p>
-----------	-------------------	--	---	---	---

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Literacy	Margaret Harbin	Elementary Education (K-6) ESOL (K-12)	2	2	<p>2011-2012 Highlands Elementary School, School Grade A Reading Mastery 45%, Math Mastery 46%, Writing Mastery 83%, Science Mastery 44%</p> <p>Reading Gains 69%, Math Gains 73%, Lowest 25% Reading Gains 82%, Lowest 25% Math Gains 73%</p>
					<p>2011-2012 Biltmore Elementary School, 4th Grade Reading and Language Arts Teacher</p>

Literacy	Arica Bridges	Elementary Education (K-6) ESOL Endorsed	1	1	School Grade A Reading Mastery 52% , Math Mastery 54%, Writing Mastery 98%, Science Mastery 42%, Reading Gains 67% , Math Gains 69%, Lowest 25% Reading Gains 53% , Lowest 25% Math Gains 95%
----------	---------------	---	---	---	---

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

Describe the school-based strategies that will be used to recruit and retain high quality, effective teachers to the school.

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1. Regular meetings of new teachers with principal, district cadre and PDF.	Principal Cadre PDF	June 2013	
2	2. Partnering new teachers with veteran teachers.	Principal PDF	June 2013	
3	3. Weekly participation in Professional Learning Communities with grade levels to plan instruction, analyze student work and use data to drive instruction.	Principal School academic coaches Teachers	June 2013	
4	4. Pre-planning Training	Principal School Based Academic Coaches	August 17th, 2012	
5	5. Individual Professional Development to strengthen teacher content knowledge.	Principal School Based Coaches District In- service Trainers	June 2013	
6	6. Attend Teach for America Recruitment Fair	Principal School academic coaches	June 2012	

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
No data submitted	

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
32	12.5%(4)	50.0%(16)	25.0%(8)	15.6%(5)	31.3%(10)	100.0%(32)	3.1%(1)	0.0%(0)	59.4%(19)

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
Cheryl Powell	Kelly Steckel	Ms. Powell has taught for 29 years and 23 years at Highlands Elementary.	Weekly meetings Common planning of lessons and assignments Mentor Observation Cycles
Angela Sevilla	Caroline Clark Sophia Ridgell	Ms. Sevilla has taught for 7 years and has taught 2nd and 3rd grade.	Weekly meetings Common planning of lessons and assignments Mentor Observation Cycles
Daisy Lucas	Bryan Ross	Ms. Lucas has taught for 6 years. She has taught second and third grade. Ms. Lucas has served as a member of the curriculum writing team for the district.	Weekly meetings Common planning of lessons and assignments Mentor Observation Cycles
Suzanne Verducci	Shannon Galligar	Ms. Verducci has taught for 5 years. Her experience is in second and fifth grade. She has served on the district curriculum writing team.	Weekly meetings Common planning of lessons and assignments Mentor Observation Cycles
Patti Weigel	Jennifer Bancroft	Ms. Weigel has taught in the CSS self-contained classroom and has served as the CSS Site Coach for the last 3 years.	Weekly meetings Common planning of lessons and assignments Mentor Observation Cycles
Patti Weigel	Christen Suratt	Ms. Weigel has taught in the CSS self-contained classroom and has served as the CSS Site Coach for the last 3 years.	Weekly meetings Common planning of lessons and assignments Mentor Observation Cycles
Melissa Floyd	Sara Claiborne	Ms. Floyd has taught 7 years in first grade, second grade, and V.E. Resource.	Weekly meetings Common planning of lessons and assignments Mentor Observation Cycles

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

Funds are used to provide additional academic support and learning opportunities to help low-achieving students in reading and math. The funds are also used to provide professional development and other school initiatives that will increase the effectiveness of teachers, paraprofessionals, and parents. The school receives Title I funds for increasing parental involvement in the school. Additionally, these funds are used to provide parents with materials and trainings for working with their children in order to improve their academic achievement. Title I funds are also used to fund the Instructional, Math and Reading coach positions.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Services are provided to ensure that English Language Learners (ELLs) meet the academic content and English proficiency standards. Title III funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide extra support to ELLs by offering internal and external safety nets in academic language acquisition.

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI funds will be coordinated with School Improvement funds to provide remediation for students identified as intensive according to FCAT, FAIR, and benchmark assessments. Students are afforded the opportunity to attend before/after school tutoring sessions for intensive remediation.

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Breakfast in the Classroom is provided each day for all students. Highlands Elementary also participates in the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program. All students receive either a fresh fruit or fresh vegetable three days a week as a healthy, nutritional snack.

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 (Kimberlee Hayward): Provides common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing RtI, conducts assessment of RtI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities.

RtI Facilitator/Guidance Counselor (Nana Vidal): Liaison for implementation of MTSS at the school level which includes feedback to the Leadership Team, presentations to the faculty, work with school-based coaches, and work with small collaborative groups of teachers, and provide direct intervention services and support to students identified as needing Tier II or Tier III intervention services.

Select General Education Teachers (K-1st (Heather Vega, Tiffany Keen-Davis, Quanae Hall), 3rd-5th (Daisy Lucas, Suzanne Verducci): Provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier I instruction/interventions, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier II interventions, and integrates Tier I materials/instruction with Tier II/III activities.

Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teacher (Sherry Bolden): Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into tier III instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching.

Communication/Social Skills Site Coach and ESE Liaison (Patti Weigel): Participates in development of behavior plans, observations, and collaboration with outside support system in the area of RtI Tier 2 and 3 behavior issues.

Reading and Math Interventionist- Reading, Math (Angela Sevilla, Bridgett Stroud): Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student needs while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk"; assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.

Reading Coach (Arica Bridges, Margaret Harbin): Provides K-12 reading plan; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data based instructional planning; supports the implementation of Tier I, Tier II and Tier III intervention.

Speech Language Pathologist (Nicole Spivey): Educates the team in the role language plays in curriculum, assessment, and instruction as a basis for appropriate program design; assists in the selection of screening measures; and helps identify systemic patterns of student need with respect to language skills.

School Technology Contact (Sheila Thompkins, Angela Sevilla): Develops technology necessary to manage and display data; provides professional development and technical support to teachers regarding data management and display.

Student Services Personnel (Lindon Britton): Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students. In addition to providing interventions, school social workers continue to link child-serving and community agencies to the schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral and social success.

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 school-based RtI Leadership Team will meet weekly to review student data and make instructional decisions. The meetings will focus around the implementation of RtI and identifying students needing Tier II or Tier III interventions. The team will meet weekly to engage in the following activities:

Review universal screening data and link to instructional decisions; review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development and resources. The team will also collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skills. The team will also facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation.

Describe the role of the school-based MTSS Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Describe how the RtI Problem-solving process is used in developing and implementing the SIP?

The RtI Leadership Team will meet to provide assistance in the development of the SIP. The team will provide data on Tier I, II, and III targets; academic and social/emotional areas that need to be addressed; help set clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, Relationship); facilitate the development of a systemic approach to teaching (Essential Questions, Activating Strategies, Teaching Strategies, Extending, Refining, and Summarizing); and align processes and procedures.

MTSS Implementation

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

Baseline data: District Benchmark Math & Science, Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), District Writing Prompt, Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), Discipline Referrals, Attendance Data

Progress Monitoring: Formative Assessments, Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), FCAT 2.0-Released Tests, Benchmark, Pearson Limelight and Inform, Genesis, FCIM, Houghton Mifflin Florida Assessments, Learning Schedule Assessments, Progress Monitoring Assessments, DRA, District K-2 CCSS Math Assessment, District Writing Assessments

Midyear: District Benchmark Math & Science, Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA2), Early Reading Diagnostic Assessment (ERDA), Number of Discipline Referrals, Attendance Data

End of year: FAIR, FCAT 2.0, Suspension data, DRA, Attendance Data, District K-2 CCSS Math Assessment

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional development will be provided during PLCs and faculty meetings throughout the year. The RtI team will also evaluate additional professional development that is needed during the RtI Leadership Team meeting.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Bi-weekly Data Chats with individual teachers to identify students needing more intensive remediation. Teachers will receive support with developing Tier II and Tier III interventions.

During PLCs teachers will receive professional development in development of documentation and data collection for the MTSS process.

Guidance Counselor and district support staff will follow up with students needing any additional services

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Principal (Kimberlee Hayward): Monitors the implementation of the CCRP, the K-12 Reading Plan, and the district curriculum. Visits classrooms daily and provides teachers with feedback from those visits along with next steps. Shares data with the Leadership team from classroom observations and helps identify next steps for professional development. Participates in weekly PLC meetings with all grade levels to analyze student data and determine the needs of individual students. Leads the decision-making process to identify areas of need in reading and helps to identify resources to meet those needs.

Reading Coach (Arica Bridges /Margaret Harbin): Reading coaches will model lessons, plan with teachers and provide professional development to support the teachers as they improve their reading instruction and implementation of the CCRP and/or district curriculum. Coaches will implement the Intensive Coaching Model in all classrooms. Based on their work in the school and monthly reading coach meetings, the coaches will help the leadership team to: analyze student data, develop the school's action plan to address students' instructional needs, develop the school-wide reading professional development plan, write the reading section of the school improvement plan, plan school-wide literacy events and schedule time for all

teachers to visit the reading model classrooms.

Select General Education Teachers-Primary and Intermediate (a representative from each grade level) - Create capacity of reading knowledge within the school building and focus on areas of literacy concerns across the school.

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

- The Literacy Leadership Team will meet monthly to address student achievement and best practices based on student data.
- The Literacy Leadership Team will report committee activities by posting agendas and minutes or making oral reports at faculty meetings. LLT will also organize and implement school-wide reading initiatives that include all staff, teachers, students, parents and community.
- Serves as the leadership for grade level or group in making decisions about curriculum practices in reading and writing
- Facilitates professional development workshops during Early Dismissal Days.
- Responsible for Reading and Writing Parent Nights
- Responsible for end of the year Reading Celebration

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

Oversee the implementation of Common Core Standards for Literacy
Increase the level of student proficiency around reading and writing
Increase parent involvement through Parent Nights
Increase number of students meeting reading goals and increased participation Reading Celebration
Themed literacy activities
Ongoing professional development during early release days and weekly Professional Learning Communities
School wide reading strategies

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.

Voluntary Pre-Kindergarten is offered for 36 four year olds that live in Highland's attendance zone. The objectives for the program are comprehensive and provide a solid foundation for entry into basic kindergarten. Students experience hands on literacy activities that build pre-reading, oral expression and phonemic awareness skills. Math skills are enhanced through daily living activities that involve matching, sorting and counting. Within the first 45 days of enrollment, kindergarten students are given two assessments: Florida Kindergarten Readiness Assessment (FLKRS) is designed to screen each child's level of readiness for kindergarten. FLKRS includes a subset of the Early Childhood Observation System (ECHOS) and the first two measures of the FAIR assessment for kindergarten (Letter Naming Fluency and Initial Sound Fluency). These assessments are used to gather information on a child's development in emergent literacy. The results from these assessments are used to group students for differentiated instruction and to provide immediate intensive intervention.

*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:	The percentage of students achieving FCAT Level 3 in reading will increase from 29% (38) to 33% (50).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29%(38)	33%(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	1a.1. New teachers are not familiar with an instructional delivery model that includes explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice, and independent practice as well as lesson assessment.	1a.1 School-based Academic Coaches will collaborate to develop an appropriate professional development plan focused on explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice, and independent practice as well as lesson assessment.	1a.1 Principal, School-based Academic Coaches,	1a.1 Focus Walks, Lesson Plan Review, Data Notebook Review	1a.1 DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric
2	1a.2. Teachers have not received in-depth professional development in the implementation of the Common Core Standards and literacy block.	1a.2. The Reading Coach will collaborate with district personnel to develop and present professional development focused on the implementation of the Common Core Standards and literacy block.	1a.2. Principal, Reading Coach, district personnel	1a.2 Focus Walks, Lesson Plan Review	1a.2. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric
3	1a.3. Teachers are not differentiating reading instruction based on individual student needs.	1a.3. School-based Coaches will support teachers through the coaching model (e.g., co-planning, modeling, co-teaching, observing, and debriefing) to implement differentiated instructional strategies in daily instruction.	1a.3. Principal, School-based Coaches, Teachers	1a.3. Focus Walks, Classroom Observations	1a.3. FAIR Reading Assessment District Reading Benchmark Assessment Weekly Reading Theme Tests
4	1a.4. Few teachers are conducting daily small group or one on one student conferences	1a.4 School based coaches will provide support through the Intensive Coaching Model to teachers on implementing daily student conferences.	1a.4 School Based Coaches Teachers	1a.4. Anecdotal Notes Classroom Observations Focus Walks	1a.4. Anecdotal Notes
	1a. 5. Few teachers are incorporating Reader's Response Journals where	1a.5 School Based Coaches will collaborate with teachers during	1a.5 School Based Coaches Principal	1a.5 Lesson Plans Readers Response Journals	1a.5. Rubric

5	students are required to record their independent thinking and application of reading strategies.	PLCs to develop a system as well as plans for incorporating reader's response journals into daily instruction.	Teachers	Classroom Observations	
---	---	--	----------	------------------------	--

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:	The percentage of students achieving a level 4, 5, or 6 will be 50% since there is no data to show a gain.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
No data last year due to cell size..	50%(8)

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	1b.1. Teachers have not received in-depth professional development on the implementation of Access Points.	1b.1 CSS Site Coach will collaborate with District ESE Staff to provide professional development to implement Access Points in daily instruction.	1b.1 District ESE Staff, Site Coach	1b.1. Lesson Plans, Curriculum Data	1b.1. Curriculum Based Assessments Brigance Inventory of Early Development II
2	1b.2. Teachers are not differentiating reading instruction based on individual student needs.	1b.2 CSS Site Coach will support teachers through the coaching model (e.g., co-planning, modeling, co-teaching, observing, and debriefing) to implement differentiated instructional strategies in daily instruction.	1b.2 Site Coach	1b.2. Focus Walks, Lesson Plan Review, Data Notebook Review	1b.2. Curriculum Based Assessments Brigance Inventory of Early Development II

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:	The percentage of students achieving FCAT Levels 4 and 5 in reading will increase from 13% (17) to 14% (21).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
13%(17)	14%(21)

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
	2a.1. Questioning strategies, such as probing, clarifying, connecting, and	2a.1. School-based Coaches will collaborate to develop and provide professional development	2a.1.Principal, District Coaches, School-based Coaches, Teachers	2a.1. Focus Walks, Lesson Plan Review	2a.1. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric

1	scaffolding are not being designed to promote critical, independent and creative thinking.	to teachers on using Webbs Depth of Knowledge to promote higher order questioning when planning and delivering lessons.			
2	2a.2. Few teachers have been trained to use available supplemental materials to increase academic rigor.	2a.2. School-Based Coaches will train teachers on the use of supplemental materials to include leveled classroom libraries, appropriate non-fiction texts, and literature circle texts.	2a.2. Principal School-Based Coaches	2a.2. Focus Walks	2a.2. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric
3	2a.3. Some teachers are not using technology and other available supplemental materials to provide enrichment and/or differentiated activities for students.	2a.3. School based coaches will work in collaboration with teachers to develop enrichment and/or differentiated activities that incorporate the use of technology.	2a.3 School-Based Coaches Teachers	2a.3 Focus Walks, Classroom Observations	2a.3 FAIR Reading Assessment District Reading Benchmark Assessment Weekly Reading Theme Tests
4	2a.4. Few teachers are providing students the opportunity to work collaboratively in higher level texts with more complex tasks.	2a.4. School based coaches will work with teachers and students to implement literature circles using assigned job roles and anecdotal notes.	2a.4. School Based Coaches Classroom Teachers	2a.4. Classroom Observations Reader Response Journals	2a.4. Reader Response Journals

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:	The percentage of students achieving a level 7 will be 10% (2) since there is no data to show a gain.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
No data due to cell size.	10% (2)

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	2b.1. Some teachers are not using technology and other available supplemental materials to provide enrichment and/or differentiated activities for students.	2b.1. CSS Site Coach will work in collaboration with teachers to develop enrichment and/or differentiated activities that incorporate the use of technology.	2b.1. CSS Site Coach Teachers	2b.1. Focus Walks, Classroom Observations, Data Notebook Review	2b.1. Unique Learning System Monthly Pre and Post 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:

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	The percentage of students making learning gains in reading will increase from 71% (68) to 73% (71)
---	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71%(68)	73%(71)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3a.1. New teachers are unfamiliar with the test item specifications for FCAT 2.0	3a.1. The School based coaches will provide professional development on FCAT Test Item Specifications, Content Limits, and tested benchmarks for FCAT 2.0	3a.1. Principal, school-based coaches, Teacher	3a.1. Focus Walks, Lesson Plan Review Board Configurations	3a.1. Lesson Plans
2	3a.2. Most teachers are not analyzing data to effectively differentiate instruction for all students.	3a.2. School based coaches will collaborate with teachers during weekly PLC meetings to analyze student data and develop instructional strategies (e.g., learning centers and small group guided reading) to address individual student needs during the 90 minute reading block.	3a.2. Principal, School-Based Coaches Teachers	3a.2. Data Notebook Review, Data Chats (individual and grade level), Lesson Plan Review	3a.2. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	No data due to cell size.
--	---------------------------

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
No data due to cell size.	No data due to cell size

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	3b.1. Teachers are not differentiating reading instruction based on individual student needs.	3b.1. CSS Site Coach will support teachers through the coaching model (e.g., co-planning, modeling, co-teaching, observing, and debriefing) to implement differentiated instructional strategies in daily instruction.	3b.1. Site Coach	3b.1. Focus Walks, Lesson Plan Review, Data Notebook Review	3b.1. Curriculum Based Assessments Brigrance Inventory of Early Development II

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.	The percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading will increase from 86% (26) to 88% (27)
---	---

Reading Goal #4:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
86%(26)	87%(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	4a.1. New teachers do not have a clear understanding of the FCIM process and therefore FCIM is not being implemented on a daily basis.	4a.1. The principal and school based coaches will provide training on the FCIM process and will assist teachers in developing monthly FCIM calendars.	4a.1.Principal, School-based Coaches	4a.1. Data Notebook Review, Data Chats (individual and grade level), Classroom Observations, Monthly FCIM Calendars FCIM Monitoring Forms	4a.1. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric FAIR Reading Assessment District Reading Benchmark Assessment FCIM Assessments
2	4a.2. Teachers need additional training in ways to identify students who are in need of RTI services.	4a.2. The Guidance Counselor will provide additional training for teachers to help identify students who are in need of Tier 2 and Tier 3 Interventions.	4a.2. Principal, Guidance Counselor RTI Team	4a.2. Anecdotal Notes Focus Walks Student Conferences	4a.2. Student portfolios Reading Assessments FCIM Data
3	4a.3. Teachers are not effectively implementing differentiated instructional strategies during the literacy block.	4a.3. School Coaches will collaborate with teachers to analyze data, plan and develop lessons that incorporate differentiated instructional strategies (e.g., learning centers and small group guided reading) to address individual student needs during the literacy block.	4a.3. Principal, School-Based Coaches Teachers	4a.3. Data Notebook Review, Data Chats (individual and grade level), Lesson Plan Review, Classroom Observations	4a.3. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric FAIR Reading Assessment District Reading Benchmark Assessment Weekly Reading Theme Tests
4	4a.4. Few teachers engage students during whole group and independent activities.	4a.4. School Based Coaches will provide professional development on student engagement and will assist teachers with lesson plan development that includes a variety of student engagement activities.	4a.4. Principal School Based Coaches Teachers	4a.4. Classroom Observations Focus Walks Lesson Plans	4a.4. District Benchmarks Common Assessments
5	4a.5. Scheduling the students to have core instruction and time to be pulled out for instruction.	4a.5. Reading Interventionist will be pulling out the bottom quartile students for 30 minutes per day, based on formal and informal data.	4a.5. Principal District Support Staff	4a.5. Weekly intervention logs Ongoing progress monitoring	4a.5. FAIR Reading Assessment District Reading Benchmark Assessment

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%.		By 2017, 67% of all students will make satisfactory progress in Reading.				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	39	44	50	55	61	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	The percentage of Black students not making AYP in reading will decrease from 65% (77) to 58% (68).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Black 65% (77)	Black 58% (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	5B.1. Black: Teachers have not received in-depth professional development in the implementation of explicit vocabulary instruction.	5B.1. School-based coaches will provide support for individual teachers through the coaching model (e.g., co-planning, modeling instruction, co-teaching, observing instruction, and debriefing) to incorporate content-specific common lessons that include appropriate content-specific vocabulary instruction.	5B.1. Principal, District and School-Based Coaches	5B.1. Data Notebook Review, Data Chats (individual and grade level), Lesson Plan Review, Classroom Observations, DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric	5B.1. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric FAIR Reading Assessment District Reading Benchmark Assessment Weekly Reading Theme Tests
2	5B.2. Some teachers are not incorporating appropriate content-specific vocabulary instruction.	5B.2. School-based coaches will collaborate with the Regional Reading Coordinator to facilitate lesson planning during common planning time that includes appropriate content-specific vocabulary tasks and activities across the curriculum.	5B2. Principal, District and School-Based Coaches , RTI Team	5B.2. Anecdotal Notes , Focus Walks, Student Conferences	5B.2. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric FAIR Reading Assessment District Reading Benchmark Assessment Weekly Reading Theme Tests
3	5B.3. Teachers are not incorporating research based reading instruction as the primary instruction model during the reading block and have not received in-depth professional development in the implementation of the core reading program and reading workshop model.	5B.3. The Reading Coach and District Coaches will collaborate to develop and present professional development focused on the implementation of Common Core Standards expectation in integration of reading and writing skills in the literacy block. on the implementation of the core reading program	5B.3.Principal, Reading Coach, District Coaches	5B.3. Focus Walks, Lesson Plan ReviewReview	5B.3. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric

		using the reading workshop model with fidelity.			
4	5B.4. Students do not have access to technology that supports prerequisite reading skills.	5B.4. School-Based Reading Coach will collaborate with teachers to provide professional development that focuses on implementation and monitoring of Success Maker.	5B.4. School-Based Reading Coach, Teachers Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	5B.4. Success Maker Reports	5B.4. Success Maker Assessments

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:		The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students not making AYP in reading will decrease from 65% (84) to 58% (75).			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
65%(84)		58% (75)			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5E.1. Many of the students lack life experiences that provide necessary background knowledge to facilitate reading comprehension.	5E.1. Administrators and teachers will provide a variety of in school and after school opportunities to enhance life experiences.	5E.1. Principal, School-Based Coaches Teachers	5E.1. Journal Review, Increased vocabulary and comprehension skills	5E.1. Writing samples Curriculum based assessments
2	5E.2. Teachers have not received in-depth professional development in the implementation of explicit vocabulary instruction.	5E.2. School-based coaches will provide support for individual teachers through the coaching model (e.g., co-planning, modeling instruction, co-teaching, observing instruction, and debriefing) to incorporate content-specific common lessons that include appropriate content-specific vocabulary instruction.	5E.2. Principal, District and School-Based Coaches s	5E.2. Data Notebook Review, Data Chats (individual and grade level), Lesson Plan Review, Classroom Observations, DA instructional Review Indicators Rubric	5E.2. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric FAIR Reading Assessment District Reading Benchmark Assessment Weekly Reading Theme Tests
3	5E.3. New teachers do not have a clear understanding of the FCIM process and therefore FCIM is not being implemented on a daily basis.	5E.3. The principal and school based coaches will provide training on the FCIM process and will assist teachers in developing monthly FCIM calendars to show student weaknesses.	5E.3. Principal, District and School-based Coaches	5E.3. Data Notebook Review, Data Chats (individual and grade level), Classroom Observations, Monthly FCIM Calendars FCIM Monitoring Forms	5E.3. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric FAIR Reading Assessment District Reading Benchmark Assessment FCIM Assessments

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
Teachers will participate in professional development						

in order to understand the Common Core Standards in reading using the literacy block with fidelity.	K-5	School-Based Coaches	School -wide	August 2012 – June 2013	Class observations Daily lesson plans	School-based Reading and Instructional Coaches
Unpacking the NGSSS and Common Core Standards and FCAT 2.0 Item Specifications	All grade levels/subjects	School Based Coaches	All teachers	Early Release and common planning (August 2012– June 2013)	Monitoring lesson plans and classroom instruction	Principal, School-Based Coaches
Using the Gradual Release Model for Daily Instruction	All grade levels	Principal	All teachers	August 2012	Classroom Observations Lesson Plans	Principal, School Based Coaches
Conduct professional development on the use of Access Points	All grade levels on Access Points	CSS Site Coach District ESE Staff	All ESE Teachers	Early Release and Common Planning (September 2012	Class observations Daily lesson plans Data Notebooks	CSS Site Coach
Complete Autism Internet Modules to enhance the teachers' knowledge of the Quality Program Indicators	All grade levels on Access Points	CSS Site Coach District ESE Staff	All ESE Teachers	Early Release and Common Planning (September 2012 – June 2013)		CSS Site Coach
Differentiated Instruction	All grade levels/subjects	Regional Reading Coordinator, Reading Coach, and district coaches.	All teachers	Co-planning, modeling, co-teaching, observing, and debriefing, data chats (October 2012 – June, 2013)	Monitoring guided reading, small group instruction, and RtI	Regional Reading Coordinator, Reading Coach, and District Coaches.
School-Based Reading Coach will collaborate with teachers to provide professional development that focuses on implementation and monitoring of Success Maker	2 - 5 grade levels/all subjects	School-Based Reading Coach,	2 - 5 grade levels/ all subjects	October 2012 – June 2013	Monitoring Success Maker ongoing progress	School Based Read Coach
Conduct professional development on the use of supplemental materials and effective instructional activities for use of leveled classroom libraries and non-fiction texts during Guided Reading.	K-5	School-based Reading Coach	School –wide	October 2012	Class observations Daily lesson plans	School-based Reading Coach
Using FAIR data to plan for instruction	All grade levels	School Based Coaches Principal	All teachers	Common Planning August 2012 – June 2013	Lesson Plans Classroom Observations	Principal School Based Coaches

Webbs Depth of Knowledge	All grade levels/subject	Regional Reading Coordinator School Coaches	All teachers	Early Release and common planning (October – June 2013)	Monitoring lesson plans and classroom instruction	Principal, School-Based Coaches
Utilize the intensive coaching model to analyze student data and develop differentiated instruction (e.g., learning centers and small group guided reading) to address individual student needs during the 90 minute reading block.	K-5	School-based Reading and Instructional Coaches	School –wide	August 2012 – June 2013	Class observations Daily lesson plans Data Notebooks	School-based Reading and Instructional Coaches
Student Engagement	All grade levels	School Based Coaches	All teachers	August 2012	Lesson Plans Classroom Observations	Principal School Based Coaches

Reading 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 Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

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

1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.

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

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.				
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.				
CELLA Goal #2:				
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.				
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.				
CELLA Goal #3:				
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

CELLA Budget:

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

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:	The percentage of students achieving FCAT Level 3 in math will increase from 32% (42) to 36% (54).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
32% (42)	36% (54)

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 have not received in-depth professional development in the implementation of the core math program and the math workshop model	1a.1. Teachers will participate in professional development provided by the school and district in order to implement the core math program using the math workshop model with fidelity.	1a.1. Principal, District and School-Based Coaches	1a.1. Focus Walks, Lesson Plans Board Configurations	1a.1. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric
2	1a.2. Many teachers are not creating daily lessons that follow an instructional delivery model that includes explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice, and independent practice as well as a lesson assessment.	1a.2. School Based coaches will collaborate with teachers during PLCs to design instruction that follows an instructional delivery model that includes explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice as well as lesson assessment.	1a.2. Principal, District and School-Based Coaches	1a.2. Focus Walks, Lesson Plan Review, Data Notebook Review	1a.2. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric
3	1a.3. Student data is not being used for ongoing progress monitoring.	1a.3. School-based Math Coach and District Math Coach will collaborate to provide teachers with professional development that focuses on using data (benchmarks and weekly assessments) to monitor student progress and using that data to modify instruction that meets the needs of individual students.	1a.3. Principal, Math Coach, and District Math Coach	1a.3. Data Notebook Review, Data Chats (individual and grade level), Lesson Plans, Monitoring Forms	1a.3. Diagnostic assessments, FCIM assessments, End-of-Unit assessments, and district benchmark assessments that are aligned with the Next Generation Math Standards
4	1a.4. Few teachers utilized math journals consistently for students to record their thinking.	1a.4. School based math coach will collaborate with teachers during PLCs to develop strategies teachers can use to implement math journals	1a.4. School based math coach Classroom Teacher Principal	1a.4. Classroom observations Lesson Plans Board Configurations	1a.4. District Benchmarks Common Assessments
	1a.5. Teachers are not effectively implementing differentiated instructional strategies	1a.5. School-Based Math Coach will plan, develop and implement lessons with teachers that	1a.5. Principal School-Based Coach Teachers	1a.5. Data Notebook Review Data Chats (individual and grade level)	1a.5. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric

5	during the math block.	address individual student needs through the Intensive Coaching Model.	Classroom Observations Lesson Plans	Math Assessments District Math Benchmark Assessment
---	------------------------	--	--	--

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1b:	The percentage of students achieving a level 4, 5, or 6 will be 50% (8) on the Florida Alternate Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
No data due to cell size.	50% (8)

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	1b.1. Teachers are not differentiating instruction based on individual student needs as defined in the IEP.	1b.1 CSS Site Coach will support teachers through the coaching model (e.g., co-planning, modeling, co-teaching, observing, and debriefing) to implement differentiated instructional strategies in daily instruction as defined in the IEP.	1b.1. CSS Site Coach	1b.1. Focus Walks, Lesson Plan Review, Data Notebook Review	1b.1. Curriculum Based Assessments Brigance Inventory of Early Development II Brigance Comprehensive Inventory of Basic Skills II

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:	The percentage of students achieving FCAT Levels 4 and 5 in math will increase from 12% (16) to 13% (20).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
12%(16)	13%(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	2a.1. Scaffolding, pacing, prompting and probing techniques are not used when asking questions designed to promote higher-order thinking	2a.1. The district instructional mathematics specialist and school-based mathematics coach will collaborate to develop and implement professional development to design higher-order questioning and discourse	2a.1. Principal, District and School-Based Coaches	2a.1. Focus Walks, Classroom Observations Lesson Plans	2a.1. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric

		for daily instruction			
2	2a.2. Teachers are not utilizing student data to effectively provide enrichment activities for all students	2a.2. School-based math coach and district math coach will provide professional development for teachers on using data to plan appropriate enrichment activities for all students. The school-based math coach will facilitate analysis of student data during common planning time.	2a.2. Principal, Math Coach, and District Math Coach	2a.2. Data Notebook Review, Data Chats (individual and grade level), Lesson Plans	2a.2. Diagnostic assessments, FCIM assessments, End-of-Unit assessments, and district benchmark assessments that are aligned with the Next Generation Math Standards

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:	The percentage of students achieving a level 7 will be 10% (2) on the Florida Alternate Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
76% (100)	78%(103)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2b.1. Some teachers are not using technology and other available supplemental materials to provide enrichment and/or differentiated activities for students.	2b.1. CSS Site Coach will work in collaboration with teachers to develop enrichment and/or differentiated activities that incorporate the use of technology.	2b.1. CSS Site Coach Teachers	2b.1. Focus Walks, Classroom Observations, Data Notebook Review	2b.1. Curriculum Based 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:

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	The percentage of students making learning gains in math will increase from 76% (100) to 78% (103).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
76% (100)	78% (103).

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	3a.1. Scaffolding, pacing, prompting and probing	3a.1. The district instructional mathematics	3a.1. Principal District and	3a.1. Focus Walks, Classroom Observations,	3a.1. DA Instructional

1	techniques are not used when asking questions designed to promote higher-order thinking.	specialist and school-based mathematics coach will collaborate to develop and implement professional development to design higher-order questioning and discourse for daily instruction.	School-Based Coaches	Lesson Plans	Review Indicators Rubric
2	3a.2. Teachers are not identifying learning styles for use in developing appropriate instructional strategies to meet the needs of all students	3a.2. School-Based academic coaches will work in collaboration with teachers through PLCs to create lesson plans that address individual students' learning styles during math instruction.	3a.2. Principal District and School-Based Coaches	3a.2. Focus Walks, Classroom Observations, Lesson Plans	3a.2. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric
3	3a.3. Teachers are not utilizing data to effectively provide manipulative activities for all students	3a.3. School-Based academic coaches will provide professional development for teachers on using data to plan appropriate manipulative activities for all students. The School-Based Math Coach will facilitate analysis of student data during common planning time.	3a.3. Principal District Math Coach School-Based Math Coach	3a.3. Data Notebook Review Lesson Plans Data Chats (individual and grade level)	3a.3. Diagnostic assessments, FCIM assessments, End-of-Unit assessments, and district benchmark assessments that are aligned with the Next Generation or Common Core Math Standards
4	3a.4. Scheduling the students to have core instruction and time to be pulled out for instruction.	3a.4. Math Interventionist will be pulling out the bottom quartile students for 30 minutes per day, based on formal and informal data.	3a.4. Principal District Support Staff	3a.4 Weekly intervention logs Ongoing progress monitoring	

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:	No previous data due to cell size.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
No data due to cell size.	No data due to cell size.

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	3b.1. Few teachers are using the Quality Program Indicators consistently to enhance and encourage learning opportunities.	3b.1. CSS Site Coach and District ESE staff will provide professional development and monitoring the use of Quality Program Indicators in the classroom.	3b.1. CSS Site Coach District ESE staff	3b.1. Focus Walks Classroom Observations	3b.1. Quality Program Indicator Checklist

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:	The percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in math will increase from 86% (26) to 88% (27).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
86% (26)	88% (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	4a.3. Teachers are not effectively implementing differentiated instructional strategies during the math block	4a.3. School based Math Coach will plan, develop and implement lessons with teachers that address individual student needs through the Intensive Coaching Model.	4a.3. Principal, School-Based Coach Teachers	4a.3. Data Notebook Review, Data Chats (individual and grade level), Lesson Plans Classroom Observations	4a.3. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric Math Assessments District Math Benchmark Assessment
2	4a.2. Many of the students lack the pre-requisite math skills that are needed to be successful.	4a.2. Through the use of vertical team planning, teachers will provide students with skills necessary to be proficient in math.	4a.2. Principal, School-Based Coaches Teachers	4a.2. PLC Vertical Team Meetings Learning Schedules	4a.2. Student portfolios Math Assessments FCIM Data
3	4a.1. Teachers do not have a clear understanding of the FCIM process and therefore FCIM is not being implemented on a daily basis.	4a.1. The principal and school based coaches will provide training on the FCIM process and will assist teachers in developing monthly FCIM calendars to show student weaknesses.	4a.1. Principal, District and School-based Coaches	4a.1. Data Notebook Review, Data Chats (individual and grade level), Classroom Observations, Monthly FCIM Calendars FCIM Monitoring Forms	4a.1. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric District Math Benchmark Assessment FCIM 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%.	Elementary School Mathematics Goal #					
	By 2017, 68% of all students will make satisfactory progress in Mathematics.					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	41	47	52	57	63	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	The percentage of Black students not making AYP in math will decrease from 59% (70) to 53% (63)
---	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Black: 59% (70)	Black: 53% (63)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5B.1. Black: Teachers do not have a clear understanding of the FCIM process and therefore FCIM is not being implemented on a daily basis.	5B.1. Black: The principal and School-Based Coaches will provide training on FCIM process and will assist teacher sin developing monthly FCIM calendars to show student weaknesses.	5B.1. Principal District and School-Based Coaches	5B.1. Data Notebook Review Data Chats (individual and grade level) Classroom Observations Monthly FCIM Calendars FCIM Monitoring Forms	5B.1. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric District Math Benchmark Assessment FCIM Assessments
2	5B.2. Teachers have not received in-depth professional development in the implementation of explicit math instruction	5B.2. School-Based coaches will provide support for individual teachers through the coaching model (e.g. co-planning, modeling instruction, co-teaching, observing instruction, and debriefing) to incorporate content specific common lessons that include appropriate content specific math instruction.	5B.2. Principal School-Based Coaches	5B.2. Data Notebook Review Data Chats (individual and grade level) Classroom Observations DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric	5B.2. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric District Math Benchmark Assessment Math Assessments
3	5B.3. Student data is not being used to monitor student progress.	5B.3. School-Based Math Coach and District Math Coach will collaborate to provide teachers with professional development that focuses on using data to modify instruction that meets the needs of individual students. School-Based Math Coach will facilitate analysis of student data during common planning time.	5B.3. Principal, Math, Coach, and District Math Coach	5B.3. Data Notebook Review, Data Chats (individual and grade level), Lesson Plan Review	5B.3. Diagnostic assessments, FCIM assessments, End-of_Unit assessments, and district benchmark assessments that are aligned with the Next Generation Math Standards
4	5B.4. Few teachers engage students during whole group and independent activities.	5B.4. School Based Coaches will provide professional development on student engagement and will assist teachers with lesson plan development that includes a variety of student engagement activities. .	5B.4. Principal School Based Coaches Teachers	5B.4. Classroom Observations Focus Walks Lesson Plans	5B.4. District Benchmarks Common Assessments
5	5B.5. Students are lacking prerequisite math skills	5B.5. School Based Coaches will provide professional development to teachers to implement and monitor students using the Quantile Framework technology to identify and address students math skill level	5B.5. School Based Math Coach Teachers	5B.5. Quantile Framework Assignments	5B.5. Quantile Framework Assignments

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:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.
 Mathematics Goal #5D:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.
 Mathematics Goal E:

The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students not making AYP in math will decrease from 62% (80) to 56% (72).

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

62% (80)

56% (72)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5E.1. Teachers do not have a clear understanding of the FCIM process and therefore FCIM is not being implemented on a daily basis.	5E.1. The Principal and school based coaches will provide training on the FCIM process and will assist teachers in developing monthly FCIM calendars that incorporate the gradual release model.	5E.1.Principal, District and School-based Coaches	5E.1. Data Notebook Review, Data Chats (individual and grade level), Classroom Observations, Monthly FCIM Calendars FCIM Monitoring Forms	5E.1. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric District Math Benchmark Assessment FCIM Assessments
2	5E.2. Teachers have not received in-depth professional development in the implementation of explicit math instruction.	5E.2. School-based coaches will provide support for individual teachers through the coaching model (e.g., co-planning, modeling instruction, co-teaching, observing instruction, and debriefing) to incorporate content-specific common lessons that include appropriate content-specific math instruction.	5E.2. Principal School-Based Coaches	5E.2. Data Notebook Review, Data Chats (individual and grade level), Lesson Plan Review, Classroom Observations, DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric	5E.2. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric Math Assessments District Math Benchmark Assessment
3	5E.3. Student data is not being used to monitor student progress.	5E.3. School-based math coach and district math coach will collaborate to provide teachers with professional development focused on using data (benchmarks and weekly assessments) to monitor student progress and modify instruction. The school-based math coach will facilitate analysis of student data during common planning time.	5E.3. Principal, Math Coach, and District Math Coach	5E.3. Data Notebook Review, Data Chats (individual and grade level), Lesson Plan Review	5E.3. Diagnostic assessments, FCIM assessments, End-of-Unit assessments, and district benchmark assessments that are aligned with the Next Generation Math Standards
4	5E.4. Students do not have access to technology that supports prerequisite math skills.	5E.4. School-Based Math Coach will collaborate with teachers to provide professional development that focuses on implementation and monitoring of Success Maker.	5E.4. School-Based Math Coach, Teachers	5E.4. Success Maker Reports	5E.4. Success Maker Assessments

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
Conduct professional development on the use of Access Points	All grade levels on Access Points	CSS Site Coach District ESE Staff	All ESE Teachers	Early Release and Common Planning (September 2012)	Class Observations Daily lesson plans Data Notebooks	CSS Site Coach

Collaborate with teachers in grade level groups to design instruction that follows an instructional delivery model that includes explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice as well as lesson assessment.	K-5	District and school -based Math Coach	School-wide	October 2012	Class observation Daily lesson plans	School -based Math Coach
The district instructional mathematics specialist and school-based mathematics coaches will utilize the intensive coaching model (e.g., lesson planning, modeling, co-teaching, observing and debriefing) to support individual teachers in implementing questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking.	K-5	District and school -based Math Coach	School-wide	October 2012- June 2013	Class observation Daily lesson plans	School -based Math Coach
Unpacking the NGSSS and Common Core standards and FCAT 2.0 Item Specifications	All grade levels/subjects	Regional Reading Coordinator	All teachers	Early Release and common planning (August 2012 – June 2013)	Monitoring lesson plans and classroom instruction	Principal, School-Based Coaches
Differentiated Instruction	All grade levels/subjects	Math Coach, and District Math coaches.	Math Coach, and District Math coaches.	Co-planning, modeling, co-teaching, observing, and debriefing, data chats (October 2012 – June 2013)	Monitoring small group math instruction, and RTI	District Math Coaches
School-Based Math Coach will collaborate with teachers to provide professional development that focuses on implementation and monitoring of Success Maker	2 - 5 grade levels/all subjects	Math Coach, and District Math coaches.	2 - 5 grade levels/ all subjects	October 2012 –June 2013	Monitoring Success Maker ongoing progress	School Based Math Coach

Student Engagement	All grade levels	School Based Coaches	All teachers	August 2012	Lesson Plans Classroom Observations	Principal School Based Coaches
Complete Autism Internet Modules to enhance the teachers' knowledge of the Quality Program Indicators	All grade levels on Access Points	CSS Site Coach District ESE Staff	All ESE Teachers	Early Release and Common Planning (September 2012 – June 2013)	End of module certificate Classroom Observations	CSS Site 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
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 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.		The percentage of students achieving FCAT Level 3 in science will increase from 44% (20) to 47% (25).			
Science Goal #1a:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
44% (20)			47% (25)		
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 lack science content knowledge. Few teachers effectively use the 5E's research-based model to deliver instruction for science.	1a.1. Collaborate with teachers during PLCs to offer professional development and to develop lessons that incorporate the 5E's research-based instructional model.	1a.1. Principal, District Based Science Coach	1a.1. Focus Walks, Lesson Plans Classroom Observations	1a.1. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric
2	1a.2. Teachers have not received in-depth professional development in the implementation of the 5 E's instructional model.	1a.2. Support science teachers through the coaching model (e.g., co-planning, modeling, co-teaching, observing, and debriefing) to implement the 5E's research-based instructional model.	1a.2. Principal, District Based Science Coach	1a.2 Focus Walks Lesson Plans Classroom Observations	1a.2. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric
3	1a.3. Teachers do not follow an appropriate progression of rigor according to the Webb's Depth of Knowledge Levels	1a.3. Provide professional development in Webb's Depth of Knowledge and use this information to develop lessons that incorporate a higher level of cognitive complexity.	1a.3. Principal Regional Reading Coordinator District Science Coach Teachers	1a.3. Focus Walks, Classroom Observations, Lesson Plans	1a.3. Lesson Plans Appropriate Observation Instrument Maintain activity logs that include classroom observations

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:	The percentage of students achieving FAA level 4, 5, and 6 will be 50% (8) since there is no data to show a gain.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
No data due to cell size.	50% (8)

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	1b.1. Students need to be exposed to a variety of science concepts with hands-on experience through the scientific method.	1b.1. Students will participate in the scientific method of exploration with hands-on opportunities to develop an understanding of science concepts.	1b.1. CSS Site Coach Teachers	1b.1. Lesson Plans Classroom Observations Data Notebook	1b.1. Pre and Post Curriculum Based 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:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal # 2a:	The percentage of students achieving FCAT Levels 4 and 5 in science will increase from 5% (2) to 10% (4)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

5% (2)		10% (4)			
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. Scaffolding, pacing, prompting and probing techniques are not used when asking questions designed to promote higher-order thinking in science instruction.	2a.1. Collaborate to develop and implement professional development for all teachers on understanding and use of Webb's Depth of Knowledge model to design higher-order questioning and discourse for daily science instruction.	2a.1. Principal, District and School-Based Coaches	2a.1. Focus Walks, Classroom Observations	2a.1. DA Instructional Review Indicators Rubric
2	2a.2. Students are not making a connection between classroom investigations and concepts being taught.	2a.2 Full implementation of science instruction via the learning schedule, instructional calendar, test specifications document Provide enrichment opportunities via field trips Teachers provide relevant classroom experiences to connect the investigations with concepts taught	2a.2. Principal, School-based Coaches, Teachers,	2a.2. Classroom observations, Student journals Lesson Plans	2a.2 Lesson Plans Classroom artifacts Appropriate observation instrument Maintain activity logs that include classroom observations

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:	The percentage of students achieving FAA level 7 will be 10% (2) since there is no data to show a gain
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
No data due to cell size.	10% (2)

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	2b.1. Teachers need professional development on the scientific method in order to enhance and encourage student learning in science	2b.1. Teachers will use the scientific method of exploration with hands-on opportunities (for students to develop a better understanding of	2b.1. CSS Site Coach Teachers	2b.1. Lesson Plans Classroom Observations Data Notebook	2b.1. Pre and Post Curriculum Based Assessments

concepts.	science concepts.			
-----------	-------------------	--	--	--

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
Lesson planning using the 5E's research-based instructional model	K-5 Teachers	District-Based Science Coach	K-5 science teachers by grade level	September 2012 - October 2012	Focus Walks, Lesson Plan Review	Principal District and School-Based Coaches
Understanding and use of Webb's Depth of Knowledge model to design higher-order questioning and discourse in science	K-5 teachers	Regional Reading Coordinator	PreK-5 teachers school-wide	October 2012 – December 2012	Focus Walks, Classroom Observations	Principal District and School-Based Coaches

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:	Students achieving FCAT level 4 and higher will increase from 8% to 20% Students achieving FCAT level 3 will increase from 83% to 91%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Level 3: 83%(40) Level 4: 8% (3)	Level 3+: 91% (35) Level 4+: 20% (7)

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 are not providing students with strategies for revising and editing writing products.	1a.1. Teachers will be provided training in the implementation of Step-Up to Writing.	1a.1. Principal, School-based Coaches	1a.1. There will be evidence of organization in students completed published pieces in their writing portfolio and journals.	1a.1. Monitoring the Writing folder and journals. District Writing Prompt Response School Monthly Writing Prompt Responses
2	1a.2. Teachers are not modeling effective writing strategies and/or the writing process	1a.2. The School-based Coaches will facilitate professional development on modeling effective writing strategies and writing process.	1a.2. Principal, School-based Coaches Teachers	1a.2. Focus Walks Lesson Plans Classroom Observations	1a.2. Student performance on district's monthly writing assessments Student portfolios
3	1a.3. Teachers are not implementing Writing and Literacy Block with fidelity on a daily basis.	1a.3. School based coaches will provide professional development on the implementation of Writing and Literacy Block in all grade levels.	1a.3. School Based Coaches Teachers	1a.3. Focus Walks Lesson Plans Board Configurations Classroom Observations	1a.3. Student Portfolios
4	1a.4. Small group instruction is not currently being implemented.	1a.4. School-Based Coaches will provide professional development during PLCs on effective small group differentiated instruction	1a.4. Principal School-Based Coaches Teachers	1a.4. Classroom Observations Differentiated Lesson Plans	1a.4. Student Portfolio
5	1a.5. Teachers need to establish conferencing and peer conferencing in the Literacy Block.	1a.5. School-Based Coaches will provide professional development during PLCs on effective conferencing during the Literacy Block.	1a.5. Principal School-Based Coaches Teachers	1a.5. Conference Journals	1a.5. Conference Journal
6	1a.6. Students are not currently using writing journals and sourcebooks effectively.	1a.6. School-Based Coaches will provide professional development during PLCs on implementation of writing journals and sourcebooks.	1a.6. Principal School-Based Coach Teachers	1a.6. Writing Journals and sourcebooks	1a.6. Writing Journals
	1a.7. New teachers	1a.7. School-Based	1a.7. Principal	1a.7. Writing Products	1a.7. Writing

7	that are unfamiliar with Florida Writing Assessment expectations.	Coaches and Fourth grade writing teachers will collaborate to analyze the State Writing Scoring rubric through PLCs. School-Based Coaches will model how to analyze and score student work using the State Scoring Rubric.	School-Based Coach Teachers	Writing Plans	Prompt Responses
---	---	---	-----------------------------	---------------	------------------

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:	The percentage of students scoring a 4 or higher on Florida Alternate Assessment will be 30% (5)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
No data due to cell size.	30% (5)

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	1b.1. Teachers are not modeling effective writing strategies and/or the writing process effectively.	1b.1. The School-based Coaches will facilitate professional development on modeling effective writing strategies and incorporating rigorous writing instruction across the curriculum.	1b.1. School Based Coaches Teachers	1b.1. Focus Walks Lesson Plans	1b.1. Student Portfolios

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
School-Based coaches will provide professional development on effective small group instruction, writing journals and conferencing.	K-5	School Based Coaches	School-wide	August – October 2012	Monitoring writing journals, conference logs and lesson plans during PLCs Classroom Observations	Principal Literacy Coach
					Monitoring teacher	

Step-Up to Writing	K -5 Teachers	District coach	K – 5 Teachers	August 2012 – October 2012	lesson plans, instruction, student portfolios and journals	Principal School-based Coaches
Coaches model (e.g., co-planning, modeling instruction, co-teaching, observing instruction, and debriefing) to incorporate modeling effective writing strategies and rigorous writing instruction across the curriculum.	K-5	School-based Coaches	School-wide	October 2012 – June 2013	Student portfolios Class observations	School-based Coaches
Writer's Workshop Training	K-5 Teachers	School coaches	K-5 Teachers	October 2012- November 2012	Monitoring teacher lesson plans, instruction, student portfolios	Principal School-based Coaches
Modeling effective writing strategies and incorporating rigorous writing instruction across the curriculum.	K-5	Regional Reading Coordinator	School-wide	October 2012 – June 2013	District Monthly writing prompts Student portfolios	School –based Coaches

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:	There will be a decrease in the percentage/number of students with excessive tardies and excessive absences by 10%.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
93.8%	96%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
223	200
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
149	134

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 parental compliance with the district's attendance policy; Parental involvement/ communication; disconnected telephone numbers; change of address;	1.1. Truant officer/guidance counselor will make home visits as needed; frequently update student information cards; speak to parents in student drop off/pick up zone; weekly/monthly reminders to repeated attendance issues	1.1. Principal, CRT Operator, Guidance Counselor, Truant Officer	1.1. Monitoring of the number of truancy cases opened and then closed due to improved attendance	1.1. Review of the monthly attendance
2	1.2. High mobility due to the make up of the community (mainly apartments). Many of the students move without giving prior notice to the school.	1.2. Collaboration with our Family Engagement Center to educate parents and teachers and encourage increased home/school communication.	1.2. Parent Liaison	1.2. Monitoring of the number of truancy cases opened, and then closed due to improved attendance.	1.2. Review of monthly attendance
3	1.3. Need to strengthen the referral process from teacher to administration	1.3. School Culture/Foundations committee will revise and communicate the attendance referral process from teacher to administration.	1.3. Principal Guidance Counselor School Culture/Foundations Committee	1.3. Increased attendance referrals and decreased absences.	1.3. Increased attendance referrals and decreased absences.

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:	There will be a decrease in the number of students who are placed in Out-of-School Suspension.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
0	0
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
0	0
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions

18	16
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
18	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	1.1. Inconsistent implementation of rituals and routines and CHAMPS	1.1. Foundations/Safe and Civil Schools Development of School wide Discipline Plan Second Steps Student Success Through Prevention Curriculum (anti-bullying) Character Education lessons bi-weekly with the Guidance Counselor CHAMPS school-wide implementation Common area station training for students in grades K-5th Positive incentive programs for classes that demonstrate behaviors that meets school-wide expectations. Parent Conferences/behavior contracts for moderate to severe behavior	1.1. Principal, Foundations Team, Teachers, Guidance Counselor	1.1. Monthly Data Report Behavior charts Second Steps curriculum taught by teachers	1.1. Safe Schools survey, Common area assessment, Staff observations, Behavior contract

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
Second Step Program	As Needed	Guidance Counselor	As Needed	Individual Basis	Classroom Observations	Principal Guidance Counselor
CHAMPS Training	As Needed	CHAMPS Trainer	As Needed	Individual Basis	Classroom Observation	Principal

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.		
*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.		Parent Involvement Plan is uploaded online.		
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:		2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:		
0		0		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

School safety will increase by 10%.

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. School safety will increase by 10%. Goal School safety will increase by 10% . Goal #1:			No data from previous year.		
2012 Current level:			2013 Expected level:		
No data from previous year.			10% increase in school safety		
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. Some of the parents in the school do not want to follow the procedures of the school.	1.1. Parents are required to sign in and out each time upon arriving and leaving the school campus. They must show a valid ID and obtain a visitor's badge. Parents must stay in vehicles when picking up students at the end of the school day. All walkers are dismissed at the same location and parents are asked to wait at the gate for their child.	1.1. School based Leadership Team. Classroom Teachers Front Office Staff Custodians	1.1 The number of parents who are stopping by the front office each day. Faculty and staff stopping anyone without a visitor's badge	1.1. Visitor's Logs maintained by the office staff.
2	1.2. Faculty and staff members unlock the gates during the school day.	1.2. All gates are kept locked and closed each day	1.2. All school based faculty and staff.	1.2. Checks thought-out the days to ensure the gates are locked	1.2. Ongoing daily log of the gates.

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

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 School safety will increase by 10%.

Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

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

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
SAC funds will be used for implementation of the School Improvement Plan.	\$0.00

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

SAC will work with the school based Leadership Team to determine needs for increased student proficiency. SAC will work closely with the school to monitor student achievement.

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Duval School District HIGHLANDS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	50%	57%	34%	29%	170	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	50%	61%			111	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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?	50% (YES)	63% (YES)			113	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					394	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					F	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Duval School District HIGHLANDS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	58%	53%	73%	23%	207	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	58%	70%			128	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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)	63% (YES)			120	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					455	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested