FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: BRANFORD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Suwannee

Principal: Jennifer Barrs

SAC Chair: Aleshia Terry

Superintendent: Jerry Scarborough

Date of School Board Approval: October 2012

Last Modified on: 10/21/2012

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)
		Masters Degree in Educational Leadership from			Principal of Branford Elementary: 2011-12: Grade B: % meeting high standards in Reading- 64%, Math-56%, Writing-72%, Science-41%. % of students making learning gains in Reading-64%, Math-56%. % of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading-67%, Math-53% Assistant Principal of Branford Elementary School in 2010-11: Grade A: % meeting high standards in Reading- 84%, Math-81%, Writing-85%, Science-59%. % of students making learning gains in Reading-71%, Math-67%. % of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading-60%, Math-51%.AYP-No, 95% of criteria met 2009-10: Grade A: % meeting high standards in Reading-81%, Math-81%, Writing-70%, Science-60%. % of students making learning gains in Reading-65%, Math-66%. % of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading-51%,

Principal	Jennifer Barrs	Florida A&M University, Bachelors Degree in Elementary Education (1-6) from Florida A&M University, ESOL Endorsement	12	8	Math 71%. AYP-No, 92% of criteria met 2008-09: Grade B: % meeting high standards in Reading-80%, Math-78%, Writing-65%, Science-44%. % of students making learning gains in Reading-71%, Math-55%. % of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading-70%, Math 57%. AYP-Yes, 100% of criteria met. 2007-08: Grade C: % meeting high standards in Reading-78%, Math-73%, Writing-67%, Science-38%. % of students making learning gains in Reading-55%, Math-55%. % of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading-53%, Math 48%. AYP-Yes, 100% of criteria met. 2006-07: Grade A: % meeting high standards in Reading-76%, Math-73%, Writing-61%, Science-44%. % of students making learning gains in Reading-77%, Math-73%. % of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading-59%, Math 74%. AYP-No, 92% of criteria met, writing proficiency was not met 2005-06: Grade A: % meeting high standards in Reading-84%, Math-72%, Writing-86. % of students making learning gains in Reading-70%, Math-81%. % of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading-64%. AYP-Yes, 100% of criteria meet
Assis Principal	Lawanna Zimmermann	Masters Degree in Educational Leadership from Florida A&M University, Bachelors Degree in Elementary Education From Florida A&M University, ESOL Endorsement			Second grade teacher at Suwannee Elementary: 2011-12 Grade C, 2010-11 Grade B, 2009-10 Grade C

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)
Academic	Amanda Johnson	Bachelors Degree in Elementary Education(K-6) from Florida A&M University, ESOL Endorsement	8		2011-12: Grade B: % meeting high standards in Reading- 64%, Math-56%, Writing-72%, Science-41%. % of students making learning gains in Reading-64%, Math-56%. % of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading-67%, Math-53 2010-11: Grade A: % meeting high standards in Reading- 84%, Math-81%, Writing-85%, Science-59%. % of students making learning gains in Reading-71%, Math-67%. % of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading-60%, Math-51%.AYP-No, 95% of criteria met 2009-10: Grade A: % meeting high standards in Reading-81%, Math-81%, Writing-70%, Science-60%. % of students making learning gains in Reading-65%, Math-66%. % of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading-51%, Math 71%. AYP-No, 92% of criteria met 2008-09: Grade B: % meeting high standards in Reading-80%, Math-78%, Writing-65%, Science-44%. % of students making learning gains in Reading-71%, Math-55%. % of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading-70%, Math 57%. AYP-Yes, 100% of criteria met. 2007-08: Grade C: % meeting high standards in Reading-78%, Math-73%, Writing-67%, Science-38%. % of students making learning gains in Reading-55%,

Math-55%. % of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading-53%, Math 48%. AYP-Yes, 100% of criteria met.
2006-07: Grade A: % meeting high standards in Reading-76%, Math-73%, Writing-61%, Science-44%. % of students making learning gains in Reading-77%, Math-73%. % of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading-59%, Math 74%. AYP-No, 92% of criteria met, writing proficiency was not met
2005-06: Grade A: % meeting high standards in Reading-84%, Math-72%, Writing-86. % of students making learning gains in Reading-70%, Math-81%. % of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading-64%. AYP-Yes, 100% of criteria meet

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	New teacher orientation with school administration	Principal, Ast. Principal	On-going	
2	Year-long mentor program for new teachers, mentors have clinical education training	Principal	On-going	
3	Required monthly meetings with new teachers and administration	Principal, Ast. Principal	On-going	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).
*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
None	

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
47	2.1%(1)	21.3%(10)	23.4%(11)	53.2%(25)	23.4%(11)	10.6%(5)	12.8%(6)	14.9%(7)	93.6%(44)

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
			The mentor will: 1. provide "how tos" for specific needs such as teaching, class organization, classroom management, parent

Rentia Kelly	Third Grade	veteran teacher of same grade level	conferences 2. do class demonstrations 3. share ideas 4. observe and give feedback 5. recognize effort and results 6. provide options that make teacher feel more comfortable 7. co-teach a lesson 8. give on-going personnel support 9. connect teachers with other teachers 10. arrange for teacher observation 11. ensure that teacher has all available resources they need 12. listen and honor teacher concerns 13. remember that no problem is to insignificant 14. feedback from classroom walkthroughs/observations via administration 15. required monthly meetings with administration

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title 1, will be utilized to provide Reading Coaches at three Title 1 schools. Funds will also provide paraprofessional at the Title 1 school to given additional help to students a level 1 or 2 on FCAT. Title 1, Title 1 Part A is also used to provide a District Wide Parent Liaison, Math Coach, Curriculum specialist, and a teacher for the Opportunity School to serve all schools in the District.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

School based administrators will observe the use of "The Essential Six" reading strategies from the Florida Reading Initiative (FRI) in all classrooms. This initiative is funded by Title I Part C and district professional development funds. ALL activities funded by Title I Part C will be supplementary and will not supplant existing State- and District-funded and required services. Reading First and FRI strategies will be monitored by administrators and reading coaches to ensure successful opportunities for Non-ELL and LEP (ELL) students. Title I Part C funds are used for a Migrant Coordinator, Migrant Tutors, Migrant paraprofessional and to purchase license for Accelerated Reading Enterprise-English in a Flash, additional computers and other supplies needed for migrant students.

Title I, Part D

Title II

School based administrators will observe the use of "The Essential Six" reading strategies from the Florida Reading Initiative (FRI) in all classrooms. This initiative is funded by Title II Part A funds are used to fund three Reading Coaches, travel, consultants and the district's professional development funds. ALL activities funded by Title III will be supplementary and will not supplant existing State- and District-funded and required services. Reading First and FRI strategies will be monitored by administrators and reading coaches to ensure successful opportunities for Non-ELL and LEP (ELL) students.

Title III

Funds from Title III Part A are used to provide tutors for ELL students, purchased instructional materials and software for ELL students. All activities funded by Title III will be supplementary and will not supplant existing State and District funded and required services. Reading First and FRI strategies will be monitored by administrators and reading coaches to ensure successful opportunities for Non-ELL and LEP (ELL) students.

Title X- Homeless

Title X Homeless funds are used to provide supplies, dues, fieldtrip fund and other needs for Homeless students.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

n/a

Violence Prevention Programs

n/a

Nutrition Programs

Free and reduced lunch

Housing Programs

n/a

Head Start

n/a

Adult Education

n/a

Career and Technical Education

n/a

Job Training

n/a

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: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school based RtI plans and activities.

Assistant Principal: Role of the AP is to work in collaboration with the principal to ensure that RtI goals are implemented.

Select General Education Teacher: Provides information about core instruction; participates in student data collection; delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention; collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.

Guidance Counselor: Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students, and links child-serving community agencies to the schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.

Reading Coach: Evaluates school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum assessment and intervention approaches; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening data to help identify 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; provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring; provides guidance on K-5 reading plan; and supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention plans.

School Psychologist: Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation; and facilitates data-based decision making activities.

Exceptional Student Education Teacher: Collaborates with general education teachers to integrate core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction.

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

Describe how the school-based MTSS Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS efforts?

> The RtI Leadership Team will focus on meetings around one question: How do we develop and maintain a problem-solving system to bring out the best in our schools, our teachers, and in our students?
>
> The meetings will review universal screening data and link to instructional decisions; review progress monitoring data to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. The team will collaborate regularly, problem solve, evaluate implementation, and make 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 met to help in the development of the SIP. The team set clear expectations for instruction; facilitated the development of a systemic approach to teaching; scheduled an uninterrupted school wide 90-minute reading block for all grade levels; identified Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 target students by grade level based on prior end of the year assessments; aligned additional personnel (special area teachers, reading coach, paraprofessionals, ESE resource teacher) to assist in the instruction of Tier 2 children; and decided upon research based interventions to be used for Tier 1, 2, and 3 students.

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: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), Annual Yearly Progress Test
> Progress Monitoring: curriculum based assessments, ThinkGate
> Midyear data: FAIR, Annual Yearly Progress Test
> End of the Year: FAIR, FCAT, Annual Yearly Progress Test
> Frequency of Data Days: once every four weeks

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

> During teacher's common planning time professional development will be provided by the school psychologist and guidance counselor throughout the year. The training will begin at the start of the school year. The RtI Leadership team will also evaluate the need for additional staff professional development during the RtI meetings.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

> With the help of the district office student support services RtI will continue to be a learning process for our staff. Monthly meetings to ensure teachers are targeting interventions to student needs will help support the MTSS process. Also during the monthly meetings other teachers will share best practices and resources to help teachers.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

> The LLT of Branford Elementary School consists of: Principal, Assistant Principal, Academic Coach, Media Specialist, and a representative from each grade level K through 5.

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

> The LLT meets once per month to discuss progress in reading and writing. Topics discussed regularly are the 90 minute reading blocks, interventions during iii, reading tutoring groups, implementation/monitoring of Accelerated Reader, review progress monitoring data (CIM, AYP test), implementation/monitoring of the Core Connectgions writing/reading program.

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

First, the LLT will monitor best practices during iii time due to loss of improvement in reading for students in the bottom quartile.
Also, the LLT will monitor the small group remediation of Tier 2 students by our special area teachers.
Also, the team will guide the implementation and fidelity of the Core Connections writing/reading program grades K-5 to ensure continued growth on grade 4 FCAT Writes.
Finally, the LLT will evaluate the implementation of AR and use of AR goals to broaden the number of students reaching their reading goals.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

Describe plans for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs as applicable.

At Branford Elementary all incoming kindergarten students are assessed prior to or upon entering kindergarten in order to ascertain individual and group needs and to assist in instructional/intervention programs. All students are assessed in the area of letter knowledge, numbers up to 12, counting objects, basic colors and shapes. Data is used to plan for instruction until FAIR and/or FLKRS is completed. Kindergarten academic and behavioral instruction will include daily explicit instruction, modeling, guided practice and independent practice.

*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:	72% of all third grade students will score at or above a level 3 on 2013 FCAT reading. 72% of all fourth grade students will score at or above a level 3 on 2013 FCAT reading. 65% of all fifth grade students will score at or above a level 3 on 2013 FCAT reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
70% (77) 65% (68) 57% (63)	72% (94) 72% (76) 65% (67)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Likely increase in percentage of economically disadvantaged students.	1. Informal oral reading fluency assessments 2. Data analysis after each FAIR assessment 3. Grade level meetings 4. Structured iii time 5. Support from reading tutoring groups 6. Accelerated Reader for goal-oriented reading 7. Soar to Success 8. Instructional focus calendars 9. Uninterrupted 90 minute reading block 10. Reciprocal teaching 11. Enrichment for higher level thinking skills 13. Elements of Reading 14. STARS and CARS materials	Principal, Ast. Principal, Academic Coach	1. lesson plans 2. classroom walkthroughs utilizing iObservation feedback 3. progress monitoring of benchmark skill based assessments 4. annual yearly progress district test 5. monthly data meetings with administration 6. monthly LLT meetings 7. STAR reading assessment 8. RTI data meetings	FCAT, ending FAIR data, annual yearly progress district test

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	71% of students will meet higher standards in reading on the 2013 FCAT
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
64% (169)	71% (240)

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	Higher percentage of below level students entering third grade due to increase in size of grade level.	1. Informal oral reading fluency assessments 2. Data analysis after each FAIR assessment 3. Activity Team meetings 4. Accelerated Reader for goal-oriented reading 5. Failure Free Reading 6. Instructional focus calendars 7. Uninterrupted 90 minute reading block 8. Reciprocal teaching 9. Enrichment for higher level thinking skills 10. Literature Circles	Principal, Ast. Principal, Academic Coach	1. lesson plans 2. classroom walkthroughs 3. progress monitoring of benchmark skill based assessments 4. annual yearly progress district test 5. monthly data meetings with administration 6. monthly LLT meetings 7. STAR reading assessment	FCAT, ending FAIR assessment, Annual Yearly Progress District Tests
2					

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	71% of all students in grades 4 and 5 will make learning gains in reading on the 2013 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
63% (97)	71% (140)

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	Guiding teachers to prioritize benchmarks to provide students with explicit relevant instruction.	1.Informal oral reading fluency assessments 2. Data analysis after each FAIR assessment 3. Grade level meetings 4. Structured curriculum enhancement 5. Support from reading tutoring groups 6. Accelerated Reader for goal-oriented reading 7. Soar to Success 8. Instructional focus calendars 9. Uninterrupted 90 minute reading block 10. Reciprocal teaching 11. Enrichment for higher level thinking skills 13. Elements of Reading 14.Grade level meetings to share best practices 15. Modeling by academic coach	Principal, Ast. Principal, Acadmeic Coach	1. lesson plans 2. classroom walkthroughs 3. progress monitoring of benchmark skill based assessments 4. annual yearly progress district test 5. monthly data meetings with administration 6. monthly LLT meetings 7. STAR reading assessment	FCAT, ending FAIR assessment, Annual Yearly Progress District Test

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

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

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	74% of the students in the lowest 25% in grades 4 and 5 will make learning gains on 2013 FCAT reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
65% (35)	74% (38)

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Ineffective differentiated instruction and interventions for lowest performing students.	1. Informal oral reading fluency assessments 2. Data analysis after each FAIR assessment 3. Grade level meetings 4. Structured iii time 5. Support from reading tutoring groups 6. Accelerated Reader for goal-oriented reading 7. Soar to Success 8. Instructional focus calendars 9. Uninterrupted 90 minute reading block 10. Reciprocal teaching 11. Enrichment for higher level thinking skills 13. Elements of Reading 14. Monthly RTI meetings to determine intervention needed	Principal, Ast. Principal, Academic Coach	1. lesson plans 2. classroom walkthroughs 3. progress monitoring of benchmark skill based assessments 4. annual yearly progress district test 5. monthly data meetings with administration 6. monthly LLT meetings 7. STAR reading assessment 8. RTI data meetings with teachers	FCAT, ending FAIR assessment, Annual Yearly Progress District Tests, STAR

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal # 73% of students will score satisfactory on reading in 2013. 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	70% (reached 6	73%	75%	78%	81%	

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:	76% of white students will score satisfactory in 2013 reading. 65% of Hispanic students will score satisfactory in 2013 reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White 66% Hispanic 57%	76% 65%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Implementation of common core standards.	Professional development related to common core standards.	Admin, reading coach	1. walkthroughs 2. lesson plans 3. implementation of CIS lessons	district progress monitoring 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:	53% of ELL students will score satisfactory on reading in 2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
20%	53%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Implementation of common core and the added rigor of standards.	Incorporate higher text complexity to daily lessons.	admin, reading coach	1. walkthroughs 2. lesson plans	district progress monitoring 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:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	42% of students with disabilities will score proficient on reading in 2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
44%	42%

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Implementation of common core standards.	Increase text complexity and scaffold lessons.	Admin, reading coach, support facilitator	1. walkthroughs 2. lesson pland 3. meetings with inclusion and support facilitator	district progress monitoring tests, IEP goals

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:	68% of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3 through 5 will score at or above a level 3 on the 2013 reading FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
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
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
Common core-comprehensive instructional sequence	k to 5	Lynda McInnis	school wide	Nov. & Dec. 2012	classroom visits, lesson plans, sample lessons	admin, reading coach
Core connections	k to 5	Michele Miller	school wide	two times per year for each grade level	classroom visits, sample assignments	admin, reading coach
Text complexity	k to 5	Amanda Johnson	school wide	Feb. 2013	classroom visits, lesson plans, sample lessons	admin, reading coach

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:	42% (8) of students in grades K-5 will score proficient on listening/speaking section of Cella in 2013.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
37% (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	Limited exposure to English outside of school.	Provide books on tape and resources for student to use at home.	bi-lingual para, reading coach	check out sheet of materials	Cella, district standardized tests

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:	26% of students in K-5 will score proficient on the reading section of Cella in 2013.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	
21% (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	Limited exposure to English reading material outside of school.	Provide books on tape and resources for student to use at home.	bi-lingual para, reading coach	check out sheet of materials	Cella, district standardized tests

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	42% of students in grades K-5 will score proficient on the writing section of Cella in 2013.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

37% (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	Limited exposure to English and opportunities for writing outside the school setting.	Small group instruction	bi-lingual para, classroom teacher	teacher log of time	Cella, district standardized tests

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	63% of all third grade students will score at or above a level 3 on 2013 FCAT math. 68% of all fourth grade students will score at or above a level 3 on 2013 FCAT math. 54% of all fifth grade students will score at or above a level 3 on 2013 FCAT math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
61% (78) 61% (67) 47% (52)	63% (82) 68% (71) 54% (57)

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Likely increase in percentage students struggling with math concepts and higher order thinking process</td><td>1. One hour math block per day
2. Drops in the Bucket
3. Incorporating manipulatives into everyday lessons
4. Emphasize the reading-math connection
5. Center activities
6. Structured iii time
7. Instructional focus calendars
8. Provide enrichment activities for higher level thinking skills
9. Modeling by academic coach and district math coach
10 Accelerated Math</td><td>Principal, Ast. Principal, Academic Coach</td><td>1. lesson plans
2. classroom walkthroughs
3. skill based benchmark assessments
4. monthly grade level data meetings
5. monthly math committee meetings</td><td>FCAT, Annual Yearly Progress District Test, STAR Math</td></tr>
</table>

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
</table>

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:	63% of students in grades 3 through 5 will meet high standards in math on the 2013 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56% (169)	63% (213)

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	Higher percentage of level 2 & 3 students entering fourth and fifth grade.	1.One hour math block per day 2. Drops in the Bucket 3. Incorporating manipulatives into everyday lessons 4. Emphasize the reading-math connection 5. Center activities 6. Structured iii time-skill based 7. Instructional focus calendars 8. Provide enrichment activities for higher level thinking skills 9. Modeling by academic coach and district math coach 10. RTI meetings with teachers to design interventions	Principal, Ast. Principal, Academic Coach	1. lesson plans 2. classroom walkthroughs 3. skill based benchmark assessments 4. monthly grade level data meetings 5. RTI data meetings	FCAT, Annual Yearly Progress District Test, STAR math

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

No Data Submitted

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	63% of students in grades 4 and 5 will make learning gains on 2013 FCAT math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
55% (176)	63% (213)

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Anticipated Barrier</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</th>
<th>Evaluation Tool</th>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Guiding teachers to prioritize core lessons and provide students with explicit relevant instruction including Webb's DOK within the math curriculum.</td>
<td>1.One hour math block per day
2. Drops in the Bucket
3. Incorporating manipulatives into everyday lessons
4. Emphasize the reading-math connection
5. Center activities
6. Structured iii time
7. Instructional focus calendars
8. Provide enrichment activities for higher level thinking skills
9. Modeling by academic coach and district math coach
10. Include Webb's DOK training</td>
<td>Principal, Ast. Principal, Academic Coach</td>
<td>1. lesson plans
2. classroom walkthroughs
3. skill based benchmark assessments
4. monthly grade level data meetings</td>
<td>FCAT, Annual Yearly Progress District Test</td>
</tr>
</table>

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

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

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr>
<th>Anticipated Barrier</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</th>
<th>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</th>
<th>Evaluation Tool</th>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="5" align="center">No Data Submitted</td>
</tr>
</table>

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:	60% of students in the lowest 25% in grade 4 and 5 will make learning gains on the 2013 FCAT math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
51% (107)	60% (126)

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	Ineffective differentiated instruction and interventions for lowest performing students.	1. One hour math block per day 2. Drops in the Bucket 3. Incorporating manipulatives into everyday lessons 4. Emphasize the reading-math connection 5. Center activities 6. Structured iii time 7. Instructional focus calendars 8. Provide enrichment activities for higher level thinking skills 9. Modeling by academic coach and district math coach 10. RTI committee design remedial interventions	Principal, Ast. Principal, Academic Coach	1. lesson plans 2. classroom walkthroughs 3. skill based benchmark assessments 4. monthly grade level data meetings 5. RTI data meetings	FCAT, Annual Yearly Progress District Test, STAR Math

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 # 66% of students will score satisfactory on 2013 math. 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	56%	66%	69%	73%	76%	

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:	68% white students will score satisfactory on 2013 math. 60% Hispanic students will score satisfactory on 2013 math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

58% white 43% Hispanic			68% white 60% Hispanic		

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	Implementation of common core standards.	Increase levels of complex assignment tasks.	Admin, district math coach	walkthroughs lesson plans	district progress monitoring, class assignments
2	Lack of knowledge on how to extend student thinking to deeper levels.	Professional development on DOK questions/essential questions.	Admin, district math coach, LEAD teachers	walkthroughs lesson plans meeting agendas	district progress monitoring, student participation

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:	53% of ELL students will be satisfactory on 2013 math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
20%	53%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Implementation of common core standards.	Increase levels of complex assignment tasks.	Admin, district math coach	walkthroughs lesson plans	progress monitoring, class 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:

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	43% of SWD will score satisfactory on 2013 math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
31%	43%

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	Implementation of common core standards.	Increase level of questioning and complex assignments.	Admin, district math coach, support facilitator	walkthroughs lesson plans agendas from meetings	district progress monitoring assessments

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

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.	61% of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3 through 5 will score at or above a level 3 on the 2013 math FCAT.
Mathematics Goal E:	

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
51%	61%

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	Likely increase in the number of economically disadvantaged students.	1. One hour math block per day 2. Drops in the Bucket 3. Incorporating manipulatives into everyday lessons 4. Emphasize the reading-math connection 5. Center activities 6. Structured iii time 7. Instructional focus calendars 8. Provide enrichment activities for higher level thinking skills 9. Modeling by academic coach and district math coach	Principal, Ast. Principal, Academic Coach	1. lesson plans 2. classroom walkthroughs 3. skill based benchmark assessments 4. monthly grade level data meetings	FCAT, Annual Yearly Progress District Test
2	Implementation of common core standards.	Increase level of questioning and complex assignments.	Admin, district math coach	walkthroughs lesson plans agendas from meetings	district progress monitoring 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
Common core	k to 5		school wide	March and April 2013		admin, district math 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. Science Goal #1a:	48% of all fifth grade students will score at or above a level 3 on 2013 FCAT science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41% (45)	48% (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	Effective implementation of science NGSSS within the time constraints of the school schedule across grade levels.	1.Incorporate NGSSS 2. 60 minutes of science daily 3. Require students to participate in the annual science fair 4. Provide real world science experiences and engaging activities 5. Instructional focus calendars 6. Incorporate science into reading activities	Principal, Ast. Principal, Academic Coach	1. lesson plans 2. classroom walkthroughs 3. skill based benchmark assessments 4. grade level data analysis meetings	FCAT, Annual Yearly Progress District Test

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b:	

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	25% of fifth grade students will meet higher standards in science on the 2013 FCAT.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
10% (11)	25% (26)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Increase the level of higher order questioning skills/techniques during the science block.	1.Incorporate NGSSS 2. 60 minutes of science daily 3. Require students to participate in the annual science fair 4. Provide real world science experiences and engaging activities 5. Instructional focus calendars 6. Incorporate science into reading activities 7. Incorporate Webb's Depth of Knowledge	Principal, Ast. Principal, Academic Coach	1. lesson plans 2. classroom walkthroughs 3. skill based benchmark assessments 4. grade level data analysis meetings	FCAT, Annual Yearly Progress District Test

---

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:	

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

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

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

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

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

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:		79% of fourth grade students meeting higher standards on 2013 FCAT writes.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
72% (79)		79% (83)			
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	Implementing a dedicated writing block with fidelity across grade levels.	1. Incorporate PDA writing strategies K to 5 2. Monthly school wide writing prompts 3. Weekly instructional prompt practice 4. Instructional focus calendars 5. Implement activities for writing across the curriculum	Principal, Ast. Principal, Academica Coach	1. lesson plans 2. classroom walkthroughs 3. follow up sessions with Mary Lewis Writing 4. monthly LLT meetings to discuss writing prompts	FCAT, School-wide monthly writing prompts

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Core Connections Reading writing connection	k to 5	Michele Miller from Core Connections	school wide	through out the year	classroom walkthroughs, monthly writing prompts	principal, ast. principal, academic coach

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	The attendance rate will increase to 95% for the 2012-2013 school year.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
94%	95%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
25	15
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)

30	28

	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	Education of parents to the understanding of compulsory attendance law.	1. Follow the truancy flow chart with fidelity 2. Parent conferences with implementation of interventions 3. Utilization of School Resource Officer and district truancy officer 4. Implementation of the 30, 90 day attendance rule	Principal, Ast. Principal. Guidance Counselor	1. weekly administration meetings to track attendance	Ending school attendance rate, monthly attendance report of absences and tardies
2	Students lack of motivation to attend school.	1. monthly attendance race between classrooms 2. each class with perfect attendance is announced on the morning news 3. at the monthly assembly the class per grade level with the highest number of days receives a certificate 4. graph of attendance in great hall area	Principal, Ast. Principal, Guidance Counselor	1. increase of days present on graph in the great hall	Ending school attendance rate, monthly attendance report of 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
Truancy law, procedures in place that include teacher responsibilities	K-5	Principal, Ast. Principal	K-5 teachers	pre-planning, grade level meetings (will be on the agenda 2 times per year)	teacher completed parent conference form (person or phone)	Principal, Ast. Principal, Guidance

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 |

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:	Out of school suspensions will decrease from 20 suspensions to 14 suspensions.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
6 in-school suspensions	6 in-school suspensions
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
4 students	4 students
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
1 suspensions	5 suspensions
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
1 students	8 students
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teachers not implementing CHAMPS with fidelity.	parent conferences (phone calls, emails), CHAMPS implementation with fidelity, behavioral interventions, CHAMPS committee meetings	Principal, Ast. Principal	monthly discipline report review	end of the year suspension report, FOCUS reports

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	85% of parents will participate in at least one parent involvement activity for the 2012-2013 school year.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:

	85% (604)		85% (604)		

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Parents inability to attend night functions at school.</td><td>Continue to provide activities after parent workday, schedule events well in advance</td><td>Principal, Ast. Principal, Leadership Team</td><td>number of parents attending</td><td>sign in sheets for each event</td></tr>
</table>

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

Additional Goal(s)

Reading K-2 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. Reading K-2 Goal Reading K-2 Goal #1:	70% of students in grade k will score proficient 55% or higher in reading on the Annual Yearly Progress District Post Test. 71% of students in grade 1 will score proficient 55% or higher in reading on the Annual Yearly Progress District Post Test. 71% of students in grade 2 will score proficient 55% or higher in reading on the Annual Yearly Progress District Post Test.
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
65% (64) 70% (67) 64% (83)	70% (73) 71% (91) 71% (70)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Likely increase in percentage of economically disadvantaged students	1. Informal oral reading fluency assessments 2. Data analysis after each FAIR assessment 3. Grade level meetings 4. Structured iii time 5. Support from reading tutoring groups 6. Accelerated Reader for goal-oriented reading 7. Soar to Success 8. Instructional focus calendars 9. Uninterrupted 90 minute reading block 10. Reciprocal teaching 11. Enrichment for higher level thinking skills 13. Elements of Reading 14.	Principal, Ast. Principal, Academic Coach	1. lesson plans 2. classroom walkthroughs 3. progress monitoring of benchmark skill based assessments 4. annual yearly progress district test 5. monthly data meetings with administration 6. monthly LLT meetings 7. STAR reading assessment 8. RTI data meetings	ending FAIR data, annual yearly progress district test

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						

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 K-2 Goal(s)

Math K-2 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. Math K-2 Goal Math K-2 Goal #1:	85% of students in grade k will score proficient in math on the Annual Yearly Progress District Post Test. 79% of students in grade 1 will score proficient in math on the Annual Yearly Progress District Post Test. 78% of students in grade 2 will score proficient in math on the Annual Yearly Progress District Post Test.
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
93% (89) 78% (77) 81% (105)	85% (88) 79% (76) 78% (77)
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Likely increase in percentage of students	1. Informal oral math fluency (facts)	Principal, Ast. Principal,	1. lesson plans 2. classroom	FCAT,, annual yearly progress

1	struggling with math concepts and higher level questioning	2. Data analysis after each district assessment 3. Grade level meetings 4. Structured iii time dedicated to math 5. Support from paraprofessionals for tutoring groups 6. Accelerated Math for skill specific needs 7. Math Facts in a Flash 8. Instructional focus calendars 9. Uninterrupted 60 minute math block 10. Reciprocal teaching 11. Enrichment for higher level thinking skills	Academic Coach	walkthroughs 3. progress monitoring of benchmark skill based assessments 4. annual yearly progress district test 5. monthly data meetings with administration 6. monthly math meetings 7. STAR math assessment 8. RTI data meetings	district test, STAR Math

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						

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

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

jn Priority	jn Focus	jn Prevent	jn NA

Are you a reward school: jn Yes jn No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 9/17/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

✓ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

SAC will play a part in the public relationship between Progress Energy and the school. Solar panels will be installed at our school to display a renewable energy source in our community.

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Suwannee School District BRANFORD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	84%	81%	85%	59%	309	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	71%	67%			138	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	60% (YES)	51% (YES)			111	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					558	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Suwannee School District BRANFORD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	81%	81%	70%	60%	292	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	65%	66%			131	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	51% (YES)	71% (YES)			122	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					545	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested