

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: BAYVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Broward

Principal: JoEllen Scott

SAC Chair: Tim Krajewski

Superintendent: Robert Runcie

Date of School Board Approval: December 4, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/19/2012

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

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)
					2011-2012 - Grade: A High Standards Reading: 88% High Standards Math: 89% High Standards Writing: 95% High Standards Science: 85% Learning Gains Reading: 73% Learning Gains Math: 86% Learning Gains Lowest 25% in Reading: 73% Learning Gains Lowest 25% in Math: 86% 2010-2011 - Grade: A AYP: N High Standards Reading: 96% High Standards Math: 97% High Standards Writing: 99% High Standards Science: 86% Learning Gains Reading: 69%

Principal	JoEllen Scott	Masters in Science / Ed. Leadership, Elementary Education, Varying ExceptionalitiesESOL Endorsement	4	11	<p>Learning Gains Math: 76% Learning Gains Lowest 25% in Reading: 59% Learning Gains Lowest 25% in Math: 79%</p> <p>2009-2010 - Grade: A AYP: Y High Standards Reading: 96% High Standards Math: 93% High Standards Writing: 96% High Standards Science: 69% Learning Gains Reading: 74% Learning Gains Math: 68% Learning Gains Lowest 25% in Reading: 77% Learning Gains Lowest 25% in Math: 72%</p> <p>2008-2009 - Grade: A AYP: Y High Standards Reading: 92% High Standards Math: 94% High Standards Writing: 97% High Standards Science: 86% Learning Gains Reading: 79% Learning Gains Math: 74% Learning Gains Lowest 25% in Reading: 81% Learning Gains Lowest 25% in Math: 85%</p>
Assis Principal	Theresa Sumner	Masters in Education / Ed. Leadership, Supervision, Early Childhood, Elementary, Special Education: SLD, Middle School English, ESOL Endorsement	8	8	<p>2011-2012 - Grade: A High Standards Reading: 88% High Standards Math: 89% High Standards Writing: 95% High Standards Science: 85% Learning Gains Reading: 73% Learning Gains Math: 86% Learning Gains Lowest 25% in Reading: 73% Learning Gains Lowest 25% in Math: 86%</p> <p>2010-2011 - Grade: A AYP: N High Standards Reading: 96% High Standards Math: 97% High Standards Writing: 99% High Standards Science: 86% Learning Gains Reading: 69% Learning Gains Math: 76% Learning Gains Lowest 25% in Reading: 59% Learning Gains Lowest 25% in Math: 79%</p> <p>2009-2010 - Grade: A AYP: Y High Standards Reading: 96% High Standards Math: 93% High Standards Writing: 96% High Standards Science: 69% Learning Gains Reading: 74% Learning Gains Math: 68% Learning Gains Lowest 25% in Reading: 77% Learning Gains Lowest 25% in Math: 72%</p> <p>2008-2009 - Grade: A AYP: Y High Standards Reading: 92% High Standards Math: 94% High Standards Writing: 97% High Standards Science: 86% Learning Gains Reading: 79% Learning Gains Math: 74% Learning Gains Lowest 25% in Reading: 81% Learning Gains Lowest 25% in Math: 85%</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)
					<p>2011-2012 - Grade: A High Standards Reading: 88% High Standards Math: 89% High Standards Writing: 95% High Standards Science: 85% Learning Gains Reading: 73%</p>

Reading	Patricia Robinson	Masters in Reading/ Early Childhood, Elementary Education, Reading, ESOL Endorsement	27	15	<p>Learning Gains Math: 86% Learning Gains Lowest 25% in Reading: 73% Learning Gains Lowest 25% in Math: 86%</p> <p>2010-2011 - Grade: A AYP: N High Standards Reading: 96% High Standards Math: 97% High Standards Writing: 99% High Standards Science: 86% Learning Gains Reading: 69% Learning Gains Math: 76% Learning Gains Lowest 25% in Reading: 59% Learning Gains Lowest 25% in Math: 79%</p> <p>2009-2010 - Grade: A AYP: Y High Standards Reading: 96% High Standards Math: 93% High Standards Writing: 96% High Standards Science: 69% Learning Gains Reading: 74% Learning Gains Math: 68% Learning Gains Lowest 25% in Reading: 77% % Learning Gains Lowest 25% in Math: 72%</p> <p>2008-2009 - Grade: A AYP: Y High Standards Reading: 92% High Standards Math: 94% High Standards Writing: 97% High Standards Science: 86% Learning Gains Reading: 79% Learning Gains Math: 74% Learning Gains Lowest 25% in Reading: 81% Learning Gains Lowest 25% in Math: 85%</p>
---------	-------------------	--	----	----	--

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1 New Educator Support System	Michael Hinesley	June 2013	
2	2.Team Leader as a Mentor	Nancy Wengren Maria Kelly Anthony Thompson Lisa Mueller Amanda Benson Michael Hinesley	June 2013	
3	3. Professional Development Workshops / Learning Communities based on Needs Assessment	JoEllen Scott Patricia Robinson	June 2013	
4	4 Assign a Grade Level Mentor	JoEllen Scott Theresa Sumner	June 2013	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
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
37	0.0%(0)	2.7%(1)	32.4%(12)	64.9%(24)	18.9%(7)	100.0%(37)	18.9%(7)	13.5%(5)	83.8%(31)

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
Patricia Robinson Lisa Mueller	Tim Krajewski Lisa Lauro	Change in Grade Level Assignment	Guided Reading Training Grade Level Standards/Expectations, Go Math Training

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

N/A

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

Other

N/A

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

JoEllen Scott - Principal, Theresa Sumner - Assistant Principal/ELL Representative, Patricia Robinson - Reading Coach, Jennifer Lai - ESE Specialist, Jennifer Fitzgerald - School Psychologist, Team Leaders - as Case Managers, and the Classroom Teacher making the CPS referral.

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 works in conjunction with the Collaborative Problem Solving Team to discuss data from the Progress Monitoring Plan or charted interfering behavior data. The roles/functions of the RtI Leadership Team is to problem solve with the teacher instructional interventions to use with at-risk students/students not making adequate gains with the core curriculum. A Functional Behavior Analysis (FBA) is generated for those students with behavior concerns. The Guidance Counselor and/or ESE Specialist are responsible for coordinating and facilitating the CPST. Student data is tracked and recorded by the teacher who is implementing the tier II or tier III intervention or FBA. If warranted a Positive Behavior Intervention Plan (PBIP) is created and monitored on a monthly basis.

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 Team meets with the School Advisory Council (SAC) and principal to help develop the SIP. The goals are based on the analysis of data collected on various assessments such as FCAT, BAT, and assessments collected within our school-wide progress monitoring folder collected on each student. Additionally, the School Improvement Team uses district information and reports that are downloaded and analyzed from the data warehouse (ie. students in the lowest 30%, subgroup performance on standardized assessments, attendance/tardy).

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.

Data is collected by the student's teacher and graphed by a case manager, the ESE Specialist, ESE Teacher or the Reading Specialist. Baseline data begins when a child is placed in an intervention on a Tier 2 status as established by the CPST. Data points are collected after approximately 20 days of instruction. A second CPST meeting is held on a particular student after an RtI intervention has been in place for a minimum of 6 weeks. Line graphs are generated to depict a child's growth in comparison to a targeted goal over a period of time. Behavior is analyzed by the frequency of a desired behavior or decrease in frequency in an undesirable behavior. If little or no progress is made the intervention is changed, or the child is

moved to a Tier 3. Tier 3 data is collected in the same manner as Tier 2 interventions.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional development will be provided during teachers' planning time, on Early Release Days and planning days throughout the year. Two professional development sessions entitled: "RtI: Problem Solving Model: Building Consensus Implementing and Sustaining Problem-Solving/RtI" and "RtI: Challenges to Implementation Data-based Decision-Making, and Supporting and Evaluating Interventions" will take place in late-August/September and throughout the year. Team Leaders will be trained as case managers on team leader release days.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

JoEllen Scott- Principal, Nancy Hogan- ESE Representative, Theresa Sumner- Assistant Principal and ESOL Contact Person, Team Leaders: Nancy Wengren- Kindergarten, Patricia Robinson-Reading Specialist, Maria Kelly- Grade 1, Lisa Mueller- Grade 2, Anthony Thompson-Gifted Teacher and Grade 3, Amanda Benson-Grade 4, Michael Hinesley -Grade 5.

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

The team meets with administration to formulate instructional focus calendars for curriculum differentiation. A monthly meeting is held to discuss student achievement, curriculum and material needs. The Literacy Team acts as the PLC facilitators for any professional development needs that may arise. LLT was selected by team members on their grade level.

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

Differentiation of curriculum, literacy centers and guided reading instruction to meet the needs of individual students will be a major initiative. The LLT will train and support team members in their acquisition and implementation of these initiatives.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

N/A

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

For schools with Grades 6-12, describe the plan to ensure that teaching reading strategies is the responsibility of every teacher.

N/A

*High Schools Only

Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1003.413(g)(j) F.S.

How does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and

relevance to their future?

N/A

How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is personally meaningful?

N/A

Postsecondary Transition

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](#)

N/A

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	Student progress will continue to be monitored based on data collected from assessments. The leadership team will meet on an ongoing basis to analyze data.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In grades 3-5, 12% (32/258) of students achieved a level 1 or 2 on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.	In grades 3-5, 69% (22/32) of the students scoring a level 1 or 2 will achieve a level 3 or better in reading on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test.

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	New students who have not been taught skills listed in the FCAT Reading Categories Content Focus Chart	Teachers will include higher order questioning techniques during reading instruction and show proof of answers utilizing the text	Administration and Reading Coach	Classroom Walkthroughs	Classroom Walkthroughs log, Reading Comprehension Tests, Mini BATs and selected assessments from the Progress Monitoring Plan
2	The scheduling of support staff for RtI.	Teachers will group students according to reading skills based on State and District assessments and data from the school's Progress Monitoring Plan to teach small groups	Administration, Reading Coach,	Data collected from classroom teachers and RtI support staff.	Reading Comprehension Tests, Mini BATs, and selected assessments from the Progress Monitoring Plan
3	Technology equipment in need of repair	Teams will report technology repair needs on a monthly basis	Administration/Micro-Tech	Team leaders will email specific technology repair needs to contact person. Quarterly review of technology inventory and repair needs	Technology 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:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	Student progress will continue to be monitored based on data collected from assessments. The leadership team will meet on an ongoing basis to analyze data.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (1/2) of students achieved a level 4 or above on the 2012 administration of the FAA.	100% (2/2) of students will achieve a level 4 or above on the 2013 administration of the FAA.

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	Acquisition of skills in one school year	Teams will collaborate with the ESE department	Administration/ESE Department	Review of data collected from reading skill assessments.	Reading Assessment Tests
2	Technology equipment in need of repair	Teams will report technology repair needs on a monthly basis.	Administration/Micro-Tech	Team leaders will email specific technology repair needs to contact person. Quarterly review of technology inventory and repair needs	Technology 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:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	Student progress will continue to be monitored based on data collected from assessments. The leadership team will meet on an ongoing basis to analyze data.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71% (182/258) of students achieved a level 4 and 5 on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.	73% (192/268) of the students will achieve a level 4 and 5 in reading on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test.

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	Availability of a variety of class materials that meet the needs of varying levels and abilities.	Purchase of Time For Kids and other supplemental materials	Administration and Teachers	Review of data collected from reading skill assessments	Reading Assessment Tests
2	Sufficient technology equipment for each child during the reading block.	Purchase of new laptops and desktops. Refurbish broken technology	Administration and Teachers	Technology Inventory	Technology checklist
3	Planning time for teachers to incorporate high yield strategies in their lesson plans.	Training on the high yield strategies via BrainSmart PLC and the Marzano support center training videos.	Administration and Team Leaders	iObservation Evaluation tool and school-based developed instruments	Formal and informal walk throughs LLT and Team meeting discussions

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:	Student progress will continue to be monitored based on data collected from assessments. The leadership team will meet on an ongoing basis to analyze data.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (1/2) of students achieved a level 7 or above on the 2012 administration of the FAA.	100% (2/2) of students will achieve a level 7 or above on the 2013 administration of the FAA

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	Acquisition of skills in one school year	Teams will collaborate with the ESE department	Administration/ESE Department	Review of data collected from reading skill assessments.	Reading Assessment Tests

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:	Student progress will continue to be monitored based on data collected from assessments. The leadership team will meet on an ongoing basis to analyze data.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
73% (120/165)of students made learning gains on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.	76% (134/176) of the students will make learning gains in reading on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test.

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	Staff's understanding of RtI process and data collection	Tier 1: Determine core instructional needs by reviewing common assessment data for all students in each grade level who are not making adequate progress. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence-based instruction/ interventions within the reading block.	Teachers and Administrators	Grade-level teams will review results of common assessment data every 6 weeks to determine progress toward benchmark.	Grade level assessments on reading benchmarks given weekly
2	Staff's understanding of RtI process and data collection	Tier 2: Plan supplemental instruction/ interventions for students not responding to core instruction. Focus of instruction is determined by review of common assessment data and will include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice. Supplemental instruction is provided in addition to core instruction.	Administrators	Grade level teams will review results of common assessment data every 6 weeks to determine progress toward benchmark.	Grade level assessments on reading benchmarks given weekly
3	Staff's understanding of RtI process and data collection	Tier 3: Plan targeted intervention for students not responding to core plus supplemental instruction using problem-solving process. Interventions will be matched to individual student needs, be evidence-based, and provided in addition to core instruction.	RtI Team	RtI team will review results of common assessment data which has been plotted on a 5 point data chart to determine progress toward benchmark.	Assessments from the intervention that has been utilized with the student

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:	Student progress will continue to be monitored based on data collected from assessments. The leadership team will meet on an ongoing basis to analyze data.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (1/2) of students made learning gains on the 2012 administration of the FAA..	100% (2/2) of students will make learning gains on the 2013 administration of the FAA

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	Acquisition of skills in one school year	Teams will collaborate with the ESE department	Administration/ESE Department	Review of data collected from reading skill assessments.	Reading Assessment Tests

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:	Student progress will continue to be monitored based on data collected from assessments. The leadership team will meet on an ongoing basis to analyze data.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (10/20) of students in lowest 25% made learning gains on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.	75% (15/20) of the students in lowest 25% will make learning gains in reading on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test.

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	Staff's understanding of RtI process and data collection	Tier 1: Determine core instructional needs by reviewing common assessment data for all students in each grade level within bottom quartile. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence-based instruction/ interventions within the reading block.	Teachers and Administrators	Grade-level teams will review results of common assessment data every 6 weeks to determine progress toward benchmark.	Grade level assessments on reading benchmarks given weekly
2	Staff's understanding of RtI process and data collection	Tier 2: Plan supplemental instruction/ interventions for students not responding to core instruction. Focus of instruction is determined by review of common assessment data and will include explicit instruction, modeled	Teachers and Administrators	Grade level teams will review results of common assessment data every 6 weeks to determine progress toward benchmark.	Grade level assessments on reading benchmarks given weekly

		instruction, guided practice and independent practice. Supplemental instruction is provided in addition to core instruction.			
3	Staff's understanding of RtI process and data collection	Tier 3: Plan targeted intervention for students not responding to core plus supplemental instruction using problem-solving process. Interventions will be matched to individual student needs, be evidence-based, and provided in addition to core instruction.	RtI Team	RtI team will review results of common assessment data which has been plotted on a 5 point data chart to determine progress toward benchmark.	Assessments from the intervention that has been utilized with the student.

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Reading Goal # The school will increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency in reading by one percent each school year from 2011- 2017.				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	88	89	90	91	92	

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:	Student progress will continue to be monitored based on data collected from assessments. The leadership team will meet on an ongoing basis to analyze data.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The breakdown of student learning gains by ethnicity is as follows: White: 14% (27/200)Black: 13% (1/8)Hispanic: 13% (4/32)Asian: 0% (0/12)American Indian: N/A	The number of students making learning gains in reading on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test for the following ethnic groups will be: White: 86% (172/200)Black: 100% (8/8)Hispanic: 94% (30/32)Asian: 100% (12/12) American Indian: N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	White: Lack of fundamental reading skills Black: Lack of fundamental reading skills Hispanic: Lack of fundamental reading skills Asian: Lack of fundamental reading skills American Indian: Lack of fundamental reading skills	Students will utilize a variety of computer software to reinforce reading skills including but not limited to Accelerated Reader, Riverdeep, KidBiz3000, etc. Results will be monitored and progress documented to be used for conferencing and individualized student instruction.	Reading Coach, Teacher	Review of all data and regrouping students and revising instruction as needed	School created assessments utilizing Reading Benchmarks, Fluency Probes,

2	<p>White: Lack of fundamental reading skills</p> <p>Black: Lack of fundamental reading skills</p> <p>Hispanic: Lack of fundamental reading skills</p> <p>Asian: Lack of fundamental reading skills</p> <p>American Indian: Lack of fundamental reading skills</p>	Teachers will include higher order questioning techniques during reading instruction and show proof of answers utilizing the text	Administrators and Reading Coach	Classroom Walkthroughs	Classroom Walkthroughs log, Reading Comprehension Tests, Mini BATs and selected assessments from the Progress Monitoring Plan
---	---	---	----------------------------------	------------------------	---

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:	No ELL subgroup to report.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
No ELL subgroup to report.	No ELL subgroup to report.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	Student progress will continue to be monitored based on data collected from assessments. The leadership team will meet on an ongoing basis to analyze data.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33% (18/54) of Students with Disabilities (SWD) did not meet proficiency on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.	80% (43/54) of Students with Disabilities (SWD) will make satisfactory progress on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Reading Test

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
	Foundation skills acquired at a slower rate	Identified at risk students will be instructed utilizing one or a variety of the following strategies/materials:	ESE teacher, ESE Specialist, and classroom teachers	Observation and review of data by teacher, ESE teacher, ESE Specialist and administrators.	Reading Comprehension Tests, Mini BATs, and selected assessments from

1		Wilson, Foundations, Rode to the Code, Read Well, Visualizing and Verbalizing, Elements of Reading, Super QAR, Great Leaps, Reader's Theater, Triumphs Intervention Series, Quick Reads, Multi-Sequence Speed Drills, STARS, Recipe for Reading, Phonics for Reading, Intermediate Rewards			the Progress Monitoring Plan Monitor progress within the given intervention
2	Foundation skills acquired at a slower rate	Small group and individual pullout instruction on specific skills.	ESE teacher, ESE Specialist, and classroom teacher	Observation and review of data by teacher, reading coach, and administrators.	Reading Comprehension Tests, Mini BATs, and selected assessments from the Progress Monitoring Plan Monitor progress within the given intervention

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:	Student progress will continue to be monitored based on data collected from assessments. The leadership team will meet on an ongoing basis to analyze data.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
16% (9/57) of students who are Economically Disadvantaged did not make satisfactory progress on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.	87% 50/57 of students who are Economically Disadvantaged will make satisfactory progress on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Reading Test

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of fundamental reading skills.	Identified at risk students will be instructed utilizing one or a variety of the following strategies/materials: Wilson, Foundations, Rode to the Code, Visualizing and Verbalizing, Elements of Reading, Super QAR, Great Leaps, Reader's Theater, Triumphs Intervention Series, Quick Reads, Multi-Sequence Speed Drills, STARS, Recipe for Reading, Phonics for Reading, Intermediate Rewards	Reading Coach, Teachers	Observation and review of data by teacher, reading coach, and administrators. Review progress of Tier 1, 2, 3 interventions.	Reading Comprehension Tests, Mini BATs, and selected assessments from the Progress Monitoring Plan Monitor progress within the given intervention
2	Limited exposure to reading materials outside of the school	Leveled books sent home daily	Teachers	Review progress data taken from evaluation tool.	Running records

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
BrainSMART	K-5	Reading specialist and assistant principal	Instructional staff	Early release and planning days	Classroom walkthroughs and LLT discussions	Administration
RtI	K-5	School psychologist	Instructional Staff	Faculty meetings	CPST meetings	Administration
Common Core State Standards	K-5	Reading Specialist Team leaders Administration	Instructional Staff	Bi-monthly LLT meetings Weekly grade level meetings	LLT agendas Team leader agendas	Administration

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Ancillary Reading Materials	Ex- Time for Kids, National Geographic, etc.	PTA	\$7,200.00
Increasing independent reading skills	Accelerated Reader	PTA	\$2,400.00
			Subtotal: \$9,600.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Incorporating new desktops/laptops	Toshiba desktops (32) and laptops (2)	PTA	\$23,350.00
Differentiating Reading for Gifted	KidBiz3000	PTA	\$8,000.00
			Subtotal: \$31,350.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Brain research	BrainSMART model	Staff development	\$1,000.00
			Subtotal: \$1,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Training for Common Core standards	District workshops	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$41,950.00

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.	89% of ELL students will score proficient in the

CELLA Goal #1:		listening/speaking section of the 2013 CELLA.			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
86% (25/29) of ELL students scored proficient in the listening/speaking section of the 2012 CELLA.					
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	Communication barriers in English at home	Provide resources to parents in helping their child at home	Administration/ESOL contact	Student performance in the classroom	Curriculum assessments

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.		41% of ELL students will score proficient in the reading section of the 2013 CELLA.			
CELLA Goal #2:					
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:					
38% (11/29) of ELL students scored proficient in the reading section of the 2012 CELLA.					
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	Communication barriers in English at home	Provide resources to parents in helping their child at home	Administration/ESOL contact	Student performance in the classroom	Curriculum assessments

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
3. Students scoring proficient in writing.		51% of ELL students will score proficient in the writing section of the 2013 CELLA.			
CELLA Goal #3:					
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:					
48% (14/29) of ELL students scored proficient in the writing section of the 2012 CELLA.					
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	Communication barriers in English at home	Provide resources to parents in helping their child at home	Administration/ESOL contact	Student performance in the classroom	Curriculum assessments

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
Infusing English vocabulary	Language Master	PTA	\$2,400.00
			Subtotal: \$2,400.00
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: \$2,400.00

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:	Student progress will continue to be monitored based on data collected from assessments. The leadership team will meet on an ongoing basis to analyze data.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
16% (42/257) of students achieved a level 3 on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Math Test.	20% (53/263) of the students will achieve a level 3 or better for math on the 2013 FCAT Math Test.

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	Student lack of prerequisite skills in the Implementation of the new math series as it relates to terminology and Big Ideas	Math centers focusing on basic math vocabulary from the Go Math series	Administration	Team meetings to review data	Go Math series assessments
2	Possible lack of manipulative use during instruction at the concrete level	Teachers will use new and different manipulatives to reinforce mathematics concepts.	Administration	Team Meetings to discuss implementation of math centers and stations, and administration will ensure activities are implemented.	Classroom Walk Through Teacher observation
3	Students who display a deficiency on math benchmarks	Utilize Destination Math, Soar to Success, and Florida Intervention	Teachers and Administration	Individual teachers and grade-level teams will track student progress	Chapter Assessments and Big Idea 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:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1b:	Student progress will continue to be monitored based on data collected from assessments. The leadership team will meet on an ongoing basis to analyze data.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (1/2) of students made learning gains on the 2012 administration of the FAA..	100% (2/2) of students will make learning gains on the 2013 administration of the FAA

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	Acquisition of skills in one school year	Teams will collaborate with the ESE department	Administration/ESE Department	Review of data collected from math skill assessments.	Math Assessment Tests

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:	Student progress will continue to be monitored based on data collected from assessments. The leadership team will meet on an ongoing basis to analyze data.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
72% (186/257) of students achieved a level 4 or 5 on the 2012	75% (197/263) of the students will achieve a level 4 or 5 on the 2013

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of in depth understanding of core concepts	Modeling and demonstration of the process behind a core concepts	Administration	Review of daily work samples, teacher observation, and benchmark assessments	Benchmark Assessments
2	Sufficient technology equipment for each child during the math block.	Acquire new laptops and desktops. Repair existing technology	Administration	Technology Inventory review	Technology 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:

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	Student progress will continue to be monitored based on data collected from assessments. The leadership team will meet on an ongoing basis to analyze data.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (1/2) of students made learning gains on the 2012 administration of the FAA..	100% (2/2) of students will make learning gains on the 2013 administration of the FAA

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	Acquisition of skills in one school year	Teams will collaborate with the ESE department	Administration/ESE Department	Review of data collected from math skill assessments.	Math Assessment Tests

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:	Student progress will continue to be monitored based on data collected from assessments. The leadership team will meet on an ongoing basis to analyze data.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
86% (142/165) of students who made learning gains on	89% (157/176) of students will make learning gains on

the 2012 FCAT Math test.			the 2013 FCAT Math test.		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students who are deficient in basic foundation math skills at grade level	Tier 1: Determine core instructional needs by reviewing common assessment data for all students in each grade level within bottom quartile. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence-based instruction/ interventions within the mathematics block.	Teachers and Administrators	Grade-level teams will review results of common assessment data every 6 weeks to determine progress toward benchmark.	Common assessments tied to Big Ideas within math standards administered weekly. BAT 1, BAT 2, and Mini BAT data.
2	Students who are deficient in basic foundation math skills at grade level	Tier 2: Plan supplemental instruction/ interventions for students not responding to core instruction. Focus of instruction is determined by review of common assessment data and will include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice. Supplemental instruction is provided in addition to core instruction.	Teachers and Administrators	Grade-level teams will review results of common assessment data every 6 weeks to determine progress toward benchmark.	Common assessments tied to Big Ideas within math standards administered weekly. BAT 1, BAT 2, and Mini BAT data.
3	Students who are deficient in basic foundation math skills at grade level	Tier 3: Plan targeted intervention for students not responding to core plus supplemental instruction using problem-solving process. Interventions will be matched to individual student needs, be evidence-based, and provided in addition to core instruction.	Rtl Team	Rtl team will review results of common assessment data which has been plotted on a 5 point data chart to determine progress toward benchmark.	Assessments from the intervention that has been utilized with the student.
4	Students who display a deficiency on math benchmarks	Utilize Destination Math, Soar to Success, and Florida Intervention	Teachers and Administration	Individual teachers and grade-level teams will track student progress	Chapter Assessments and Big Idea Assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	Student progress will continue to be monitored based on data collected from assessments. The leadership team will meet on an ongoing basis to analyze data.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (2/2) of students made learning gains on the 2012 administration of the FAA..	100% (2/2) of students will make learning gains on the 2013 administration of the FAA

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	Acquisition of skills in one school year	Teams will collaborate with the ESE department	Administration/ESE Department	Review of data collected from math skill assessments.	Math Assessment Tests

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:	Student progress will continue to be monitored based on data collected from assessments. The leadership team will meet on an ongoing basis to analyze data.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
65% (14/22) of students in the lowest quartile made learning gains on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Math Test.	70% (17/22) of students in the lowest quartile will make learning gains on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Math Test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students who are deficient in basic foundation math skills at grade level	Tier 1: Determine core instructional needs by reviewing common assessment data for all students in each grade level within bottom quartile. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence-based instruction/ interventions within the mathematics block.	Teachers and Administrators	Grade-level teams will review results of common assessment data every 6 weeks to determine progress toward benchmark.	Common assessments tied to Big Ideas within math standards administered weekly. BAT 1, BAT 2, and Mini BAT data.
2	Students who are deficient in basic foundation math skills at grade level	Tier 2: Plan supplemental instruction/ interventions for students not responding to core instruction. Focus of instruction is determined by review of common assessment data and will include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice. Supplemental instruction is provided in addition to core instruction.	Teachers and Administration	Grade-level teams will review results of common assessment data every 6 weeks to determine progress toward benchmark.	Common assessments tied to Big Ideas within math standards administered weekly. BAT 1, BAT 2, and Mini BAT data.
3	Students who are deficient in basic foundation math skills at grade level	Tier 3: Plan targeted intervention for students not responding to core plus supplemental instruction using problem-solving process. Interventions will be matched to individual student needs, be evidence-based, and provided in addition to core instruction.	Rtl Team	Rtl team will review results of common assessment data which has been plotted on a 5 point data chart to determine progress toward benchmark.	Assessments from the intervention that has been utilized with the student.
	Students who display a	Utilize Destination Math,	Teachers and	Individual teachers and	Chapter

4	deficiency on math benchmarks	Soar to Success, and Florida Intervention	Administration	grade-level teams will track student progress	Assessments and Big Idea 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 # The school will increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency in mathematics by one percent each school year from 2011- 2017.				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	89	89	90	91	92	

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:		Student progress will continue to be monitored based on data collected from assessments. The leadership team will meet on an ongoing basis to analyze data.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
The breakdown of students not making learning gains by ethnicity is as follows: White: 12% (23/199)Black: 25% (2/8)Hispanic: 13% (4/32)Asian: 0% (0/12)American Indian: N/A		Students will make learning gains in reading on the 2012 FCAT Math Test for the following ethnic groups White: 91% (181/199)Black: 88 % (7/8) Hispanic: 90% (29/32)Asian: 100% (12/12)American Indian: N/A			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of student understanding of prerequisite skills as it relates to Math Big Ideas and terminology within the content area	Teaching of basic math vocabulary from math series.	Teachers	Team meetings to review data	Go Math series assessments
2	Possible lack of manipulatives that correlate with new math series	Teachers will use a variety of manipulatives for instruction and student use.	Teachers	Team Meetings to discuss implementation of math lessons using manipulatives.	Teacher observation

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:		N/A			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
There was no ELL Subgroup		There was no ELL Subgroup			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
			Person or	Process Used to	

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	Student progress will continue to be monitored based on data collected from assessments. The leadership team will meet on an ongoing basis to analyze data.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
26% (14/53) of students with Disabilities (SWD) did not make satisfactory progress on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Math Test.	77% (40/53) of students with Disabilities (SWD) will make satisfactory progress on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Math Test.

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	Foundation skills acquired at a slower rate	Small group instruction on specific skills.	ESE Teachers, classroom teachers, ESE Specialists, and Administrators	Charting student proficiency of skills.	Weekly assessments
2	Possible lack of use of manipulatives that correlate with new math series	Teachers will increase the use of manipulatives to reinforce mathematics concepts.	ESE Teachers, classroom teachers, ESE Specialists, and Administrators	Team Meetings to discuss implementation of math centers and stations involving the use of manipulatives, and administration will ensure activities are implemented.	Go Math series 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:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	Student progress will continue to be monitored based on data collected from assessments. The leadership team will meet on an ongoing basis to analyze data.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
14% (8/57) of Economically Disadvantaged (ED) students did not make satisfactory progress on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Math	89% (51/57) of Economically Disadvantaged (ED) students will make satisfactory progress on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Math Test.

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 opportunities to work on real world math problem solving strategies	Students will increase the use of manipulatives to reinforce mathematics concepts utilizing real world problems.	Teachers	Review of data taken from assessments	Go Math Series 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
Common Core State Standards	K-5	Reading Specialist Team leaders Administration	Instructional Staff	Bi-monthly leadership team meetings; Weekly grade level meetings	LLT Agendas Team Leader Agendas Walk Throughs Staff Meetings	Administration
BrainSmart	K-5	Reading Specialist Assistant Principal	Instructional Staff	Planning Days Team meetings Early Release	Team Leader Agendas	Administration

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
Web-based math programs	First in Math	PTA	\$2,160.00
			Subtotal: \$2,160.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$2,160.00

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:	Student progress will continue to be monitored based on data collected from assessments. The leadership team will meet on an ongoing basis to analyze data.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

39% (35/89) students scored Level 3 on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Science Test.	45% (39/87) of students will achieve at Level 3 on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Science Test.
--	--

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of vocabulary and background knowledge in basic science concepts.	Science lessons and centers that incorporate vocabulary development and hands on activities and experiments.	Classroom teachers	Team Meetings to discuss data taken from student work in science centers.	Science Mini Assessment
2	Lack of Scientific Thinking skills	Incorporate science journals	Classroom teachers	Team meetings to collaborate and discuss science investigations	Science Journal Rubric

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	Student progress will continue to be monitored based on data collected from assessments. The leadership team will meet on an ongoing basis to analyze data..
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
46% (41/89) of students scored Level 4 and 5 on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Science Test.	50% (44/87) of students will score Level 4 and 5 on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Science Test

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of vocabulary and background knowledge in basic science concepts.	Science lessons that incorporate hands on activities and experiments.	Classroom teachers	Team Meetings to discuss student data collected from science activities and science	Science Mini Assessments

				journal.	
2	Lack of Scientific Thinking skills	Incorporate science journals	Classroom teachers	Team meetings to collaborate and discuss science investigations	Science Journal Rubric

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00

Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$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:	Student progress will continue to be monitored based on data collected from assessments. The leadership team will meet on an ongoing basis to analyze data..
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
95% (82/86)of grade 4 students scored Level 3 and higher on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Writing Test.	97% (86/89)of students will score at Level 3 or higher on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Writing Test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lacking an understanding the organization and components of an expository and narrative composition.	Utilize graphic organizers to focus on main idea and details within a composition.	Classroom Teachers	Team Meetings to discuss student work samples and compare initial writing prompts with prompts given after instruction.	Writing Rubrics
2	Students overuse of common vocabulary	Use of word walls, activities, and resources that build a more extensive and mature vocabulary.	Classroom Teachers	Team Meetings to discuss student work samples and compare initial writing prompts with prompts given after instruction.	Writing Rubrics

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:	Student progress will continue to be monitored based on data collected from assessments. The leadership team will meet on an ongoing basis to analyze data.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (2/2) of students made learning gains on the 2012 administration of the FAA..	100% (2/2) of students will make learning gains on the 2013 administration of the FAA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of	Evaluation Tool
--	---------------------	----------	------------------------------------	--	-----------------

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	Acquisition of skills in one school year	Teams will collaborate with the ESE department	Administration/ESE Department	Review of data collected from writing skill assessments.	Writing Assessment Tests

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
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$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:	Data indicates a need for improvement in decreasing the number of students who are absent and/or tardy more than 10 days.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:

97% (543/560) of students attend school regularly.	98% (553/564) of students will attend school regularly.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
3% (17/560) students had excessive absences.	2% (11/564) or less students will have excessive absences.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
19% (108/560) students had excessive tardies	Excessive tardies will decrease by 25% and/or 29 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	Parents keeping children out of school to take a family vacation on school days	Emphasis placed on the importance of student attendance during parent trainings and conferences	Classroom Teachers, School Social Worker, and Administration	Attendance bulletin	Review of district attendance bulletin
2	Parents not leaving home early enough to avoid traffic congestion and drawbridge	Parent link newsletter and phone calls to remind parents the importance of beginning school on time	Classroom teachers, school social worker, and administration	Attendance bulletin	Review of district attendance bulletin

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
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00

			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$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:	Data indicates a need for improvement in decreasing the number of In-School Suspensions.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
There were 2 In-School Suspensions	There will be a 50% decrease in In-School Suspensions.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
There were 2 In-School Suspensions	There will be a 50% decrease in In-School Suspensions.
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
There were 0 Out-of-School Student Suspensions	There will be 0 Out-of-School Suspensions
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
There were 0 Out-of-School Suspensions	There will be 0 Out-of-School Suspensions.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The students demonstrate poor problem solving skills and strategies for dealing with conflict.	Providing guidance lessons for whole group, small group, and individuals.	Administration	Student feedback from lessons.	Reduction in suspension rate

(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
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$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:	
<p>1. Parent Involvement</p> <p>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</p> <p><i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i></p>	<p>Efforts will be made to promote increased parent involvement in curriculum oriented training.</p>
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
During the 2011-2012 school year 15% of the parents attended curriculum oriented evening workshops.	By June 2013, 18% of parents will attend curriculum oriented evening workshops.
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	Parents lack understanding of the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards in the multiple curriculum areas.	Outreach communication from PTA and staff members inviting parents to attend curriculum trainings that will assist them in understanding the curriculum and helping their children make academic gains.	Classroom Teacher, PTA Board, and Administration	Reflection activities related to each curriculum area training.	Data collected from reflection activities and evaluation tool.

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
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	\$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)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Ancillary Reading Materials	Ex- Time for Kids, National Geographic, etc.	PTA	\$7,200.00
Reading	Increasing independent reading skills	Accelerated Reader	PTA	\$2,400.00
Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Writing	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Attendance	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Suspension	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Parent Involvement	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$9,600.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Incorporating new desktops/laptops	Toshiba desktops (32) and laptops (2)	PTA	\$23,350.00
Reading	Differentiating Reading for Gifted	KidBiz3000	PTA	\$8,000.00
CELLA	Infusing English vocabulary	Language Master	PTA	\$2,400.00
Mathematics	Web-based math programs	First in Math	PTA	\$2,160.00
Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Writing	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Attendance	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Suspension	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Parent Involvement	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$35,910.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Brain research	BrainSMART model	Staff development	\$1,000.00
Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Writing	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Attendance	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Suspension	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Parent Involvement	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$1,000.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Training for Common Core standards	District workshops	N/A	\$0.00
Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Writing	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Attendance	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Suspension	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
Parent Involvement	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
				Grand Total: \$46,510.00

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
Quick Reads Materials	\$800.00
Composition notebooks for ELA, Math, and Science CCSS implementation	\$500.00
Phonics For Reading Materials	\$800.00
Math Supplemental Materials for Math CCSS implementation	\$2,700.00

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

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

Broward School District BAYVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	96%	97%	99%	86%	378	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	69%	76%			145	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	59% (YES)	79% (YES)			138	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					661	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Broward School District BAYVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	96%	93%	96%	69%	354	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	74%	68%			142	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	77% (YES)	72% (YES)			149	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					645	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested