Brevard County Public Schools
School Improvement Plan
2012-2013

Name of School: Area:

South

Ocean Breeze Elementary

Principal: Area Superintendent:

Mark Mullins

Laurie Hering

SAC Chairperson:

Tina Compton & Laurie Martinez

Superintendent: Dr. Brian Binggeli

Mission Statement:

Ensure for a caring and collaborative community of life-long learners focused on achieving our personal best.

Vision Statement:

Our best achieved, together.

	Page 1	

Brevard County Public Schools
School Improvement Plan
2012-2013

RATIONALE – Continuous Improvement Cycle Process

Data Analysis from multiple data sources: *(Needs assessment that supports the need for improvement)*

An analysis of 2012 FCAT data shows that Ocean Breeze Elementary students perform above state and district averages on annual academic achievement measures. Eighty-five and one-half percent (85.5%) of our students are performing at or above grade level in reading and seventy-three and one-half percent (73.5%) of our students are performing at or above grade level in math. Overall, sixty percent (60%) of our students made an annual learning gain in reading and fifty-five percent (55%) made an annual learning gain in math. Eighty-nine percent (89%) of our 4th grade students scored at proficiency in writing (3.0) and eighty-six percent (86%) of our 5th grade students scored at proficiency in science.

An analysis of subgroups revealed that seventy-one (71%) of our lowest 25% made annual learning gains in reading and sixty-two (62%) made annual learning gains in math. Results for students with disabilities revealed that seventy-three percent (73%) and fifty-four percent (54%) are making annual learning gains in reading and math respectively, however the percentage of students with disabilities scoring at satisfactory grade level achievement dropped in both reading and math to fifty-three percent (53%) and forty-one percent (41%) respectively. The results for our highest performing students (levels 4 and 5) revealed annual learning gains at ninety percent (90%) for reading and ninety-six percent (96%) for math. The school average learning gain for all students was seventy-eight percent (78%) for reading and seventy-three percent (73%) for math. A review of grade specific data revealed that fifth graders demonstrated the largest percentage of students making annual learning gains in both reading and math (82% and 81% respectively). Sixth graders making annual learning gains were at the school average for reading (78%), and slightly above the school average for math (75%). While fourth graders were slightly below the school average for annual learning gains for reading (75%) and the percentage of fourth graders making annual learning gains in math was 62%, significantly below the school average.

In addition, an analysis was completed of instructional data using Scholastic Reading Inventory (SRI) results, Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), as well as District Required Assessments, and Running Records. This analysis reveals that 89% of our current first through third grade students are working on or above grade level in reading and 40% are working on or above grade level in mathematics.

While an overall focus on improved student performance and annual learning gains for reading and math at all grade levels, as well as writing at fourth grade and science at fifth grade is consistent with our general needs, the analysis of this data provides specific areas of focus for improvement. These areas include the implementation of strategies to ensure the following: satisfactory grade level achievement for our students with disabilities, continuous improvement of learning gains for our lowest 25% while maintaining the learning gains for our highest performing student (levels 4 and 5 on FCAT), as well as ensuring overall learning gains for our current 4th and 5th grade students. Additionally, mathematics proficiency will be a school wide focus at all grade levels. While the average score for fourth graders on FCAT Writing was 3.6, above the target of 3.0, this will continue to be an additional area of focus for the 2012-2013 school year.

Analysis of Current Practice: *(How do we currently conduct business?)*

Research-based programs comprise the core instructional materials that support our standards based instruction in all content areas. Teachers work with students in flexible groups to address the needs of all learners. Differentiation of instruction methods and content, student products, and learning processes to address the needs of students working on, above, and below grade level are employed as a general instructional strategy in all classrooms. The Media Specialist works collaboratively with classroom teachers in support of core instruction, to provide literary and research-based support of units of study, to provide technology instruction in both social and collaborative computing, and assist students with technology based student projects. Exceptional Student Education (ESE) teachers and instructional staff support core instruction as well as provide targeted intervention for ESE students and as part of Tier II and III services. ESE teachers also serve as valuable resources to teachers in the areas of interventions and differentiation.

The high quality instructional staff have embraced and driven the professional development of the school. This has included Marzano's <u>Classroom Instruction That Works</u>, Multiple Intelligences and Brain Compatible Learning, Kagan Cooperative Learning Structures and Thinking Maps. Whole-staff trainings were an extension of the year-long PLC study group using Robert Marzano's Classroom Instruction That Works. Kagan Cooperative Learning Structures are specifically designed to foster cooperation and collaboration within student groups. Student engagement is fostered through the structures as their very design requires student accountability and involvement. The structures can be used to teach content, as a formative measure to assess in-process content knowledge, and in product-based assessments. Thinking Maps (nonlinguistic representations) are graphic organizers that are used for specific tasks related to representing knowledge and information, and correspond with eight fundamental thinking processes.

Multi-Tiered System of Supports ensures that students in need of additional support are identified early and provided targeted intervention at the time of need. Teacher collaboration and S.M.A.R.T. Time teams are comprised of grade level team members plus at least one additional staff member who meet monthly to address the needs of students. The expertise of the staff in sharing best practices is an important element of SMART Time teams. This had led to significant improvement in the annual outcome measure for our lowest 25% as well as our upper quartile students.

The nature of the Professional Learning Culture (PLC) is a fluid and dynamic. Teacher teams collaborate monthly to address best practices within grade level teams, grade cluster groups, or whole staff groups. Teacher Learning Communities meet twice per month to address grade specific instruction, assessments, professional development needs as identified by the grade level TLC. In addition TLC's serve in support of collaboration on teacher Professional Growth Plans.

Classroom teachers use common planning time to address best practices in planning instruction, pacing, and to develop the common formative assessments used to focus instruction on knowledge gaps, misconceptions, and errors that occur during instruction of content to enhance the factual and long-term acquisition of key instructional concepts.

Teachers use multi-media applications to enhance content and to provide students the opportunity to use technology to create student products that demonstrate mastery of all instructional content.

The Professional Learning Culture has identified, differentiated instruction, Thinking Maps, Kagan Cooperative Learning Structures, and 21st Century Instruction (Creativity & Innovation, Critical Thinking, & Problem Solving) as focus areas to improve instruction and student performance. Informal surveys, Classroom Walk-Through data, and Curriculum Teams data suggests that while some teachers are incorporating these high-yield instructional practices, they are not being used in a systemic fashion across all grade levels and content areas. Student performance in all content areas will improve with continued focus and professional development as we move toward systemic use of these targeted teacher tools.

Differentiation of instruction through flexible small-groups is a research-based instructional approach that targets instruction to meet students where they are in the learning process and move them along at a pace appropriate for that child which positively impacts student achievement. Carol Ann Tomlinson (The Education Digest, Jan. 2000) states, "Differentiated instruction is not a strategy. It is a total way of thinking about learners, teaching, and learning." The focus of differentiation should be on content (what the student needs to know), process (activities that engage the student in master of the content), and product (the vehicle that the student uses to show mastery of content). In "How to Differentiate Instruction in Mixed-Ability Classrooms," also by Carol Ann Tomlinson, she states, "In a differentiated classroom, the teacher assumes that different learners have differing needs. Therefore, the teacher proactively plans a variety of ways to 'get at' and express learning." The teacher must possess the fundamental understanding that the more the learning is tailored to the individual students based on their needs, the greater the chances are that the learning experience will provide the most appropriate fit for students. She further states that, "Effective differentiation will typically be proactively planned by the teacher to be robust enough to address a range of learner needs."

In Robert Marzano's Classroom Instruction that Works, 9 high yield instructional strategies are identified as those most likely to improve student performance across all content areas. Of the nine, Nonlinguistic Representations and Cooperative Learning had a net effect of a 27 percentile gain in student achievement as measured through a McREL study. These high yield instructional practices cross all content areas and student achievement.

The Partnership for 21st Century Skills presents a framework for 21st century teaching and learning that combines a specific focus on student learning outcomes with innovative support systems to help students master the skills required of them in the 21st century. According to the partnerships website located at www.p21.org, the key elements of 21st century learning are represented through specific standards, skills, curriculum, instruction, professional development, and learning environments. Instruction focuses on learning and innovation skills that are recognized as the skills that separate students who are prepared for increasingly complex life and work environments in the 21st century, and those who are not. The 21st Century Learning and Innovation Skills are;
- Creativity & Innovation
- Critical Thinking & Problem Solving
- Communication
- Collaboration

Arthur L. Costa and Bena Kallick write of, "shifting our mental models," in their chapter, It Takes Some Getting Used To; Rethinking Curriculum for the 21st Century in the book, Curriculum 21 edited by Heidi Hayes Jacobs. That mental model includes what we teach, how we teach, and how we asses student learning growth. They specifically point out that such changes require an open mind, flexibility, patience and courage. It is not easy to depart from the comfort of teacher planning handbooks and pacing guides. Tony Wagner suggests that a learning environment in which critical thinking, problem solving, collaboration and leadership are present is, "necessary for learning in school, in the workplace, and in life."

CONTENT AREA:

Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Parental Involvement	Drop-out Programs
Language Arts	Social Studies	Arts/PE	Other:		

School Based Objective: *(Action statement: What will we do to improve programmatic and/or instructional effectiveness?)*

> Teachers will use high-yield instructional practices in the delivery of standards-based instruction which targets the 21st century Learning and Innovation skills of Communication and Collaboration, Creativity and Innovation, and Critical Thinking and Problem Solving.

Strategies: *(Small number of action oriented staff performance objectives)*

Barrier	Action Steps	Person Responsible	Timetable	Budget	In-Process Measure
1. Time – accomplished through dedicated time on the master schedule	1. Collaboration among the professional staff is accomplished through dedicated and protected time on the master calendar.	Administrators Instructional Staff	Beginning August 16, 2012; Third Thursday of each month and two Mondays per month alternating with Faculty Meetings	none	Team meeting notes, artifacts, master calendar, survey Baseline – 72.3% of teachers engage in collaboration at least once per week.
2. Time & Fidelity	2. B.E.S.T. training and strategies are used by teachers and provide a focus for continued professional development for the instructional staff.	Administrators Instructional Staff	Preplanning week of August 1 – 7 October 12, 2012 Implementation beginning August 8, 2012	$200.00	Training logs, artifacts, observation, survey Baseline – 56.9% of teachers use B.E.S.T. instructional strategies daily

3. Fidelity	3. Student engagement is assured through the use of Kagan Cooperative Learning Structures.	Administrators Instructional Staff	Preplanning week of August 1 – 7 October 12, 2012 Implementation beginning August 8, 2012	$200.00	Lesson plans, artifacts, observation, survey Baseline – 15.5% of teachers use Kagan Structures daily; Baseline - 45.1% of teachers use Kagan Structures weekly
4. Fidelity	4. Student instructional needs are met through differentiation of content, process, and product.	Administrators Instructional Staff	Preplanning week of August 1 – 7 October 12, 2012 Implementation beginning August 8, 2012	$200.00	Lesson plans, artifacts, observation, survey Baseline – 57.1% of teachers provide differentiated instruction daily
5. Fidelity	5. Center-based activities are used in support of core instruction and to serve as a platform for Learning and Innovation Skills.	Administrators Instructional Staff	Preplanning week of August 1 – 7 October 12, 2012 Implementation beginning August 8, 2012	$200.00	Lesson plans, artifacts, observation, survey Baseline – 21.7 % use center-based activities daily Baseline – 47.8% use center-based activities weekly

| 6. Fidelity & Technology Resources | 6. Technology applications are embedded in core instruction to target standards-based instructional content, along with information and media literacy. | Administrators

Instructional Staff | Preplanning week of August 1 – 7

October 12, 2012

Implementation beginning August 8, 2012 | $1000.00 | Lesson plans, artifacts, observation, survey

Baseline - |

EVALUATION – Outcome Measures and Reflection

Qualitative and Quantitative Professional Practice Outcomes: *(Measures the level of implementation of the professional practices throughout the school)*

Professional development records and walk-through data will provide quantitative data on the completion and implementation of specific professional development and strategies. Building level artifacts, team notes, and records will provide qualitative documentation of teacher collaboration, and strategy implementation. Teacher survey data and established group norms will provide both qualitative and quantitative data on implementation of the strategies of the SIP. This data will provide evidence of the systemic use of high yield instructional practices that are a part of daily instruction in classrooms throughout Ocean Breeze Elementary School. Teachers will own these strategies and employ them, not only in a preplanned manner, but with spontaneity as a function of the dynamic teaching and learning process with students.

Qualitative and Quantitative Student Achievement Expectations: *(Measures of student achievement)*

FCAT, End of Year content area assessments, FAIR, SRI, FAA, and CELLA provide pre and post school year intervention data with which to measure student progress. The expectation is that each student will make a year's worth of progress, and any achievement gaps for individual students show evidence of narrowing. A data wall, and regularly scheduled data chats will provide ongoing and timely information on individual student progress toward grade level mastery of standards. In addition to these quantitative measure, walk-through data and student survey data will provide evidence of teacher practices and student attitudes and thoughts on the degree to which teacher use of high yield strategies make learning more engaging and enjoyable. Parent survey data will provide additional data regarding the objectives of this plan.

APPENDIX A

Reading Goal **1. Increase the percent of students reading at proficiency as determined by standardized annual assessments and benchmark assessments.**	2012 Current Level of Performance 85.5% = 279 students	2013 Expected Level of Performance 88% = 287 students
Anticipated Barrier(s): 1. **Aligning instruction to match standards requiring abstract, high-level, inferential thinking skills.**		
Strategy(s): 1. **Professional development in unpacking the Common Core State Standards.** 2. **Identify achievement gaps between expected levels of student performance and outcome performance data.** 3. **Plan instruction to target achievement gaps.** 4. **Team meetings at least twice per month to address on-going progress monitoring.** 5. **Use of a Data Wall and regularly scheduled Data Chats to ensure individual student progress toward closing achievement gaps.**		
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 **Barrier(s): Deeper conceptual knowledge required.** **Strategy(s):** 1. **Align instruction** 2. **Monitor individual student progress with greater regularity**	27.8% = 91 students	30% = 98 students
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Reading **Barrier(s): Aligning instruction to meet expectations** **Strategy(s):** 1. **Conduct teacher training on expectations** 2. **Monitor individual student progress with greater regularity**	16% = 1 student	32% = 2 students

FCAT 2.0
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Reading
 	
Barrier(s): Enrichment strategies applied as a general instructional strategy in each classroom.
 	
Strategy(s):
  1. **Share best practices school wide as well as within each grade level**
  2. **Use data chats and data wall as a tool to address those students who will benefit from additional enrichment strategies**
	57.5% =188 students	60% = 196 students

Florida Alternate Assessment:
Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading
 	
Barrier(s): Aligning instruction to meet expectations
 	
Strategy(s):
 	
  1. **Conduct teacher training on expectations**
  2. **Monitor individual student progress with greater regularity**
	16% = 1 student	32% = 2 students

Florida Alternate Assessment:
Percentage of students making learning Gains in Reading
 	
Barrier(s): Aligning instruction to meet expectations
 	
Strategy(s):
 	
  1. **Conduct teacher training on expectations**
  2. **Monitor individual student progress with greater regularity**
	50% = 2 students	75% = 3 students

FCAT 2.0
Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading
 	
Barrier(s): Focus the lens on incremental changes in performance
 	
Strategy(s):
  1. **Align instruction**
  2. **Monitor individual student progress with greater regularity**
	72% = 32 students	75% = 33 students

Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: **Baseline data 2010-11: 18%**	15% = 49 students	13% = 43 students

Student subgroups by ethnicity NOT making satisfactory progress in reading :	Enter numerical data for current level of performance	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance
Multiracial	64% = 9 students	50% = 7 students
White	16.3% =45 students	13% =36 students
Black	0	0
Hispanic	.5% = 1 student	0
Asian	0	0
American Indian	0	0
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** 1.	0% = 0 students	0% = 0 students

Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Reading
Barrier(s): Ensuring core grade level instruction and support
 	
Strategy(s):
    1.   **Align instruction for each student**
    2.   **Maximize human resources to support student learning needs**
    3.   **Monitor individual student progress with greater regularity**
	38.7% = 12 students	32 = 10 students

Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Reading **Barrier(s): Ensuring core grade level instruction and support** **Strategy(s):** 1. Align instruction for each student 2. Maximize human resources to support student learning needs 3. Monitor individual student progress with greater regularity	27.7% = 20 students	25% = 18 students

Reading Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/ Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring
Common Core State Standards	October 2012	Grade level team and collaboration meeting notes, grade level meeting notes
High Yield Instructional Strategies follow up training	August 2012 and ongoing via TLC's	PGP documentation, walk through data

CELLA GOAL	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/ Monitoring
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Listening/ Speaking:** 57%	**Barrier(s): Ensuring core grade level instruction and support**	1. **Align instruction for each student** 2. **Maximize human resources to support student learning needs** 3. **Monitor individual student progress with greater regularity**	Classroom teachers and administration share a joint responsibility for learning process and progress monitoring
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Reading:** 0 5	**Barrier(s): Ensuring core grade level instruction and support**	4. **Align instruction for each student** 5. **Maximize human resources to support student learning needs** 6. **Monitor individual student progress with greater regularity**	Classroom teachers and administration share a joint responsibility for learning process and progress monitoring
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Writing**: 43%	**Barrier(s): Ensuring core grade level instruction and support**	7. **Align instruction for each student** 8. **Maximize human resources to support student learning needs** 9. **Monitor individual student progress with greater regularity**	Classroom teachers and administration share a joint responsibility for learning process and progress monitoring

Mathematics Goal(s):	2012 Current Level of Performance	2013 Expected Level of Performance
1. Increase the percent of students demonstrating proficiency in mathematics as determined by standardized annual assessments and benchmark assessments.	74% = 240 students	80% = 262 students
Anticipated Barrier(s): 1. **Aligning instruction to match standards requiring abstract, high-level, inferential thinking skills.**		
Strategy(s): 1. **Professional development in unpacking the Common Core State Standards.** 2. **Identify achievement gaps between expected levels of student performance and outcome performance data.** 3. **Plan instruction to target achievement gaps.** 4. **Team meetings at least twice per month to address on-going progress monitoring.** 5. **Use of a Data Wall and regularly scheduled Data Chats to ensure individual student progress toward closing achievement gaps.**		
FCAT 2.0 **Barrier(s): Deeper conceptual knowledge required.** **Strategy(s):** 1. **Align instruction** 2. **Monitor individual student progress with greater regularity**	29.7% = 97 students	32% = 105 students
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Reading **Barrier(s): Aligning instruction to meet expectations** **Strategy(s):** 3. **Conduct teacher training on expectations** 4. **Monitor individual student progress with greater regularity**	33.3% =2 students	50% = 3 students
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Reading **Barrier(s): Enrichment strategies applied as a general instructional strategy in each classroom.** **Strategy(s):** 3. **Share best practices school wide as well as within each grade level** 4. **Use data chats and data wall as a tool to address those students who will benefit from additional enrichment strategies**	43.7% = 143 students	46% = 150 students

Florida Alternate Assessment:
Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading
 	
Barrier(s): Aligning instruction to meet expectations
 	
Strategy(s):
 	
   3.   **Conduct teacher training on expectations**
   4.   **Monitor individual student progress with greater regularity**
	0% = 0 students	

Florida Alternate Assessment:
Percentage of students making learning Gains in Mathematics
 	
Barrier(s): Aligning instruction to meet expectations
 	
Strategy(s):
 	
   3.   **Conduct teacher training on expectations**
   4.   **Monitor individual student progress with greater regularity**
	16% = 1 student	32% = 2 students

FCAT 2.0
Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics
 	
Barrier(s): Focus the lens on incremental changes in performance
 	
Strategy(s):
   1.   **Align instruction**
   2.   **Monitor individual student progress with greater regularity**
	62% = 38 students	70% = 43 students

Florida Alternate Assessment:
Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics
 	
Barrier(s): Focus the lens on incremental changes in performance
 	
Strategy(s):
   1.   **Align instruction**
   2.   **Monitor individual student progress with greater regularity**
	0% = 0 students	

Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: **Baseline Data 2010-11: 24%**	26% = 64 students	20% = 53 students
Student subgroups by ethnicity : Multiracial White Black Hispanic Asian American Indian	21% = 3 students 21.8% = 60 students 0 50% = 1 student 0 0	14% = 2 students 18% = 51 students 0 0 0 0
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	60% = 3 students	40% = 2 students

Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	50% = 16 students	40% = 13 student
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	31.6% =32 students	27% = 27 students

Mathematics Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/ Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring
Common Core State Standards	October 2012	Grade level team and collaboration meeting notes, grade level meeting notes
High Yield Instructional Strategies follow up training	August 2012 and ongoing via TLC's	PGP documentation, walk through data

Writing Goal	2012 Current Level of Performance	2013 Expected Level of Performance
1. **Increase the percent of students demonstrating proficiency in writing to 94% as measured by FCAT Writing.**	**89.4% = 76 students**	**94% = 80 students**
Barrier(s): Misalignment of curriculum and instruction **Strategy(s):** 1. **Provide explicit writing instruction to include spelling and conventions**		
FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement level 3.0 and higher in writing	89.4% =76 students	94% = 80 students
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing	50% = 1 student	100% = 2 students

Science Goal(s) (Elementary and Middle)	2012 Current Level of Performance	2013 Expected Level of Performance
1. Increase the percent of students demonstrating proficiency in Science to 90% as measured by FCAT Science.	85.4% = 76 students	90% = 80 students

Barrier(s): Hands-on lab experiences beyond the textbook.
 	
Strategy(s):
  1. **Align instruction to provide hands-on lab experiences**
  2. **Monitor individual student progress with greater regularity**		

FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Science**:**	47.2% = 42 students	52% = 46 students
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science	0% = 0 students	
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Science:	38.2% = 34 students	43% = 38 students
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading	0%	

Additional Goal(s)	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/Monitoring
Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: Goal 1: Improve average daily attendance to at or above 95%.	1. Parent perceptions regarding absence from school. 2. Student attitudes. 3. Students with chronic health conditions.	1. Provide information to parents on the importance of regular school attendance. 2. Contact and meet with parents on the 5th absence during a semester. 3. Ensure that students with chronic health conditions have met with the school team, and have proper documentation. 4. Provide incentives for regular school attendance and recognize classes with 100% attendance.	1. Classroom teacher 2. Office Clerk 3. Administrator(s) 4. Guidance Counselor

For the following areas, please write a brief narrative that includes the data for the year 2011-12 and a description of changes you intend to incorporate to improve the data for the year 2012-13.

MULTI-TIERED SYSTEM OF SUPPORTS (MTSS)/RtI (Identify the MTSS leadership team and it role in development and implementation of the SIP along with data sources, data management and how staff is trained in MTSS)

The Individual Problem Solving Team at Ocean Breeze Elementary School is comprised of a school administrator, ESE teacher, guidance counselor, school psychologist, classroom teacher(s), and other support staff. The team meets weekly to address student learning and behavior needs that are interfering with student learning progress. Classroom teachers were trained on Response to Intervention and MTSS during prior school years, and updated in August 2012. Specific guidelines for the process of applying MTSS to daily practices is included in our Staff Handbook, and reinforced through grade level meetings, data chats, and S.M.A.R.T. Time.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT: Ocean Breeze continues to have strong parental involvement through an active Parent Teacher Organization, School Advisory Council, and strong Apple Core Volunteer program that has consistently enable us to meet the Golden School Award based, in part, on the involvement of our community in the schools and the number of hours volunteered annually. The annual survey of parents provided evidence the overall level of involvement and other important indicators. Almost ninety-three percent (92.9%) of parents attended informational meetings or academic events during the 2011-12 school year with 91.3% indicating that the information was useful. General satisfaction percentage with instruction, homework, instructional materials, technology, safe and clean school environment was solidly in the mid 80's.

ATTENDANCE: (Include current and expected attendance rates, excessive absences and tardies)
Ocean Breeze Elementary is currently experiencing an average daily attendance rate of 95.8%. The 2011-12 history, however, is that this level drops throughout the year to below the target of 95%. Strategies have been employed in the past to combat improved individual student and average daily attendance and tardiness.

SUSPENSION: There were 16 separate suspensions during the 2011-12 school year. These suspensions involved 7 different students. None of the suspensions involved law enforcement or criminal charges.

DROP-OUT (High Schools only): n/a

POSTSECONDARY READINESS: (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? Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report.) **n/a**