FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: AVALON ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Collier

Principal: Dr. Francine Eufemia

SAC Chair: Ms. Maribel Mejia

Superintendent: Dr. Kamela Patton

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 9/21/2012



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) |
|-----------|---------------------|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| Principal | Francine Eufemia | Studies, Stockton State College; Master of Elementary Education, College of New Jersey; Educational Specialist Educational Leadership, NOVA Southeastern; Doctorate in Educational Leadership, University of Florida; School Principal Certification – State of Florida | 1 | 8 | 2012 – School Grade A (EES) Reading Level 3+ = 71% Reading Gains = 83% Reading Lowest 25% Gains = 81% Math Level 3+ = 64% Math Gains = 83% Math Lowest 25% Gains = 71% Writing 3.0+ = 73% Science Level 3+ = 52% 2012 EES School Letter Grade from B to A. 2012 Learning gains fourth highest in district in reading and math. Maintained a school letter grade of A three out of four years at EES with an increasing level of Economically disadvantaged students. |
| | | M.S Educational Leadership, FGCU; B.A. | | | 2012 - School Grade C (Avalon Elementary School) Reading Level 3+ = 38% |

| Assis Principal | Jennifer Gates | Psychology Framingham (Massachusetts) State University; Certifications: School Principal All Levels, Educational | 4 | 4 | Reading Gains = 58% Reading Lowest 25% Gains = 76% Math Level 3+ = 39% Math Gains = 66% Math Lowest 25% Gains = 78% Writing 3.0+ = 63% Science Level 3+ = 36% |
|-----------------|-------------------|---|---|---|---|
| | | Leadership, | | | While school letter grade remained a C, |
| | | Elementary | | | there was a 16 points improvement for SY |
| | | Education; | | | 2012 when compared with SY 2011. |

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) |
|--------------|-----------------------|---|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| Reading | Colleen Witzke | M.A. Elementary Education; B.A. Elementary Education and ESE Certification: K - 6 and ESE 2012 - School Grade C Reading Level 1 = 27% Reading Level 2 = 37% Reading Level 3 = 20% Reading Level 4 = 14% Reading Level 4 = 14% Reading Gains = 58% | | Reading Level 1 = 27% Reading Level 2 = 37% Reading Level 3 = 20% Reading Level 4 = 14% Reading Level 5 = 2% Reading Gains = 58% Reading Gains, Lowest 25% = 76% | |
| Math | Meghan Bankhead | B.S. Elementary Education; Certification: K-6 | 2 | 1 | 2012 - School Grade C • Mathematics Level 1 = 22% • Mathematics Level 2 = 36% • Mathematics Level 3 = 24% • Mathematics Level 4 = 15% • Mathematics Level 5 = 3% • Mathematics Gains = 66% • Mathematics Gains, Lowest 25% = 78% |
| Science | Elizabeth Kirshner | BS Criminal Justice , Minor is Sociology: Florida Southern College MA Education: Florida Gulf Coast University Certification K-6 | | 2 | 2012School Grade A Highest science gains in the district. |

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 | All of our teachers are highly qualified. In order to retain our teachers, we will provide ongoing professional development and mentor support for teachers new to our school. | Principal | June 2013 | |
| 2 | Monthly new teacher meetings with mentors and leadership team. | Principal | June 2013 | |
| 3 | | Principal, Asst. Principal, Instructional Team Leaders | June 2013 | |
| 4 | Site-based and district professional development targeted to teacher needs. | Leadership Team | June 2013 | |
| 5 | Dalassa tima for taschare to observe vatorsa taschare | Assistant Principal | June 2013 | |
| 6 | On-going collaborative team planning. | Leadership Team | 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 |
|---|---|
| Teachers: No teachers received a less than effective rating. All teachers are Highly Qualified. Out-of-field: ELL Endorsement: | a |

Staff Demographics

Please complete the following demographic information about the instructional staff in the school.

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

| Total Number of Instructional Staff | % of First-Year Teachers | | % of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience | % of Teachers with Advanced Degrees | % Highly Effective Teachers | % Reading Endorsed Teachers | % National Board Certified Teachers | % ESOL Endorsed Teachers |
|--|--------------------------------|-----------|---|--|---|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| 45 | 4.4%(2) | 53.3%(24) | 28.9%(13) | 13.3%(6) | 33.3%(15) | 100.0%(45) | 8.9%(4) | 2.2%(1) | 75.6%(34) |

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 |
|----------------|--------------------|---|---|
| Lisa Ettleman | Jane Keddie | Mentor has a proven record of improving student achievement in primary grades. She has received clinical educator training and has supported new teachers successfully in the past. | The mentor and mentee will meet weekly for planning meetings. The mentor receives release time to observe the mentee and provide feedback. The mentee will also receive release time if needed to observe veteran teachers. In addition a new teacher induction program, with monthly meetings is held. Each meeting covers a separate topic (i.e. classroom management, PBS, RTI, data warehouse). |
| Megan Bankhead | Hannah Schouten | Mentor has a proven record of improving student achievement in intermediate grades. She has received clinical educator training and has supported new teachers successfully in the past. Mentee is teaching with CCPS for the | The mentor and mentee will meet weekly for planning meetings. The mentor receives release time to observe the mentee and provide feedback. The mentee will also receive release time if needed to observe veteran teachers. In addition a new teacher induction program, with monthly meetings is held. Each meeting covers a separate topic (i.e. classroom management, PBS, RTI, data warehouse). |

| first time. | |
|-------------|--|
|-------------|--|

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

- The Collier County School district provides a systematic and strategic approach to providing services through the District Strategic Plan, 3 Year Academic Plan, the K-12 Comprehensive Reading Plan and District Collaborative Planning process. Goals and objectives of each program and department are aligned with these overarching district plans. Additionally:
- Title I Parts A, C, D, and School Improvement (1003a and 1003g), Title II Part A and Title III are managed out of the same Federal and State Grants and English Language Learner Office in Collier County. They share administrative staff so that oversight, coordination, budgeting, staffing, and monitoring are efficiently and effectively coordinated. In addition to informal communications, monthly formal administrative meetings are held to discuss program needs, issues and coordinate efforts.
- Support staff of the Title I Part A, Title I Part C, Title I Part D, and Title X programs meet regularly to coordinate efforts and receive joint staff development for improving their services.
- Regularly scheduled Curriculum and Instruction department meetings are scheduled that include district level program coordinators, including IDEA, Perkins, Head Start, Supplemental Academic Instruction, Advanced Placement Initiative, Career and Technical Education
- LEA, Title I Basic, Title I Migrant, Title X coordinate services to assist homeless parents of homeless children, and shelters representing the homeless children to resolve problems concerning registration and educational services at Title I schools. The LEA provides services in coordination with the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act.
- Title I and District joint funding of the Homeless Liaison staff position and use of additional Title I Part A funds to provide after school tutorials for homeless students in non-Title I schools.
- Title I Part A, Title II Part A and RTTT fund exam reimbursements to ensure staff meet HQT Requirements.
- Title I Part A funds used in collaboration with Title I SIG 1003g, Title II Part A and Reading to fund Academic Coaches at Elementary, Middle and High schools, depending on school DA status and professional learning needs of school faculty.
- As applicable, depending on school:
- District Resource Team meetings will provide forum for coordination and integration of resources to support unique needs of school sites.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

- Title I Migrant, Title I Basic, Title III funds are coordinated to provide at risk students with supplemental instructional support and resources in form of supplemental resource teachers, counselors, paraprofessionals, tutors.
- Title I Migrant, Title I Basic and Title II Part A funds are coordinated to provide customized professional learning that ensures students receive high quality, differentiated instruction.
- Title I Migrant and school collaboration occurs with local eye doctor to provide eye exams and glasses at no cost to migrant students in need or at a discounted price to our program.
- Coordination occurs with Homeless Liaison staff and Title I Migrant staff in identifying eligible students and families that can be served as homeless.

Title I, Part D

Title II

- Title II, Part A collaborates with Collier County Public School's Human Resources in providing funds that are used to reimburse teachers striving to meet Highly Qualified
- Teacher requirements through subject area tests. This helps ensure that all teachers meet HQT requirements and provide high quality instruction.
- Title II funds will support schools with instructional coaching, lesson planning and professional learning by funding several teachers on special assignment in areas of Math and Science; these staff will integrate with the instructional staff at school sites to ensure high quality instruction differentiated to address unique student needs.
- Coordination of professional learning activities, including those funded by Title II, occurs through the following activities: o Individual schools conduct annual staff development surveys to determine staff development needs. A district comprehensive Staff Development Plan and consolidated planning coordinates all available district resources.

 o Staff development within a school (including the use of Title I money) is coordinated through the SIP/Title I Plan and
- o Staff development within a school (including the use of Title I money) is coordinated through the SIP/Title I Plan and comprehensive needs assessment.

- o Title I and II in-service is coordinated through Learning Support Services departmental curriculum staff.
- o The Director of Federal and State Grants, Executive Director of Federal and State Grants and ELL, the Chief Academic Officer review the professional development allocations in the Title I plans and in the Title II project.
- o Reading coaches receive ongoing professional development through their bi-monthly literacy team meetings. The teacher's individual plan (IPDP) is based upon an assessment of student learning needs, and this analysis of student achievement data in reading is essential to the creation of each teacher's professional development plan.
- o The district will provide ongoing professional development and support for principals on classroom walk-through strategies, including how to give feedback to teachers.

Title III

Title I and Title III administrators have met to collaborate by providing Title I schools the optimum resources necessary to bring improve academic instruction. This has allowed them to maximize productivity while also eliminating duplicity of services, use of personnel and instructional materials. There are five major areas of collaboration: 1) tutoring, 2) teacher training, 3) parental involvement activities, 4) highly qualified personnel and 5) before and after school programs to address the needs of our most needy students in order to improve student achievement and development while meeting the Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs). Upon reviewing and analyzing the English Language Learners' (ELLs) data, found key factors that prevented the District from achieving the Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives (AMAOs). Among those factors are included two groups:

Group 1 presented the following challenges:

- 1) Lack of previous education or limited education,
- 2) Lack of literacy in heritage language
- 3) Lack of academic skills in ELLs' heritage language,
- 4) Lack of consistency in attending school in home country and/or in the United States, and
- 5) Lack of parental support in the home.

Group 2 presented the following challenges:

- 1) Uninterrupted education.
- 2) Average literacy in heritage language.
- 3) Less than average academic proficiency in heritage language.
- 4) Consistency in attending school, and
- 5) Some parental support in the home.

(See District School Improvement Plan for English Language Learners.)

Title X- Homeless

The Collier County School District, through a No Child Left Behind grant, provides support services and resources for homeless students and their families. A homeless liaison works with school staff, Title I Migrant staff, and community agencies, and local shelters to identify eligible students, expedite school registration and bus transportation, as well as provide school supplies, shoes and uniforms. The homeless liaison aids in securing before and after school care for students when appropriate. The liaison also monitors enrollment data, attendance records, and grades for all homeless students through the district database and school contacts. Coordination services are provided by the LEA as they relate to the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act. The support staff from the Title I Part A, Title I Part D, and Title X programs regularly meets to coordinate services as well as participate in staff development. Homeless students and their parents are served by LEA, Title I Basic, Title I Migrant personnel and shelters to address issues concerning the registration and educational services at Title I schools. Title I and district funding provides for after school tutorials for homeless students in non-title I schools.

| S | upplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) |
|---|--|
| | |
| L | |
| V | iolence Prevention Programs |
| | |

Nutrition Programs

The District is offering breakfast at no charge to all students through the USDA Provision 2 breakfast program. All reduced students are receiving lunch at no charge. The NSLP Fresh Fruit and Vegetable program is being offered in twelve elementary schools. We are continuing to institute the OrganWise program through the University of Florida in qualifying elementary schools.

Housing Programs

N/A

The Collier County School District, through a No Child Left Behind grant, provides support services and resources for homeless students and their families. A homeless liaison works with school staff, Title I Migrant staff, and community agencies, and local shelters to identify eligible students, expedite school registration and bus transportation, as well as provide school supplies, shoes and uniforms. The homeless liaison aids in securing before and after school care for students when appropriate. The liaison also monitors enrollment data, attendance records, and grades for all homeless students through the district database and school contacts. Coordination services are provided by the LEA as they relate to the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act.

The support staff from the Title I Part A, Title I Part C, Title I Part D, and Title X programs regularly meets to coordinate services as well as participate in staff development. Homeless students and their parents are served by LEA, Title I Basic, Title I Migrant personnel and shelters to address issues concerning the registration and educational services at Title I schools. Title I and district funding provides for after school tutorials for homeless students in non-title I schools.

Head Start

The Head Start Program in Collier County Public Schools serves 712 four-year-olds in targeted elementary sites based on the needs of the parents and students. The Head Start Program includes students identified for ESE services, Voluntary Prekindergarten (VPK) students, and students identified as Title I and Migrant. By coordinating efforts and funding, the all-encompassing Head Start Program is able to serve approximately 300 additional eligible students than the funding from Head Start alone supports.

Head Start provides comprehensive services to eligible families and their children. These comprehensive services include education, social services, parent involvement, and health services. These services are coordinated with the requirements of the other funding sources as a seamless service for parents and our 4-year-old students. The Head Start Program is a vital part of our school community and these students are included in all academic and extra-curricular/enrichment programs as appropriate.

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

Career Education students are offered the opportunity to earn a third party industry approved certification which is designed to demonstrate to potential employers the technical skills and abilities for the students. Students also have the opportunity to earn the Florida Ready to Work Credential which is designed to demonstrate to future employers the reading and mathematics skills of the students. The purpose of both credentials is to integrate real world skills and abilities to the instructional objectives for both career and academic courses. In addition all CE programs offer the opportunity to include both On-the-Job Training and or Executive Internships to further show the relationships between high school programs and real world skills.

Job Training

Students are offered Job Training programs through a variety of programs. All CE programs offer On-The-Job Training programs for situations where students are paid. Non-Paid opportunities are offered as Executive Internships. Students may also enroll for the Volunteer class which is offered in many school locations.

In addition to the Career and Technical courses available to all students, the Collier Skill Training for Employment Program (CO-STEP) is designed to meet the unique needs of students with disabilities. This program provides individualized instruction, training, and counseling services to assist students with disabilities in successfully developing marketable skills in career and technical coursework as well as on-the-job training in the community.

Other

N/A

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team-

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

- Dr. Francine Eufemia, Principal
- Ms. Jennifer Gates, Assistant Principal
- Ms. Colleen Witzke, Reading Coach
- Ms. Michelle Mendenhall, Intervention Support Specialist
- Ms. Jennifer Johansen, Guidance Counselor
- Ms. Maria Ashmore, School Psychologist
- Ms. Megan Bankhead, Math Coach

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 MTSS Leadership Team will meet once per month to monitor school-wide student progress.

The team will engage in the following activities:

- 1. Review universal screening data and relate to instructional decisions;
- 2. Review progress monitoring data at each grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team monitors how these students are being serviced;

- 3. Identify/review professional development and resources needed;
- 4. Facilitate the process of building consensus amongst staff;
- 5. Each team member facilitates grade-level weekly data meetings in which team members collaborate to problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skills.

In addition, the team meets as needs dictate to monitor data collection for students for whom interventions have been created. Interventions may be refined and/or revised at this time.

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 MTSS Leadership Team met with the School Leadership Team and SAC members to help develop the school improvement plan (SIP). The team provided data on: instructional targets; academic and social/emotional areas that needed to be addressed. The team helped set clear expectations for instruction (Rigor, Relevance, Relationship); facilitated the development of a systemic approach to teaching (Gradual Release, Essential Questions, Activating Strategies, Teaching Strategies, Extending, Refining, and Summarizing); and aligned processes and procedures.

-MTSS Implementation-

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

Tier I

Reading-FAIR data from PMRN; District Benchmark tests

Math-District formative tests from district data warehouse;

Science-District formative tests from district data warehouse;

Writing-Baseline and monthly prompts

Behavior-Referral data from Student Pass (district database)

Tier II and Tier III

Reading, Math, Science, Writing, Behavior-ongoing progress monitoring from formative assessments; data entered and monitored in district data warehouse

Please note: lesson plans when used as a process to determine effectiveness of strategy are monitored by the principal and assistant principal. These plans are housed in ANGEL - our web-based school PLC information repository. Lesson plans are monitored not less than twice per month.

Our Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) meet as a grade level weekly to review and analyze formative data, as well as design instructional activities to target students with demonstrated weaknesses. The principal and assistant principal meet weekly with the teams to review data, discuss challenges, reflect on education practices, and provide suggestions/listen to suggestions for student improvement.

Avalon has employed an Intervention Support Specialist to assist school teams that meet in grade level teams as professional learning communities throughout the RTI process. During these montly RTI team level meetings, the teams discuss teaching and learning. Teams examine the standards to be taught, share best practices, engage in building common formative assessments and review data. As a team they have strengthened their core teaching and have established that 80% of their students will meet the requirements. Re-teaching will occur as needed for the Tier 1 students. Data Warehouse has been designed to record the minutes from these meetings as well as to follow the progress of groups and individual students. This Tier 1 data will be used during PLCs to follow the rate of student progress over time. Teachers share results and best practices.

As students fail to meet with success in Tier 1 students are referred to the school's RtI team and Tier 2 strategies. The Data Warehouse data management system continues to follow the student's progress as monitored by the PMP. Online assessments and other data points are tracked on the charts and graphs in the Data Warehouse.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The role of the MTSS Leadership team is to oversee the problem solving process, ensure the integrity and consistency of implementation of the process, and facilitate the MTSS Team Meetings.

The district training has incorporated a multi-tiered approach to staff development in the area of MTSS. To facilitate training, a group of Professional Learning Community (PLC) team leaders and key leadership personnel from each school (K-12) completed an intensive 4 day training on MTSS principles and consensus building. The PLC team leaders and key leadership personnel are charged with the responsibility to move MTSS practices forward at the school level. Follow-up training will occurunder the guidance of the District Coordinator through monthly on site walk throughs, problem-solving meetings, and PLC meetings. In addition, the District Coordinator of RtI/PBS will provide monthly follow-up trainings with School-Based MTSS Coordinators. Teachers meet with PLCs twice a month to discuss RtI implementation at their grade level. Finally, mini workshops on MTSS-related topics, such as differentiating instruction, data analysis, and specific intervention training areavailable through district personnel throughout the school year upon the request of a school administrator. In addition to district face-to-face training, a variety of online tools are available for use in the schools. ANGEL is being used as an online

facilitator for MTSS related documents, video clips, training materials and power points, research links, intervention tools, andhas a district Problem Solving/Response to Intervention manual. Also, the district has required all instructional personnel (PK-12) to complete RtI training within the first two years of employment using the Direct Steps online training tool. Each staff member will be required to complete 3 courses.

The PLC teams will continue to monitor progress for all students throughout the year, through the use of the Data Warehouse resources.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

-School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

- Dr. Francine Eufemia, Principal
- Ms. Jennifer Gates, Assistant Principal
- Ms. Colleen Witzke, Reading Coach (Chairperson)
- Ms. Michelle Mendenhall, Intervention Support Specialist
- Ms. Jill Seitz, Media Specialist

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

The goal of the Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) is to assure that the district's K-12 Comprehensive Research-based Reading Plan is implemented with fidelity. A member of the LLT has been assigned to each grade level in order to assist at each of the weekly grade level PLC meetings. The Literacy Leadership Team also meets together quarterly. The focus is on grade level curriculum standards. The team reviews formative assessment data, students' responses to intervention, and links them to instructional decisions. The team collaborates regularly with the aim of problem solving, sharing effective instructional practices, and evaluating implementation. All meetings are documented in the Collier County Data Warehouse.

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

The major initiatives of the Literacy Leadership Team this year are to support the strengthening of core instruction by providing leadership in the use of rigorous instruction, relevant engaging lessons, and building reading stamina. Support for the initiatives will be given through:

- 1. enhancement of the learning center structure to strengthen independent reading, reading strategies, and writing from a source
- 2. teach vocabulary using the roots approach
- 3. school-wide reading challenge (Passport to reading) which promotes independent reading choice for all student K-5.
- 4. support the use of close reading strategies across all academic areas
- 5. lesson study-each grade level will complete a lesson study in one of the core academic areas with a focus on close reading strategies.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification View uploaded file (Uploaded on 9/11/2012)

*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.

All schools implement a minimum of two transition activities for incoming kindergarten students and their families each year. The spring event includes an orientation for parents and students with registration available at that time. At this event, parents and students meet the teachers, visit classrooms, learn about the expectations and the curriculum, and tour the school.

At the spring Orientation and also upon registration, a booklet (available in multiple languages) is provided to all parents. This booklet is designed to help parents look at their child's physical, social, emotional, and cognitive development. It provides checklists and tips to help guide them as they work and play with their child. The checklists contain items that are important to the child's success in kindergarten and are specifically designed for four-year-olds. It also contains school enrollment information and suggestions for the first day of school.

Before school begins in mid-August, the schools hold an Open House for all students and parents to attend. The students and parents are given the opportunity to visit their classrooms, tour the school, visit the cafeteria and media center. This helps with the transition to the start of school.

The School District of Collier County is also a VPK provider, both during the school year and during the summer session. The school year program includes the Head Start/ESE Inclusion/Title I/Migrant prekindergarten classes and a few full-day and half-day VPK/child care classes. These prekindergarten programs are provided in various school sites across the county. Both programs provide opportunities for students to learn the basics for success in school and also provide an easy transition to kindergarten for the students.

| *Grades 6-12 Only |
|---|
| Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S. |
| For schools with Grades 6-12, describe the plan to ensure that teaching reading strategies is the responsibility of every teacher. |
| |
| *High Schools Only |
| Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1003.413(g)(j) F.S. |
| How does the school incorporate applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future? |
| |
| How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is personally meaningful? |
| |
| Postsecondary Transition |
| Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S. |
| Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the <u>High School Feedback Report</u> |
| |

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

| | on the analysis of studen provement for the following | | eference to "Guiding | Questions", identify and o | define areas in need |
|-------|---|--|--|--|---|
| readi | CAT2.0: Students scoringing. | g at Achievement Level 3 | Increase studen | t proficiency in reading fro % (61 students). | m 24% (46 |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perform | nance: | 2013 Expected | Level of Performance: | |
| | ercent of students scoring 4%(46 students). | at Level 3 on FCAT 2012 | | students scoring a Level 3 from 24% (46 students) to | |
| | Pr | oblem-Solving Process t | o Increase Studer | nt Achievement | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 1. Rigor Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking. | Teachers will plan for and include higher order questions in weekly lesson plans so that the questions are purposeful and aligned to the NGSSS or CCSS. | | Monitor lesson plans and provide feedback to teachers. Collect HOTs data during observations. Monitor monthly through trend reports to determine training implications. Monitor monthly through trend reports to | Quarterly Assessment Data - Disaggregated by item complexity rating CTEM Observation Data Data from HOTs collection tool |
| 2 | 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned | Principal AssistantPrincipal | determine training implications. Monitor evidence of Kagan structures in lesson plans. Utilize Non-negotiable collection tool to monitor use of collaborative structures. Utilize iObservation to record the frequency of cooperative strategies observed during classroom visitations. Data will be used to make decisions regarding teacher professional learning. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating Data from Non- negotiable collection tool CTEM Observation Data |
| | 3. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills | Teachers will utilize a minimum of 50% non-fiction/informational text for instruction. Using the close reading model (gr. | Reading Coach, Media Specialist, Principal, Assistant Principal | All grade level teams will participate in a grade level specific Lesson Study to establish best practices for close | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating |

| 3 | non-fiction texts to build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. | through Read Alouds and in grades 3-5 with | reading instruction. Monitoring Lesson Study data and reflections to determine need for teacher training in use of close reading and intertextual triad. | Lesson Study Data and Reflections |
|---|---|--|---|--------------------------------------|
|---|---|--|---|--------------------------------------|

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier Strategy Responsible **Evaluation Tool** Effectiveness of Strategy Monitoring No Data Submitted Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need

of improvement for the following group:

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement
Level 4 in reading.

Reading Goal #2a:

The percent of students scoring above proficiency (Levels 4 and 5) on FCAT 2013 in Reading will increase 14% (28 students) to 15% (32 students).

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

The percent of students scoring above proficiency (Levels 4 and 5) on the FCAT Reading 2012 was 14%(28 students).

The percent of students scoring above proficiency (Levels 4 and 5) on the FCAT Reading 2013 will be 15%(32 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 | 1. Rigor Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking. | Students will write a contract for achieving a 4 on the scale; identifying the specific mastery-level work they will complete to demonstrate exemplary standard/benchmark success. | Classroom teacher Gifted endorsed teachers Gifted Resource Teacher | with students for the purpose of goal setting and reviewing individual | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating |

| 1 | İ | l | l | l | İ |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | enrichment activities. | |
| 2 | 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | questions to be used to lead a Socratic seminar based on the text. Include these questions in Data Binders to be shared during | Classroom teacher Gifted endorsed teachers Gifted Resource Teacher Leadership Team | the HOTS questions that | Disaggregated by |
| 3 | analytic and evaluative | Teacher will infuse Intertextual Triads into instructional units, scaffolding as needed until students are able to analyze and evaluate multiple texts independently. | Classroom teacher Gifted endorsed teachers Gifted Resource Teacher Leadership Team | use of intertextual triads. Data will be used to make decisions regarding | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating Non-negotiable Collection Tool Data |
| | thinking and comprehension strategies. | | | | |

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier Strategy Responsible **Evaluation Tool** Effectiveness of for Strategy Monitoring No Data Submitted

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a: | The percent of students achieving learning gains on the 2013 FCAT in Reading will increase from 56% (68 students) to 60% (88 students). | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |

The percent of students achieving learning gains on the 2012 The percent of students achieving learning gains on FCAT FCAT was 56%(68 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 | 1. Rigor Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking. | Maintain high expectations for all students to appropriately respond to higher order questions, providing scaffolded support and structure as appropriate for low-expectancy students, enabling their success in meeting rigorous expectations. | academic coaches, | | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating PLC Notes which include Intervention Group Data Spreadsheet Data from HOTs collection tool |
| 2 | 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to | · · | Monitor evidence of Kagan structures in lesson plans. Utilize Non-negotiable collection tool to monitor use of collaborative structures. Utilize iObservation to record the frequency of cooperative strategies observed during classroom visitations. Data will be used to make decisions regarding teacher professional learning. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating Data from Non- negotiable collection tool CTEM Observation Data |
| 3 | 3. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills Instruction infrequently utilizes both fiction and non-fiction texts to build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. | Monitor progress a minimum of once per month by monitoring student record of reading behavior which will include a text dependent written response. | academic coaches, principal, assistant | Meet with grade level | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating PLC Notes which include Intervention Group Data Spreadsheet |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in nee of improvement for the following group: | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: | | | | |
| Percentage of students making Learning Gains in | | | | |
| reading. | | | | |
| Reading Goal #3b: | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4: | The percent of students in the Lowest 25% making learning gains on FCAT Reading 2013 will increase from 70%(21 students) to 73% (27 students). | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | | |
| The percent of students in the Lowest 25% making learning gains on FCAT Reading 2012 was 70%(21 students). | The percent of students in the Lowet 25% making learning gains on FCAT Reading 2013 will increase to 73%(27 students). | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| 1 | 1. Rigor Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking. | Maintain high expectations for all students to appropriately respond to higher order questions, providing scaffolded support and structure as appropriate for low-expectancy students, enabling their success in meeting rigorous expectations. | academic coaches, | | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating PLC Notes which include Intervention Group Data Spreadsheet Data from HOTs collection tool |
| 2 | 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to | | Monitor evidence of Kagan structures in lesson plans. Utilize Non-negotiable collection tool to monitor use of collaborative structures. Utilize iObservation to record the frequency of cooperative strategies observed during classroom visitations. Data will be used to make decisions regarding teacher professional learning. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating Data from Non- negotiable collection tool CTEM Observation Data |

| 3 | Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills Instruction infrequently | minimum of once per month by monitoring student record of reading behavior which will include a text dependent written response. | Academic coaches, principal, assistant principal | with grade level data teams a minimum of twice per month to analyze data from Record of Reading Behavior. Disaggregate data by subgroup to determine | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating PLC Notes which include Intervention Group Data Spreadsheet |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| | | | | Provide tiered interventions to support mastery of grade-level benchmarks. | |

| | | | | | | | bench | marks. | |
|----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|-----------|--|--|--|--|
| Based | on Amb | itious but Achiev | able Annual | Measurable Ob | iectiv | ves (AMOs), AM | IO-2, R | leading and Math Pe | rformance Target |
| 5A. Ar Measu | mbitious Irable Ok Will red | but Achievable Abjectives (AMOs) uce their achieve | nnual In six year | Reading Goal # Avalon E over the | ≠ leme | | educe | the achievement of the the year 2012 | gap by 50% |
| Baseline data 2011-2012 2012-201 | | | | 2013-201 | 4 | 2014-201 | 5 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | analysis of stude nt for the followir | | | efere | ence to "Guiding | J Quest | ions", identify and c | define areas in need |
| Hispa satisf | nic, Asia | subgroups by et an, American I r progress in read #5B: | ndian) not n | | | Over six years, decrease by 50' | | mber of students no | ot proficient will |
| 2012 | Current | Level of Perfor | mance: | | | 2013 Expected | d Leve | l of Performance: | |
| Black Hispar | 43% (10 nic 32% | 0 students) 0 students) (44 students) 2 students) | | | | White 70% (24 students) Black 49% (14 students) Hispanic 39% (57 students) Asian 100% (0 students) | | | |
| | | F | roblem-So | Iving Process t | toIn | ocrease Studer | nt Achi | ievement | |
| | Antio | ipated Barrier | St | rategy | | Person or Position esponsible for Monitoring | | rocess Used to Determine ffectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | incorpor strategion promote indepen | do not routinely rate questioning es designed to e critical, dent, and thinking. | data by su order to ic specific to factors as the sub-gr uncovers s to closing achievement teacher wi identify ap differentia | sociated with roup. As data specific barriers the ent gap, II propriate ted nal strategies to | prin | cipal, assistant cipal | data t twice analyz comm and O Comp Asses identi may r key co | per month to ze data from ion assessments | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating Data from HOTS Data Collection Tool CTEM Observation Data |

teachers.

| | | | | Collect HOTs data during observations. Monitor monthly through trend reports to determine training implications. | |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| 2 | 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | data by sub-group in order to identify issues specific to the risk-factors associated with the sub-group. As data uncovers specific barriers to closing the achievement gap, teacher will | Prinicpal, assistant principal | Utilize Non-negotiable collection tool to monitor use of collaborative | Ouarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating Data from Non- negoitable collection tool CTEM Observation Data |
| 3 | | minimum of 50% non- fiction/informational text | Reading Coach, Media Specialist, Principal, Assistant Principal | participate in a grade level specific Lesson Study to establish best practices for close reading instruction. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating Lesson Study Data and Reflections |

| 1 | on the analysis of studen provement for the following | | eference to "Guidino | Q Questions", identify and o | define areas in need | |
|-------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| satis | nglish Language Learnei factory progress in readi ing Goal #5C: | ` ' | , | Over six years, the number of students not proficient will decrease by 50%. | | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perforr | nance: | 2013 Expected | d Level of Performance: | | |
| 24% | (23 students) | | 32% (28 stude | 32% (28 students) | | |
| | Pr | oblem-Solving Process t | to Increase Stude | nt Achievement | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Anticipated Barrier Strategy Ro | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| 1 | 1. Rigor Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking. | Teacher will utilize multiple ELL strategies to meet the needs of second language learners, scaffolding support for meeting high expectations. | Instructional Support Specialist,ELL contact, principal, assistant principal | Monitor lesson plans and provide feedback to teachers. Meet with grade level data teams a minimum of twice per month to analyze data from common assessments and OPM. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating and ELL subgroup PLC Notes which include Intervention Group Data Spreadsheet | |

| | | | | Determine if instruction/intervention is working and adjust instruction as needed. | |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|
| 2 | 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | second language learners, scaffolding support for meeting high expectations. | Instructional Support Specialist,ELL contact, principal, assistant principal | Utilize Non-negotiable collection tool to monitor use of collaborative structures. Utilize iObservation to record the frequency of cooperative strategies observed during classroom visitations. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating and ELL subgroup PLC Notes which include Intervention Group Data Spreadsheet iObservation Data Non-negotiable Data Collection Tool |
| 3 | 3. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills Instruction infrequently utilizes both fiction and non-fiction texts to build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. | Teacher will utilize multiple ELL strategies to meet the needs of second language learners, scaffolding support for meeting high expectations. | Instructional Support Specialist,ELL contact, principal, assistant principal | provide feedback to teachers. Meet with grade level data teams a minimum of twice per month to analyze data from common assessments and OPM. | PLC Notes which include Intervention Group Data Spreadsheet |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need improvement for the following subgroup: | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D: | Over six years, the number of students not proficient will decrease by 50%. | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| 46% (11) | 51% (16) | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |

Person or Process Used to Position Determine Evaluation Anticipated Barrier Strategy Responsible Effectiveness of Tool for Monitoring Strategy INSS, 1. Rigor Teacher will accommodate/adapt An administrator will Quarterly classroom work to be consistent with IEP Classroom attend each IEP Assessment Lessons do not strategies, working in small group or meeting in order to Data teacher, ESE routinely individually with closely monitor Disaggregated resource incorporate students to support improved reading teachers, student progress by subgroup skills(differentiated materials/instruction). toward IEP goals. questioning principal, strategies designed to **IEP** Meeting assistant Submit lesson plans to a central database principal Collect ongoing Notes in Excent (School Shared Drive) to increase ESE promote critical, progress monitoring independent, and data weekly or bicreative remediation/differentiation/accommodation weekly.

| ī | thinking | apportunities in deily instructional | I | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| | thinking. | opportunities in daily instructional practices. | | Meet with grade level data teams a minimum of twice per month to analyze data from common assessments and OPM. | |
| | 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | | INSS, Classroom teacher, ESE resource teachers, principal, assistant principal | Monitor evidence of Kagan structures in lesson plans. Utilize Non-negotiable collection tool to monitor use of collaborative structures. Utilize iObservation to record the frequency of cooperative strategies observed during classroom visitations. Data will be used to make decisions regarding teacher professional learning. | Ouarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by subgroup Data from Nonnegotiable collection tool CTEM Observation Data |
| | 3. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills Instruction infrequently utilizes both fiction and nonfiction texts to build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. | Teacher will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP strategies, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading skills across all content areas. (differentiated materials/instruction). | INSS, Classroom teacher, ESE resource teachers, principal, assistant principal | An administrator will attend each IEP meeting in order to closely monitor student progress toward IEP goals. Collect ongoing progress monitoring data weekly or biweekly. Meet with grade level data teams a minimum of twice per month to analyze data from common assessments and OPM. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by subgroup IEP Meeting Notes in Excent |

| 1 | 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: | | | Over six years, | Over six years, the number of students not proficient will decrease by 50%. | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected | d Level of Performance: | | |
| 34% (61 students) | | | 41% (81 studer | 41% (81 students) | | |
| | Pr | oblem-Solving Process t | o Increase Studer | nt Achievement | | |
| Anticipated Barrier Strategy R | | | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| | Rigor Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to | Teachers will plan for and include higher order questions in weekly lesson plans so that the questions are | Principal, Assistant Principal | Monitor lesson plans and provide feedback to teachers. Collect HOTs data during | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating | |

| 1 | promote critical, independent, and creative thinking. | purposeful and aligned to the NGSSS or CCSS. | | observations. Monitor monthly through trend reports to determine training implications. | CTEM Observation Data Data from HOTs collection tool |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| 2 | 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned | Principal Assistant Principal | Monitor evidence of Kagan structures in lesson plans. Utilize Non-negotiable collection tool to monitor use of collaborative structures. Utilize iObservation to record the frequency of cooperative strategies observed during classroom visitations. Data will be used to make decisions regarding teacher professional learning. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating Data from Non- negotiable collection tool CTEM Observation Data |
| 3 | 3. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills Instruction infrequently utilizes both fiction and non-fiction texts to build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. | Teachers will utilize a minimum of 50% non-fiction/informational text for instruction. Using the close reading model (gr. K-5), in grades K-2 through Read Alouds and in grades 3-5 with intertextual triads, students will build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. | Reading Coach, Media Specialist, Principal, Assistant Principal | All grade level teams will participate in a grade level specific Lesson Study to establish best practices for close reading instruction. Monitoring Lesson Study data and reflections to determine need for teacher training in use of close reading and intertextual triad. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating Lesson Study Data and Reflections |

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 |
|---|------------------------|---|--|--|---|--|
| Close Reading Strategies | K-5 | Reading Coach | Grade level PLCs and school-wide | and faculty | the iObservation tool. | Principal, Assistant Principal |
| Kagan Cooperative Learning | K-5 | Kagan Trainer | School-wide | August 13 and January 4 | Classroom observations using the electronic non-negotiable list as well as CTEM observations using the iObservation tool. Data gathered will be used to direct future professional learning. | Principal, Assistant Principal |

| Stratogy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available |
|--|---|----------------|---|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Amoun |
| Monitor progress a minimum of once per month by monitoring student record of reading behavior which will include a text dependent written response. | .5 Academic Coach K-5 teachers will be provided with intervention and instruction support and techniques to assist in meeting the needs of multiple instructional levels in their classrooms. In addition, K-5 teachers will be provided with data management and date analysis guidance in order to assist in assessment driving planning and instruction. Data analysis will be used for providing appropriate instruction and interventions. | Title 1 | \$29,993.10 |
| Using the close reading model (gr. K-5), in grades K-2 through Read Alouds and in grades 3-5 with intertextual triads, students will build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. | Comprehension Tool Kit | Title 1 | \$2,894.00 |
| | Building Vocabulary from Word Roots Kit | Title 1 | \$1,800.00 |
| Teachers will utilize a minimum of 50% non-fiction/informational text for instruction. Using the close reading model (gr. K-5), in grades K-2 through Read Alouds and in grades 3-5 with intertextual triads, students will build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. | Informational Text | Title 1 | \$500.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$35,187.1 |
| | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amoun |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.0 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amoun |
| Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies that provide support for student | Kagan Cooperative Learning | Title 1 | \$6,778.00 |
| accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | Professional Development Training: August, January | | |
| and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning | 1 | | Subtotal: \$6,778.0 |
| and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning | 1 | | Subtotal: \$6,778.0 |
| and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | 1 | Funding Source | Subtotal: \$6,778.0 Available Amoun |
| and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. Other | August, January | | Available |

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 In 2013, 47% (50 students) will score proficient on the Listening and Speaking subtest of Cella. CELLA Goal #1: 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking: 43% (44) Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine **Anticipated Barrier** Strategy **Evaluation Tool** Effectiveness of Responsible for Strategy Monitoring Students have Monitor progress a Language Arts Monitor evidence of CTEM data. insufficient background minimum of once a and/or ELL Kagan structures in teacher, ELL Spring CELLA knowledge of US month by monitoring lesson plans. cultural norms and student participation in Contact and assessment. Utilize Non-negotiable content specific collaborative activities Reading coach. vocabulary to fully collection tool to and maintaining monitor use of understand oral empirical as well as language. assessment data. collaborative Disaggregate data to structures. determine additional Utilize iObservation to supports that may be record the frequency of needed to improve oral language skills of cooperative strategies identified ELL learners. observed during classroom visitations. Data will be used to make decisions regarding teacher professional learning.

| Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|--|
| 2. Students scoring proficie CELLA Goal #2: | nt in reading. | In 2013, 17% as measured b | (18 students) will be pro y Spring Cella. | ficient in Reading | |
| 2012 Current Percent of Stu | idents Proficient in read | ding: | | | |
| 15% (16) Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| ELL students experience delays in acquisition of reading skills due to limited vocabulary, limited experience to build background knowledge, limited English usage in the home and in many | Employ frequent checks for understanding that include 1:1 questioning with the student or written responses to text dependent questions to determine student's level of understanding of what | Cassroom teacher, ELL Contact and Reading coach. | Classroom Walk Throughs from administrators and coaches to observe: Teachers explaining prerequisite language applications: reading directions, idioms, | CTEM data, CELLA assessment data, FCAT data. | |

sentence starters,

essay formats, pattern

cases, illiteracy in the was read.

home.

| drills, or completing a story map with appropriate checks for understanding. |
|--|
| Observation data will be used to guide professional learning. |

| Stude | ents write in English at gr | ade level in a manner sin | nilar to non-ELL st | udents. | | |
|----------------|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| 3. Stu | udents scoring proficie | nt in writing. | The percentag | The percentage of students scoring proficient in the | | |
| CELLA Goal #3: | | | Writing subtes | t of Cella will increase from 3% (14 students). | | |
| 2012 | 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing: | | | | | |
| 12% | 12% (13 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 | Students do not have opportunities for authentic conversations and evaluation of their own or others writing. | To develop strategic and extended thinking in regard to student writing, teacher will provide opportunities for peer evaluation of students' writing based on the writing rubric. Students will be accountable for defending their thinking based on specific examples from the writing and their understanding of expectations for quality writing, providing recommendations for improving the writing. | Classroom teacher, ELL contact, Reading coach. | Classroom walk throughs to observe teacher using the writing process to teach writing. Data will used to guide instructional decisions for students and training for teachers. | Monthly writing prompt data, teacher created writing rubrics and spring CELLA assessment data. | |

CELLA Budget:

| Evidence-based Progra | am(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 Developm | nent | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |

| | | | Grand Total: \$0.00 |
|--|---------------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Other | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| English Language Learner Teaching Strategies That Work (including visual aids, and hands on activities) | ELL Contact, District Personnel | n/a | \$0.00 |
| Using ELL Strategies appropriately in the classroom during delivery of instruction | ELL Contact, District Personnel | n/a | \$0.00 |

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

| | on the analysis of studen or overment for the following | | eference to "Guiding | Questions", identify and o | define areas in need |
|------|---|--|--|---|--|
| math | CAT2.0: Students scoring ematics. ematics Goal #1a: | g at Achievement Level (| The percent of | students scoring Level 3 o se from 34% (54 students | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perforn | nance: | 2013 Expected | d Level of Performance: | |
| | ercent of students scoring ematics FCAT 2012 was 34 | | | students scoring an Achiev AT 2013 will be 35% (82 | |
| | Pr | oblem-Solving Process t | to Increase Studer | nt Achievement | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 1. Rigor Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking. | Teachers will plan for and include higher order questions in weekly lesson plans so that the questions are purposeful and aligned to the NGSSS or CCSS. | Principal Assistant Principal | Monitor lesson plans and provide feedback to teachers. Collect HOTs data during observations. Monitor monthly through trend reports to determine training implications. Monitor monthly through | Quarterly Assessment Data - Disaggregated by item complexity rating CTEM Observation Data Data from HOTs collection tool |
| 2 | <u> </u> | that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned | Principal AssistantPrincipal | trend reports to determine training implications. Monitor evidence of Kagan structures in lesson plans. Utilize Non-negotiable collection tool to monitor use of collaborative structures. Utilize iObservation to record the frequency of cooperative strategies observed during classroom visitations. Data will be used to make decisions regarding teacher professional learning. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating Data from Non- negotiable collection tool CTEM Observation Data |
| 3 | 3. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills Instruction infrequently utilizes both fiction and non-fiction texts to build | close reading model (gr. K-5), in grades K-2 through Read Alouds and | Reading Coach, Media Specialist, Principal, Assistant Principal | All grade level teams will participate in a grade level specific Lesson Study to establish best practices for close reading instruction. Monitoring Lesson Study | Quarterly Assessment Data - Disaggregated by item complexity rating Lesson Study Data and Reflections |

| | analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. | intertextual triads, students will build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. | | data and reflections to determine need for teacher training in use of close reading and intertextual triad. | |
|---|---|--|------------------|---|---|
| 4 | 3. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction. | expectations for | Math and Science | and science journals/notebooks/exit tickets. Data collected on student writing performance generated from rubric scores will be monitored, analyzed, and | Ouarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating Data binders and data chats Student-led conferences |

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier Strategy Responsible **Evaluation Tool** Effectiveness of for Strategy Monitoring No Data Submitted

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement The percent of students scoring above proficiency (Levels 4 Level 4 in mathematics. and 5) on the 2013 FCAT in Math will increase from 15%(30 students) to 17% (36 students). Mathematics Goal #2a: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: The percent of students scoring above proficiency (Levels 4) The percent of students scoring above proficiency (Levels 4 and 5) on the 2012 FCAT in Math was 15% (30 students). and 5) on the 2013 FCAT in Math will be 17% (36 students). Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine **Anticipated Barrier** Strategy **Evaluation Tool** Effectiveness of Responsible for Monitoring Strategy

| 1 | 1. Rigor Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking. | Students will write a contract for achieving a 4 on the scale; identifying the specific mastery-level work they will complete to demonstrate exemplary standard/benchmark success. | Classroom teacher Gifted endorsed teachers Gifted Resource Teacher | Implement Data Chats with students for the purpose of goal setting and reviewing individual student's data. Revisit data with students monthly or quarterly to determine if their goal has been met. Data will be used to make decisions regarding design of effective enrichment activities. | Ouarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|
| 2 | 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | questions to be used to lead a Socratic seminar based on the text. Include these questions | Classroom teacher Gifted endorsed teachers Gifted Resource Teacher Leadership Team | During data chats, students will demonstrate their understanding of the HOTS questions that they have developed based on a HOT question rubric. Data will be used to determine areas for reteaching. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating |
| 3 | 3. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills Instruction infrequently utilizes both fiction and non-fiction texts to build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. | Teacher will infuse Intertextual Triads into instructional units, scaffolding as needed until students are able to analyze and evaluate multiple texts independently. | Classroom teacher Gifted endorsed teachers Gifted Resource Teacher Leadership Team | l . | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating Non-negotiable Collection Tool Data |
| 4 | 3. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction. | Students will be accountable for writing short and extended responses a minimum of once each week in all classes. Writing rubrics with detailed expectations for response writing will be displayed and used. | Classroom teacher Gifted endorsed teachers Gifted Resource Teacher Leadership Team | Utilize Non-negotiable collection tool to monitor journaling and notebooking across subject areas and short and extended responses. Data will be used to make decisions regarding teacher professional learning needed in the area of writing across the curriculum. | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in nee of improvement for the following group: | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. | | | | | |
| Mathematics Goal #2b: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | | |
| | | | | | |

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

| | I on the analysis of studen provement for the following | | eference to "Guiding | Questions", identify and o | define areas in need | |
|------|---|---|--|--|---|--|
| 9 | | | The percent of Math FCAT will | The percent of students achieving learning gains on the 2013 Math FCAT will increase from 66% (76 students) to 69% (101) students. | | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perforn | nance: | 2013 Expected | d Level of Performance: | | |
| | ercent of students achievir was 66% (76 students). | ng learning gains on the 2 | | students achieving learning % (101 students). | g gains on the 2013 | |
| | Pr | oblem-Solving Process t | to Increase Studer | nt Achievement | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| 1 | 1. Rigor Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking. | Maintain high expectations for all students to appropriately respond to higher order questions, providing scaffolded support and structure as appropriate for low-expectancy students, enabling their success in meeting rigorous expectations. | academic coaches, | Meet with grade level data teams a minimum of twice per month to analyze data from common assessments and OPM. Determine if instruction/intervention is working and adjust instruction as needed. Utilize Non-negotiable collection tool to monitor use of HOTs. | Disaggregated by item complexity rating PLC Notes which include | |
| 2 | Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain | prove reasoning aligned | | Monitor evidence of Kagan structures in | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating Data from Non- negotiable collection tool CTEM Observation Data | |
| | 3. Use of Informational Text across all Content | Students will be accountable for writing | Classroom teacher | Utilize Non-negotiable collection tool to monitor | Quarterly Assessment Data – | |

| 2 | to Teach Reading and Writing Skills Students have inadequate opportunities | once each week in all classes. | teachers | notebooking across subject areas and short and extended | Disaggregated by item complexity rating Non-negotiable |
|---|---|--|----------|--|---|
| 3 | O . | Writing rubrics with | | | Collection Tool |
| | language arts instruction. | detailed expectations for response writing will be displayed and used. | · | Data will be used to make decisions regarding teacher professional learning needed in the area of writing across the curriculum. | |

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier Strategy Responsible **Evaluation Tool** Effectiveness of for Strategy Monitoring No Data Submitted

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% The percent of students in the Lowest 25% making learning making learning gains in mathematics. gains in Mathematics on the 2013 FCAT will increase from 78%(22 students)to 80%(30 students). Mathematics Goal #4: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: The percent of students in the Lowest 25% making learning The percent of students in the Lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics on the 2012 FCAT was 78% (22 gains in Mathematics on the 2013 FCAT was 80% (30 students). 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. Rigor | Maintain high expectations for all | academic coaches, | data teams a minimum of | Quarterly Assessment Data – |
| | Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning | students to appropriately respond to higher order | | · · | Disaggregated by item complexity |
| | strategies designed to | questions, providing | ' | , | rating |
| | promote critical, | scaffolded support and | | and OPM. | DIO NI I |
| | independent, and | structure as appropriate | | | PLC Notes which |
| 1 | creative | for low-expectancy | | | include |
| | thinking. | students, enabling their | | instruction/intervention is | Intervention Group |

| | | success in meeting rigorous expectations. | | working and adjust instruction as needed. Utilize Non-negotiable collection tool to monitor use of HOTs. | Data Spreadsheet Data from HOTs collection tool |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|
| 2 | 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned | | Utilize Non-negotiable collection tool to monitor use of collaborative structures. Utilize iObservation to | Ouarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating Data from Non- negotiable collection tool CTEM Observation Data |
| 3 | 3. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction. | Students will be accountable for writing short and extended responses a minimum of once each week in all classes. Writing rubrics with detailed expectations for response writing will be displayed and used. | Classroom teacher, math coach, principal, assistant principal | journaling and notebooking across subject areas and short and extended responses. | |

| 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 # Avalon Elementary will reduce the achievement gap by 50% over the course of six years. In the year 2012-2013, we will reduce the achievement gap by 8.4% Our goal is 46%. 5A: | | | | |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 | |
| | | | | | | | |

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 Over six years, the number of students not proficient will satisfactory progress in mathematics. decrease by 50%. Mathematics Goal #5B: 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: White: 67% (20 students)- Met Criteria White: 48% Black: 43% (20 students)- Met Criteria Black: 33% Hispanic: 32% (44 students)- Did not Meet Hispanic: 41% Asian: 100% (2 students) - Did not meet Asian: n/a Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | | | Person or | Process Used to | |
|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Position Responsible for Monitoring | Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 1. Rigor Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking. | Teacher will maintain data by sub-group in order to identify issues specific to the risk-factors associated with the sub-group. As data uncovers specific barriers to closing the achievement gap, teacher will identify appropriate differentiated instructional strategies to remove the barrier. | principal | twice per month to | Ouarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating Data from HOTS Data Collection Tool CTEM Observation Data |
| 2 | 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | specific to the risk- factors associated with the sub-group. As data uncovers specific barriers to closing the | principal | Utilize Non-negotiable collection tool to monitor use of collaborative | Ouarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating Data from Non- negoitable collection tool CTEM Observation Data |
| 3 | 3. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction. | Students will be accountable for writing short and extended responses a minimum of once each week in all classes. Writing rubrics with detailed expectations for response writing will be displayed and used. | Classroom teacher, math coach principal, assistant principal | interventions to support mastery of grade-level | Ouarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating Non-negotiable Collection Tool Data |

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.

Mathematics Goal #5C:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

29% (27 students)

36% (32 students)

| | Pr | oblem-Solving Process t | to Increase Studer | nt Achievement | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | | | |
| 1 | 1. Rigor Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking. | Teacher will utilize multiple ELL strategies to meet the needs of second language learners, scaffolding support for meeting high expectations. | Instructional | Monitor lesson plans and provide feedback to teachers. Meet with grade level | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating and ELL subgroup PLC Notes which include Intervention Group Data Spreadsheet | | | |
| 2 | 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | second language learners, scaffolding support for meeting high expectations. | Instructional Support Specialist,ELL contact, principal, assistant principal | Monitor evidence of Kagan structures in lesson plans. Utilize Non-negotiable collection tool to monitor use of collaborative structures. Utilize iObservation to record the frequency of cooperative strategies observed during classroom visitations. Data will be used to make decisions regarding teacher professional learning. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating and ELL subgroup PLC Notes which include Intervention Group Data Spreadsheet iObservation Data Non-negotiable Data Collection Tool | | | |
| 3 | Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills Students have | Teacher will utilize multiple ELL strategies to meet the needs of second language learners, scaffolding support for meeting high expectations. | ELL contact, Math Coach, | Monitor lesson plans and provide feedback to teachers. Meet with grade level data teams a minimum of twice per month to analyze data from common assessments and OPM. Determine if instruction/intervention is working and adjust instruction as needed. | Assessment Data – Disaggregated by item complexity rating and ELL subgroup PLC Notes which include Intervention Group Data Spreadsheet | | | |

| 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: | Over six years, the number of students not proficient will decrease by 50%. | | | |
| 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. Rigor Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking. | Teacher will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP strategies, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading skills(differentiated materials/instruction). Submit lesson plans to a central database (School Shared Drive)to increase ESE teacher remediation/differentiation/accommodation opportunities in daily instructional practices. | | An administrator will attend each IEP meeting in order to closely monitor student progress toward IEP goals. Collect ongoing progress monitoring data weekly or biweekly. Meet with grade level data teams a minimum of twice per month to analyze data from common assessments and OPM. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by subgroup IEP Meeting Notes in Excent | | |
| 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | Maintain high expectations for all SWD to participate in collaborative activities and to appropriately fulfill specified roles within groups. | INSS, Classroom teacher, ESE resource teachers, principal, assistant principal | Monitor evidence of Kagan structures in lesson plans. Utilize Non-negotiable collection tool to monitor use of collaborative structures. Utilize iObservation to record the frequency of cooperative strategies observed during classroom visitations. Data will be used to make decisions regarding teacher professional learning. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by subgroup Data from Non- negotiable collection tool CTEM Observation Data | | |
| 3. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills Students have inadequate opportunities for writing outside of language arts instruction. | Teacher will accommodate/adapt classroom work to be consistent with IEP strategies, working in small group or individually with students to support improved reading skills across all content areas. (differentiated materials/instruction). | INSS, Classroom teacher, ESE resource teachers, Math Coach, Principal, Assistant Principal | An administrator will attend each IEP meeting in order to closely monitor student progress toward IEP goals. Collect ongoing progress monitoring data weekly or biweekly. Meet with grade level data teams a minimum of twice per month to analyze data from common assessments and OPM. | Quarterly Assessment Data – Disaggregated by subgroup IEP Meeting Notes in Excent | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in new of improvement for the following subgroup: | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E: | Over six years, the number of students not proficient will decrease by 50%. | | |

| 2012 | Current Level of Perforn | nance: | 2013 Expected | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
|------|---|--|--|--|---|--|
| 37% | (66 students) | | 43% (85 studer | 43% (85 students) | | |
| | Pr | oblem-Solving Process | to Increase Studer | nt Achievement | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| 1 | Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, | Teachers will plan for and include higher order questions in weekly lesson plans so that the questions are purposeful and aligned to the NGSSS or CCSS. | Principal, Assistant Principal | Monitor lesson plans and provide feedback to teachers. Collect HOTs data during observations. Monitor monthly through trend reports to determine training implications. | Quarterly Assessment Data - Disaggregated by item complexity rating CTEM Observation Data Data from HOTs collection tool | |
| 2 | Differentiated Instruction Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned | Principal Assistant Principal | Monitor evidence of Kagan structures in lesson plans. Utilize Non-negotiable collection tool to monitor use of collaborative structures. Utilize iObservation to record the frequency of cooperative strategies observed during classroom visitations. Data will be used to make decisions regarding teacher professional | Quarterly Assessment Data - Disaggregated by item complexity rating Data from Non- negotiable collection tool CTEM Observation Data | |
| 3 | to Teach Reading and Writing Skills Instruction infrequently utilizes both fiction and non-fiction texts to build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. | Teachers will utilize a minimum of 50% non-fiction/informational text for instruction. Using the close reading model (gr. K-5), in grades K-2 through Read Alouds and in grades 3-5 with intertextual triads, students will build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. | Reading Coach, Media Specialist, Principal, Assistant Principal | learning. All grade level teams will participate in a grade level specific Lesson Study to establish best practices for close reading instruction. Monitoring Lesson Study data and reflections to determine need for teacher training in use of close reading and intertextual triad. | Quarterly Assessment Data - Disaggregated by item complexity rating Lesson Study Data and Reflections | |
| 4 | Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills Students have inadequate opportunities | Students will be accountable for writing short and extended responses a minimum of once each week in all classes. Writing rubrics with | Math and Science Coaches, Principal, | Monitor the use of math and science journals/notebooks/exit tickets. Data collected on student writing performance generated from rubric scores will be monitored, analyzed, and interpreted. Data will guide instructional decisions for students and training for teachers. | conferences | |

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 | (e.g., PLC, | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow- | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|------------------------|---|------------------|---|--|--|
| Model Drawing | K-5 | Math Coach | Grade-level PLCs | Monthly in first quarter. Scheduled as needed/requested after first quarter. | Classroom observations using the electronic non- negotiable list as well as CTEM observations using the iObservation tool. Data gathered will be used to direct future professional learning. | |
| 8 Standards for Mathematical Practices | K-5 | Math Coach | Grade-level PLCs | Early Release Days | Classroom observations using the electronic non- negotiable list as well as CTEM observations using the iObservation tool. Data gathered will be used to direct future professional learning. | |

Mathematics Budget:

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available |
|--|--|----------------|-----------------------|
| Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. Teachers will include use of these in weekly lesson | Full Time Math Coach Modeling, demonstrating, and coaching of math instruction (K-5) | Title 1 | Amount \$53,206.90 |
| plans. | | _ | Subtotal: \$53,206.90 |
| Technology | | | 3ubtotal: \$33,200.70 |
| 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 |

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

| | d on the analysis of stud | | | Guiding Questions", ide | ntify and define |
|---------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| 1a. F Leve | in need of improvement CAT2.0: Students scor I 3 in science. Ince Goal #1a: | | The percent of | f students scoring Leve prove from 30% (17 st | |
| 2012 | Current Level of Perfo | ormance: | 2013 Expecte | ed Level of Performan | ce: |
| | percent of students scor ace 2012 was 30%(17 st | | | f students scoring a Levwill be 35% (23 student | |
| | Prob | lem-Solving Process t | o Increase Stude | ent Achievement | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 1. Rigor Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking. | Teachers will plan for and include higher order questions in weekly lesson plans so that the questions are purposeful and aligned to the NGSSS or CCSS. | Principal Assistant Principal | Monitor lesson plans and provide feedback to teachers. Collect HOTs data during observations. Monitor monthly through trend reports to determine training implications. | Quarterly Assessment Data –Disaggregated by item complexity rating CTEM Observation Data Data from HOTs collection tool |
| 2 | 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. Teachers will include use of these in weekly lesson plans. | | Monitor monthly through trend reports to determine training implications. Monitor evidence of Kagan structures in lesson plans. Utilize Non-negotiable collection tool to monitor use of collaborative structures. Utilize iObservation to record the frequency of cooperative strategies observed during classroom visitations. | Quarterly Assessment Data –Disaggregated by item complexity rating Data from Non- negotiable collection tool CTEM Observation Data |
| | 3. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and Writing Skills Instruction infrequently utilizes both fiction and | minimum of 50% non- fiction/informational text for instruction. Using the close reading model (gr. K-5), in | Principal, Assistant | make decisions regarding teacher professional learning. All grade level teams will participate in a grade level specific Lesson Study to establish best practices for close reading instruction. | Quarterly Assessment Data -Disaggregated by item complexity rating |

| 3 | 3 | non-fiction texts to build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. | Read Alouds and in grades 3-5 with intertextual triads, students will build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. | | Monitoring Lesson Study data and reflections to determine need for teacher training in use of close reading and intertextual triad. | Lesson Study Data and Reflections |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|---|
| 2 | 1 | | accountable for writing short and extended responses a minimum | and Science Coaches, Principal, Assistant Principal | journals/notebooks/exit tickets. Data collected on student writing performance generated | by item complexity rating |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and refer areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | to "Guiding Questions", | , identify and define |
|--|------------------------|---------|-----------|--|-----------------------|
| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. | | | | | |
| Science Goal #1b: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of | Performance: | : | 2013 Exp | ected Level of Perforr | mance: |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proces | s to Ir | ncrease S | tudent Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier Strategy Position Responds | | for | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | No | Data S | Submitted | | |

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a: | The percent of students scoring a Level 4 on FCAT Science in 2013 will improve from 5% (3 students) to 6% (4 students). | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| The percent of students scoring a Level 4 on FCAT Science 2012 was 5% (3 students). | The percent of students scoring a Level 4 on FCAT Science in 2013 will be 6% (4 students). | | | |
| 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 | 1. Rigor Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking. | Students will write a contract for achieving a 4 on the scale; identifying the specific mastery-level work they will complete to demonstrate exemplary standard/benchmark success. | teachers | Implement Data Chats with students for the purpose of goal setting and reviewing individual student's data. Revisit data with students monthly or quarterly to determine if their goal has been met. Data will be used to make decisions regarding design of effective enrichment | Quarterly Assessment Data –Disaggregated by item complexity rating |
| 2 | 2. Interactive Learning Strategies and Differentiated Instruction Students do not have opportunities to engage in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | practice, ask learners to develop higher order questions to be used to lead a Socratic seminar based on the text. Include these | Gifted endorsed teachers Gifted Resource Teacher | activities. During data chats, students will demonstrate their understanding of the HOTS questions that they have developed based on a HOT question rubric. Data will be used to determine areas for reteaching. | Quarterly Assessment Data -Disaggregated by item complexity rating |
| 3 | to Teach Reading and Writing Skills Instruction infrequently utilizes both fiction and | Intertextual Triads into instructional units, scaffolding as needed until students are able to analyze and evaluate multiple texts independently. | Gifted endorsed teachers | Utilize Non-negotiable collection tool to monitor use of intertextual triads. Data will be used to make decisions regarding design of effective enrichment activities. | Ouarterly Assessment Data —Disaggregated by item complexity rating Non-negotiable Collection Tool Data |
| 4 | 3. Use of Informational Text across all Content to Teach Reading and | accountable for writing short and extended responses a minimum of once each week in all classes. Writing rubrics with detailed expectations | Classroom teacher Gifted endorsed teachers Gifted Resource Teacher Leadership Team | Utilize Non-negotiable collection tool to monitor journaling and notebooking across subject areas and short and extended responses. Data will be used to make decisions regarding teacher professional learning needed in the area of writing across the curriculum. | Quarterly Assessment Data –Disaggregated by item complexity rating Non-negotiable Collection Tool Data |

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

| 2b. Florida Alternate Students scoring at o in science. | Assessment: r above Achievement Lev | | | | |
|---|--|---|-----------|--|-----------------|
| Science Goal #2b: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of | Performance: | | 2013 Exp | pected Level of Perform | mance: |
| | | | | | |
| | Problem-Solving Proces | s to I | ncrease S | tudent Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | | |

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 |
|---|---|------------------------|---|---|--|---------------------------------------|---|
| l | Modeled Lesson using the 5Es. | K-5 | Science Coach | K-5 Classroom teachers, Science Points of Contact | Early release days-quarterly | HISING THE HUNSERVATION | Drincinal/Assistant |

Science Budget:

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|---|---------------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Students will be accountable for writing short and extended responses a minimum of once each week in all classes. | Materials for science notebooks | school-based | \$300.00 |
| | | - | Subtotal: \$300.00 |
| Fechnology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | • | Subtotal: \$0.00 |

| 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 |
| | | | |

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

| in ne | ed of improvement for the | e following group: | | J | , | |
|-------|---|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| | | | The percent o | The percent of students achieveing a Level 3 or higher on 2013 FCAT Writing will be 69% (50 students). | | |
| 2012 | 2 Current Level of Perfo | rmance: | 2013 Expect | ed Level of Performance | e: | |
| | percent of students achie Writing (3.0 or higher) v | | | f students achieving prof will be 69% (50 students) | | |
| | Prol | blem-Solving Process t | o Increase Stud | ent Achievement | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| 1 | Lessons do not routinely incorporate questioning strategies designed to promote critical, independent, and creative thinking. | As evidence of strategic and extended thinking in writing, teacher will hold students accountable for producing a written analysis of multiple genres of thematically connected texts a minimum of six times per year. In K-1 classrooms the process will be implemented through Read-Alouds. | Reading Coach, Leadership Team | Grade level PLCs will meet quarterly with leadership team to analyze student writing samples by placing scores on a continuum. Data will be used to plan future lessons, and intervention as well as enrichment activities. | PLC Meeting Minutes | |
| 2 | in rigorous accountable talk to show, tell, | proper capitalization of the first word of the | Classroom teachers | Grade level PLCs meet weekly to discuss best practices. Topic to be included in monthly is best practices in teaching "Check for 3." Teams will post best practices for full implementation of "Check for 3" on AVE share drive. AVE Share Drive | AVE Share Drive PLC Meeting Minutes | |
| | Students have inadequate opportunities for writing | Students will be accountable for writing short and extended | Classroom teachers | Grade level PLCs meet weekly to discuss best practices. Topic to be | AVE Share Drive PLC Meeting | |

| 3 | outside of language arts instruction. | responses a minimum of once each week in all classes. Writing rubrics with detailed expectations for response writing will be displayed and used. | | included monthly is writing short and extended responses across content areas. Teams will post best practices for writing short and extended responses across content areas on AVE share drive. | Minutes |
|---|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|---------|
|---|---------------------------------------|---|--|--|---------|

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------|---------------------|--|--|-----------------|
| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b: | | | The percent of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on FCAT Writing will increase from 8% (5 students) to 9% (7 students). | | |
| 2012 Current Level of | Performance: | | 2013 Exp | pected Level of Perform | nance: |
| The percent of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on FCAT Writing 2012 was 8% (5 students). | | | The percent of students scoring a Level 4 or higher on FCAT Writing 2013 will be 9% (7 students). | | |
| | Problem-Solving Process | s to I | ncrease S | tudent Achievement | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Posi Resp for | on or tion ponsible itoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | | |

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) | release) and | Strategy for Follow- up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|--|------------------------|--|---|--|--|--|
| Use of conventions, spelling, punctuation in student writing (Grammar) | K-5 | Reading Coach, ESE Resource Teacher, ELL Contact | K-5 teachers related arts teachers | Selected early release days, grade-level PLCs | Classroom observations using the electronic non- negotiable list as well as CTEM observations using the iObservation tool. Data gathered will be used to direct future professional learning. | Reading coach, Leadership Team |
| Journaling and notebooks; short and extended responses to text | K-5 | Science Coach, Reading Coach | K-5 teachers related arts teachers | Selected early release days, grade-level PLCs | Classroom observations using the electronic non- negotiable list as well as CTEM observations using the iObservation tool. Data gathered will be used to direct future | Reading coach,Science coach, Leadership Team |

| | | | | | professional learning. | |
|--------------------------|-----|--|-------------|---------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| Write Traits training | 3,4 | Reading Coach, ESE Resource Teacher, ELL Contact | Grades 3, 4 | Grade Level PLCs | Classroom observations using the electronic non- negotiable list as well as CTEM observations using the iObservation tool. Data gathered will be used to direct future professional learning. | Reading coach, Leadership Team |

Writing Budget:

| Evidence-based Progra | am(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 Developm | nent | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

| Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| Attendance Attendance Goal #1: | By July 2013, the Average Daily Attendance (ADA) will increase from 96% to 98%. | | | |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: | | | |
| The Average Daily Attendance Rate for 2012 was 96%. | The Average Daily Attendance Rate for 2013 will be 98%. | | | |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | | | |
| During the 2012 school year, 22% (123 students) had excessive absences. | The percent of students with excessive absences will improve to 20% (115 students). | | | |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | | | |

During the 2012 school year, 10% (47 students) had excessive tardies.

The percent of students with excessive tardies will improve to 8% (44 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 | Students may lack motivation to attend school on a daily basis. | Implementing PBS supports at all levels addressing attendance. Tier 1(Universal supports): Rewards/Recognition for perfect attendance at the classroom level. Classrooms will be recognized on a daily, weekly, and monthly level for achieving perfect attendance. Recognition: On a daily basis, classrooms achieving perfect attendance will be announced on the morning news. | Classroom teacher/Data entry- Daily attendance monitoring Assistant Principal | percentage of classrooms achieving daily, weekly, and | Monthly Attendance reports will be used to determine if 98% Average daily attendance rate is being achieved. |
| 2 | Parents may not understand their responsibility to ensure daily attendance of their child. | Parent, Teacher, Administration, and student conference. Parent/student attendance contract will be developed after 4 absences. Attendance contract will be monitored on a bi-weekly basis with school administration. | Assistant Principal | Daily attendance data will be analyzed to determine the effectiveness of attendance contracts. | Weekly attendance data on selected students. |
| 3 | Parents may have limited understanding of the state law for attendance and consequences of continued poor attendance. | Conference will be held with parent, Administrator and/or the District Truancy officer to educate the parent on the state law and consequences for continued poor attendance. Truancy documents will be shared with the parents. | Principal | Daily attendance data reflecting attendance of those who are on an attendance contract and have been educated on the policy analyzed to determine the effectiveness of the strategy. | Weekly attendance data on selected students. |

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 |
|---|------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | Ν | No Data Submitted | d | | |

Attendance Budget:

| Evidence-based Progra | arri(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 Developm | nent | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

| Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1. Suspension | The number of in-school suspensions will decrease from 2% (8) to 1% (5). | | | | |
| Suspension Goal #1: | The number of out-of-school suspensions will decrease from 0% (2) to 0% (0). | | | | |
| 2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions | | | | |
| The total number of in-school suspensions for 2012 was 9. | The expected number of in-school suspensions for 2013 is 5. | | | | |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In- School | | | | |
| The total number of students suspended in-school for 2012 was 8. | The expected number of students suspended in-school for 2013 is 5. | | | | |

| 2012 | 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | | | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|-----------------|--|
| The total number of out-of-school suspensions for 2012 was 2. | | | The expected r 2013 is 0. | The expected number of out-of-school supsensions for 2013 is 0. | | |
| 2012 Scho | Total Number of Stude | ents Suspended Out-of- | - 2013 Expecte of-School | d Number of Students | Suspended Out- | |
| The total number of students suspended out-of-school for 2012 was 2. | | | | The expected number of students suspended out-of-school for 2013 is 0. | | |
| | Prol | olem-Solving Process t | o Increase Stude | nt Achievement | | |
| | | | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool | |
| 1 | Teachers may not be using behavior plans to address behavior issues. | PBS Committee members, and INSS will train grade level teams on the use of behavior plans. | Assistant Principal | PBS data will be analyzed to determine effectiveness of behavior plans and adjust behavior plans accordingly. | PBS Data | |

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 |
|---|------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | Ν | lo Data Submitted | d | | |

Suspension Budget:

| m(s)/Material(s) | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|
| Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | |
| Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| ent | | |
| Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | Description of Resources No Data Description of Resources No Data ent Description of Resources | Description of Resources Funding Source No Data Description of Resources Funding Source No Data No Data Description of Resources Funding Source Funding Source Part Funding Source Part Funding Source |

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|----------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | - | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

| | d on the analysis of pare | ent involvement data, an | nd ref | erence to "Guid | ing Questions", identify a | and define areas |
|--|---|---|--|--|--|----------------------------------|
| 1. Pa | arent Involvement | | | | | |
| Parent Involvement Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated. | | | | The percent of increase from 5 | parents involved in scho 0% to 60%. | ol activities will |
| 2012 Current Level of Parent I nvolvement: | | | | 2013 Expected | d Level of Parent Invol | vement: |
| 50% | | | | 60% | | |
| | Pro | blem-Solving Process | to I r | ncrease Stude | nt Achievement | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Re | son or Position sponsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | A majority of the students have non- English speaking parents. They feel uncomfortable linguistically in the school setting. | Provide all printed material in English, Spanish, and Creole. Provide for translation at all school functions. | Assistant Principal, Title 1 Documentation Coordinator, Tutors, ELL Contact | | The number of families attending school events will be used to determine the effectiveness of this strategy. | Sign-in sheets |
| 2 | Parents do not know how to actively participate with their child's academic achievements. | Academic Night in conjunction Student-led conferences will be held at the beginning of the school year. Parents will be given an overview of the expectations, curriculum, and exemplars. Parents and students discuss benchmark testing and goals for the school year. | | | Parents will fill in a feedback/suggestion form following academic night. Information from the forms will be used to plan future parent information nights. | Sign-in sheets Feedback forms |
| 3 | | Train staff members on strategies for creating a positive and welcoming office environment to promote parent involvement and build parent capacity. "Opening Doors" Staff Training 9/17/12 | Princ | cipal | Participants will complete a training feedback form. Information from the forms will be used to strategize a list a ways to build parent capacity. | Sign-in sheet Feedback forms |

| | | Classroom | The number of families | Sign-in sheet |
|---|-----------------------|--|--|----------------|
| 4 | pair/share afternoon, | Teachers, ELL Contact, Academic Coaches,Leadership Team | attending each event will be used to determine the effectiveness of this strategy. Participants will complete a training feedback form. Information from the forms will be used to | Feedback forms |
| | | | plan future parent information nights. | |

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 |
|---|------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
| Opening Doors | Office Staff | Title 1 Staff | Office Staff | 9-17-2012 | Participants will complete a training feedback form. Information from the forms will be used to strategize a list a ways to build parent capacity. | Sign-in sheet Feedback forms |

Parent Involvement Budget:

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|---|---|----------------------------|---------------------|
| Provide all printed material in English, Spanish, and Creole. Provide for translation at all school functions. | Provide written Right to Know information regarding Teacher qualifications and subsequent written notification of Highly Qualified Teacher issues as they arise. Information provided in letters that are translated into three languages and distributed to parents. | Title 1 Parent Involvement | \$602.72 |
| Provide all printed material in English, Spanish, and Creole. Provide for translation at all school functions. | Provide Parent Compact. Reviewed annually by the SAC with parent input and revised as needed. Translated into three languages and signed at the Annual Title 1 Meeting and throughout the year as needed. | Title 1 Parent Involvement | \$700.06 |
| Avalon will hold one pair/share afternoon, and one pair/share evening where parents will have an opportunity to "make and take" an activity for Reading, Mathematics, and writing that is linked with the curriculum for their child's grade level. | Avalon will conduct informational training for parents by way of meetings, parent newsletters, curriculum nights, and FSG sponsored workshops. | Title 1 Parent Invovlement | \$924.00 |

| Provide all printed material in English, Spanish, and Creole. Provide for translation at all school functions. | Parent Newsletter - Instructional supplies will be purchased i.e. paper and computer ink for parent involvement newsletters and training materials. | Title 1 Parent Involvement | \$165.00 |
|--|---|----------------------------|---------------------|
| | | Sul | ototal: \$2,391.78 |
| 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 |
| Academic Night in conjunction Studentled conferences will be held at the beginning of the school year. Parents will be given an overview of the expectations, curriculum, and exemplars. Parents and students discuss benchmark testing and goals for the school year. | Open House/Academic Nights in which an explanation of the Title 1 status and a list of personnel funded by Title 1 is presented via in-school television and provided on handout. Translations are provided during the meeting. | Title 1 Parent Involvement | \$200.00 |
| | | S | Subtotal: \$200.00 |
| | | _Grand | Total: \$2,591.78 |

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Goal(s)

areas.

* 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 Increase STEM activities school-wide throughout the curriculum to incorporate at least one STEM activity per STEM Goal #1: grade per quarter. Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine **Anticipated Barrier Evaluation Tool** Strategy Responsible for Effectiveness of Monitoring Strategy Provide meaningful District support Teachers will complete Professional Many teachers do not understand the professional learning staff, Academic professional learning Learning connection of STEM to that effectively models coaches, Points feedback sheets. Feedback Forms a specific content and STEM skills and strategies and builds contact, Principal, Data from these sheets may be resistant to incorporating STEM collaborative PLCs for Assistant will direct follow-up skills and strategies into the purpose of infusing Principal, needed at grade-level Leadership team their content. these skills and or comfort-level PLC strategies across all meetings. content. Academic coaches and Lesson Plans. Academic Grade-level teachers Instructional Resource work with academic coaches. teacher will work Instructional coaches to write STEM PLC Meeting resource Teacher, lesson plans once per closely with classroom Notes. teachers to plan Points of contact, quarter. effective lessons that Leadership team extend the curriculum **CTEM Teacher Leaders** across multiple subject observe lesson and

provide feedback

| | | | individually or in grade- level PLCs. Feedback will be used to guide planning of future STEM lessons. | |
|---|--|--|---|------------------------------------|
| 3 | Students will be exposed to multiple STEM activities that allow students to think creatively, experiment, and work with data throughout the school year. Planned Activities include: Global Garden Program Science Fair Participation Super Science Early Release Days Field Trips: Rookery Bay Naples Botanical Garden | Academic coaches, Instructional Resource Teacher, Points of contact, Leadership team | Students will complete learning feedback forms. Data from these forms will be discussed at grade level PLCs and be used to inform subsequent STEM instruction. | Student Learning Feedback Forms |

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 |
|---|------------------------|---|--|--|--|---|
| Train teachers in how to incorporate STEM applications into the curriculum. | K-5 | Science Coach, District Curriculum and InstructionPersonnel | PLCs | PLCs during the 1st semester | Leadership team will monitor PLC notes, hold discussions will grade level PLCs, and use this information to plan future professional learning. | Leadership Team |

STEM Budget:

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | - | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |

| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
|----------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| | | - | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | • | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

| Evidence-based Pro | gram(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|--------------------|---|---|----------------|------------------|
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Monitor progress a minimum of once per month by monitoring student record of reading behavior which will include a text dependent written response. | .5 Academic Coach K-5 teachers will be provided with intervention and instruction support and techniques to assist in meeting the needs of multiple instructional levels in their classrooms. In addition, K-5 teachers will be provided with data management and date analysis guidance in order to assist in assessment driving planning and instruction. Data analysis will be used for providing appropriate instruction and interventions. | Title 1 | \$29,993.10 |
| Reading | Using the close reading model (gr. K-5), in grades K-2 through Read Alouds and in grades 3-5 with intertextual triads, students will build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. | Comprehension Tool Kit | Title 1 | \$2,894.00 |
| Reading | | Building Vocabulary from Word Roots Kit | Title 1 | \$1,800.00 |
| Reading | Teachers will utilize a minimum of 50% non-fiction/informational text for instruction. Using the close reading model (gr. K-5), in grades K-2 through Read Alouds and in grades 3-5 with intertextual triads, students will build analytic and evaluative thinking and comprehension strategies. | Informational Text | Title 1 | \$500.00 |
| Mathematics | Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. Teachers will include use of these in weekly lesson plans. | Full Time Math Coach Modeling, demonstrating, and coaching of math instruction (K-5) | Title 1 | \$53,206.90 |
| Science | Students will be accountable for writing short and extended responses a minimum of once each week in all classes. | Materials for science notebooks | school-based | \$300.00 |
| | | Provide written Right to Know information regarding Teacher | | |

| | Academic Night in | | | |
|-----------------------|--|---|-------------------------------|----------------------|
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Other | | December 5 | | |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$6,778.00 |
| CELLA | English Language Learner Teaching Strategies That Work (including visual aids, and hands on activities) | ELL Contact, District Personnel | n/a | \$0.00 |
| CELLA | Using ELL Strategies appropriately in the classroom during delivery of instruction | ELL Contact, District Personnel | n/a | \$0.00 |
| Reading | Teachers will utilize appropriate cooperative structures/strategies that provide support for student accountable talk during both whole and small group instruction, requiring students to show, tell, explain and prove reasoning aligned to the standards. | Kagan Cooperative Learning Professional Development Training: August, January | Title 1 | \$6,778.00 |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Professional Developn | nent | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amoun |
| Technology | | | | |
| | | newsletters and training materials. | | Subtotal: \$91,085.7 |
| Parent Involvement | Provide all printed material in English, Spanish, and Creole. Provide for translation at all school functions. | Parent Newsletter - Instructional supplies will be purchased i.e. paper and computer ink for parent involvement | Title 1 Parent Involvement | \$165.00 |
| Parent Involvement | Avalon will hold one pair/share afternoon, and one pair/share evening where parents will have an opportunity to "make and take" an activity for Reading, Mathematics, and writing that is linked with the curriculum for their child's grade | | Title 1 Parent Invovlement | \$924.00 |
| Parent Involvement | Provide all printed material in English, Spanish, and Creole. Provide for translation at all school functions. | Provide Parent Compact. Reviewed annually by the SAC with parent input and revised as needed. Translated into three languages and signed at the Annual Title 1 Meeting and throughout the year as needed. | Title 1 Parent Involvement | \$700.06 |
| Parent Involvement | Provide all printed material in English, Spanish, and Creole. Provide for translation at all school functions. | subsequent written notification of Highly Qualified Teacher issues as they arise. Information provided in letters that are translated into three languages and distributed to parents. | Title 1 Parent Involvement | \$602.72 |

| Parent Involvement | conjunction Studentled conferences will be held at the beginning of the school year. Parents will be given an overview of the expectations, curriculum, and exemplars. Parents and students discuss benchmark testing and goals for the school year. | Open House/Academic Nights in which an explanation of the Title 1 status and a list of personnel funded by Title 1 is presented via in-school television and provided on handout. Translations are provided during the meeting. | Title 1 Parent Involvement | \$200.00 |
|--------------------|--|---|-------------------------------|--------------------------|
| | | | | Subtotal: \$200.00 |
| | | | | Grand Total: \$98,063.78 |

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

| | jn Priority | jn Focus | jn Prevent | jn NA |
|--|-------------|----------|------------|-------|
|--|-------------|----------|------------|-------|

Are you a reward school: jn Yes jn No

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

View uploaded file (Uploaded on 9/20/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

| Projected use of SAC Funds | Amount |
|--|------------|
| SAC funds will be used the school-wide cooperative learning initiative thorugh the purchase of resources and supplies. Additional funds may be used for Temporary Duty substitutes | \$1,435.00 |

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

The School Advisory Council will meet monthly to determine the distribution of School Improvement Funds towards a specific school need. The council will also advise school administration on budget and safety issues.

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

| Collier School District AVALON ELEMENTARY 2010-2011 | SCHOOL | | | | | |
|---|-----------|----------|---------|---------|---------------------------|---|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 71% | 55% | 57% | 38% | | 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 | 73% | 35% | | | 108 | 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? | 65% (YES) | 44% (NO) | | | 109 | 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 | | | | | 438 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | С | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |

| Collier School District AVALON ELEMENTARY 2009-2010 | SCHOOL | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------------|---|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 62% | 63% | 78% | 38% | 241 | 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 | 63% | 57% | | | 120 | 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? | 52% (YES) | 68% (YES) | | | 120 | Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math. |
| FCAT Points Earned | | | | | 481 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | С | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |