

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: O. J. SEMMES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Escambia

Principal: Ann W. Smith

SAC Chair: Veronica Streeter

Superintendent: Malcolm Thomas

Date of School Board Approval: November 20, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/30/2012

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 | Ann W. Smith | BS in Health, Leisure and Sports, BA in Elementary Education, MA in Reading Education. Certified as a School Principal in grades K-12. | 3 | 18 | <p>2008 C 2009 C 2010 C 2011 C 2012 B</p> <p>In 2012 the Reading proficiency decreased from 54% to 30% proficient. In 2012 the Math proficiency decreased from 54% to 38%. In 2012 the percent of students meeting high standards in Writing increased from 77% to 91%. In 2012 the percent of students making high standards in Science increased from 30% to 35%. In 2012 the percent of students making Learning Gains in Reading increased from 58% to 68%. The percent of students making Learning Gains in Math increased from 62% to 72%.</p> <p>In 2012, students in the lower quartile making learning gains in Reading increased from 48% to 82%. In 2012, the students in the lower quartile making learning gains in</p> |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | math increased from 80% to 83%. OJ Semmes Elementary earned a FCAT school grade of "B" for the first time in its history. Even with increased rigor in FCAT 2.0 testing, and the school grading criteria changing, OJ Semmes scored the highest number of cumulative points ever! |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

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.

| | 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) |
|-------------------|------|------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| No data submitted | | | | | |

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 | Hire NCLB Highly Qualified Teachers. Assign consulting teacher (CT) for first year teachers. Assign veteran teachers to experienced teachers new to the school worksite (mentors/buddy). Utilize START teachers. | Principal | June 2013 | |
| 2 | Student teachers and practicum students | Principal | June 2013 | |
| 3 | Hire In-Field Teachers. Assign consulting teacher (CT) to first year teachers. Assign veteran teacher to experienced teachers new to the school worksite (mentors). Utilize START teachers. | Principal | 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 |
| 100% of the instructional staff members are highly-qualified. In 2011-2012 4% (1) teacher was given an unstafactory evaluation. | The teacher who earned an unsatisfactory evaluation was placed on a 90 day probationary plan and is being supported by school staff and District level evaluators. |

Staff Demographics

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

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

| Total Number of Instructional Staff | % of First-Year Teachers | % of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience | % of Teachers with Advanced Degrees | % Highly Effective Teachers | % Reading Endorsed Teachers | % National Board Certified Teachers | % ESOL Endorsed Teachers |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 24 | 4.2%(1) | 20.8%(5) | 50.0%(12) | 58.3%(14) | 75.0%(18) | 95.8%(23) | 16.7%(4) | 0.0%(0) | 12.5%(3) |

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 |
|--------------|--------------------------------|--|--|
| Jane Silver | Jeanice Lewis | Ms. Lewis is an experienced teacher but new to the school. Mrs. Silver is the grade level chairperson for First grade. | The Mentee meets on a regular basis with the Mentor. Their rooms are across the hallway so as to help facilitate quick answers to questions. |
| Kathy Godwin | Tomi Morrison and Ruby Coleman | Both teachers are very experienced but new school. Mrs. Godwin is the Kindergarten grade level chairperson | The Mentees and Mentor meet on a regular basis. |

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title 1 provides funding for the Curriculum Coordinator, and part-time Technology Coordinator. Both are responsible for helping teachers to disaggregate data and demonstrate best practices lessons.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Services for Migrant children are provided by the district level Title 1 office. After thoroughly checking the Migrant Student Information Exchange (MSIX) system and our local Student Data Base, we have determined that there are no migrant children at OJ Semmes Elementary School.

Title I, Part D

Services to neglected and delinquent students are provided by various district-operated programs. These services are overseen by the Title 1 office. Our school does not serve Title 1, Part D students.

Title II

Professional development is offered at both the school and district level. Please see each goal area for specific professional development activities (inservice education).

Title III

Services for English Language Learners are provided as required by law. Several ESOL centers are provided at various key locations in the district. Students who do not attend centrally located school-based sites attend their zoned school where ESOL endorsed teachers provide services. All teachers who serve ELL identified students have ESOL endorsement on the teaching certificate. Our school is not an ESOL Center and we serve 3 ESOL students.

Title X- Homeless

The school works with the district's Homeless Coordinator to provide resources (clothing, school supplies, and social services referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for free and appropriate education. This program is overseen by the District Title 1 Office. At OJ Semmes Elementary School we have identified 24 homeless students and provide additional assistance to these students and their families.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI monies are being used to hire a part-time In School Suspension teacher.

Violence Prevention Programs

The school offers a non-violence and anti-drug programs to students that incorporate guest speakers, counseling, and classroom discussion. Red Ribbon Week is held in October with school-wide activities and guest speakers. Through our school's Behavior Management Plan, we provide training for faculty, staff, and students regarding bullying. The Jeffery Johnson Stand Up for All Students Act, required our school district to adopt an official policy prohibiting bully and harassment of students and staff on school grounds, at school-sponsored events, and through school computer networks. In addition, beginning with the 2012-2013 School Year, our district will launch the "Bullying Reporting" website where bullies may be reported anonymously.

Nutrition Programs

Our school is committed to continue offering nutritional choices in its cafeteria. This includes salad bar, ala carte items, and self-serve options. Our school is also a Healthier Generation Alliance School. The school follows the district's nutrition program for summer feeding at selected sites. Additional programs and staff will address the obesity issue, especially in elementary age children.

Housing Programs

This is offered at the district level and overseen by the Title 1 District Office. This program is not applicable to our school.

Head Start

Our school houses a Head Start program. The District allows Head Start to place a modular unit on our property. They are totally self contained. Additionally, three PK classes are a District run program but collaborate with Head Start. We anticipate housing 51 PK students in 2012-2013.

Adult Education

Adult Education takes place at all high schools.

Career and Technical Education

Teachers emphasize careers throughout the daily curriculum.

Job Training

Job Training programs take place at high schools.

Other

We received the Florida Fresh Fruits and Vegetables grant for the first time in September 2011. We received the same grant in 2012-2013.

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Ann W. Smith, Principal
Mark Yelverton, Curriculum Coordinator
Angie Esco, Exceptional Student Education Teacher (representing 4th and 5th grades)
Tatum Collins, Kindergarten Teacher
Lynda Stratton, Guidance Counselor
Janine Fadham, School Psychologist
Jane Silver, first grade
Patti Jones, third grade

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 Leadership Team will focus meetings on developing and maintaining a problem-solving process to encourage and support high achievement in our teachers, staff and students.

The Team meets once a month to review screening data, progress monitoring data, and classroom performance to identify students who are meeting or exceeding benchmarks, are at moderate risk or high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on this information, the team will identify professional development and resources. The Team will also collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions and practice new processes and skills.

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

The RtI Leadership Team with the School Advisory Council(SAC) and Principal help develop the SIP. The Team provided data on targets for Tier 1, 2, and 3, academic and social/emotional areas with needs, helped set clear expectations for instruction, facilitated the development of a systemic approach to teaching and aligned procedures.

MTSS Implementation

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

Baseline Data: Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading(FAIR) 2011-2012, Go Math pre-test
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test(FCAT).
Progress Monitoring: FAIR, Benchmark Assessments, FCAT Simulation
Midyear: FCAT Simulation, FAIR Go Math Mid-year assessment
End of the year: FAIR, FCAT Go Math End of Year Assessment
Frequency of DATA Analysis: once a month

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The Guidance Counselor and school Psychologist provide teacher training at the beginning of the school year with additional training provided in data collection and data analysis in collaboration with the Data Power Team members. Professional development will be provided during the teachers' planning time and small and large sessions throughout the school year. The RtI team will also evaluate additional staff Professional Development needs during the RtI Leadership Team meetings.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

See above sections.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Ann W. Smith, Principal
Sandy Hulehan, Media Specialist
Linda Doyle, Fourth grade teacher and Chairperson
ReNae Grant, Kindergarten teacher
Alicia King, Fourth grade teacher
Donna Foster, Kindergarten teacher

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

The Reading Leadership Team (RLT) meets one time per month. Third grade teacher, RaNae Grant is the Chairperson and facilitates each meeting. The role of the LLT is to continuously promote a culture of literacy in our school environment. The action plan is determined by the LLT after studying our school's current data. The action plan is monitored as the LLT discusses, collaborates, and reviews new data as it become available.

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

The two major goals of the RLT for this year are:

1. To expose students to rich, Tier II vocabulary through a variety of systematic school-wide implementation processes.
2. To significantly increase the amount of student reading by promotion and creating excitement about literacy.

The LLT created an action plan to accomplish each goal. The action plan is available for viewing at the school.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification

[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 10/11/2012)

*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.

In the spring, we invite VPK and other PK students to tour our school and meet our teachers.

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

N/A

*High Schools Only

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

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

N/A

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

N/A

Postsecondary Transition

Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the [High School Feedback Report](#)

N/A

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

| | |
|--|--|
| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a: | Maintain or increase by 1 percentage point the students achieving proficiency in reading. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In 2012, based on the Florida School Grades Report, the percent of students achieving proficiency was 30%. | In 2013, based on the Florida School Grades Report, the percent of students achieving proficiency will be 31%. |

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 | Attendance | Closely monitor attendance and tardies and notify parents of academic impact. | Principal Guidance Counselor | Attendance reports | Attendance reports |
| 2 | Students entering school two years behind in reading. | Additional small group instruction. | Principal Guidance Counselor | Academic Assessment | FAIR, Mastery Checklist Rtl process |
| 3 | Students with unidentified disabilities | Assessment and additional academic instruction | Principal Curriculum Coordinator Reading Coach | Academic Assessment | FAIR Mastery checklist Discovery Education |
| 4 | Length of the School Day | After school instructional programs SES | Principal Curriculum Coordinator | Academic Assessments | FAIR Mastery Checklist Rtl process |

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

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 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

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: | Maintain or increase by one percentage point the students achieving Levels 4 and 5. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In 2011, 22% of students scored a Level 4 or 5. In 2012 29% of students scored at or above Level 4 in Reading. | In 2013 we will maintain or increase by one percentage point the students achieving Levels 4 and 5. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|-----------------------------|--|---|---|---------------------|
| 1 | Attendance | Closely monitor attendance and tardies and notify parents of academic impact | Principal Curriculum Coordinator Guidance Counselor | Attendance reports | Attendance reports |
| 2 | Length of instructional day | Increase learning opportunities after school. | Principal Curriculum Coordinator | Discovery Education Reading Assessments | Discovery Education |

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

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 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

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: | Maintain or increase by one percentage point the number of students making learning gains in reading. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In 2011 58% made learning gains in Reading. In 2012, 68% of students made a learning gain. This is an increase of 10 percentage points. | Maintain or increase by one percentage point the number of students making learning gains in reading. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|----------------------|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Attendance | Closely monitor attendance and tardies and notify parents of academic impact. | Principal Guidance Counselor | Attendance reports | Attendance reports |
| 2 | Students entering school two years or more behind in reading. | Additional small group instruction | Principal Curriculum Coordinator | Academic Assessments | Academic Assessments |
| 3 | Students with unidentified disabilities | Assessments and additional academic instruction | Principal Curriculum Coordinator | Academic assessments | Academic Assessments |
| 4 | Length of the school day | After school tutoring SES | Principal Curriculum Coordinator | Academic Assessments | Academic Assessments |

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

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

| 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 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

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: | Maintain or increase by one percentage point students in the lowest quartile making learning gains in reading. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In 2012 82% of students in the lowest quartile made learning gains. This was the highest score in the District. | Maintain or increase by one percentage point students in the lowest quartile making learning gains in reading. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|-----------------|---|---|-----------------|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| | Attendance | Closely monitor | Principal | Attendance reports | Attendance |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|----------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | | attendance and tardies and notify parents of academic impact. | Guidance Counselor | | reports |
| 2 | Students entering school two or more years behind in reading. | Additional small group instruction | principal Curriculum Coordinator | Academic Assessments | Academic Assessments |

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|--|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | | Reading Goal # In six years, OJ Semmes Elementary School, will reduce our achievement gap by 50%. 5A : | | | | |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | 30 | 46 | 51 | 57 | 62 | |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B: | Maintain or increase by one percentage point the students who made AYP. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In 2010 43% (49) Black students made AYP in Reading. In 2011, 42% of Black students made AYP in Reading. | Maintain or increase by one percentage point the students who made AYP. |

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 | Attendance | Closely monitor attendance and tardies and report to parents the academic impact. | Principal Guidance Counselor | Attendance reports | Attendance reports |
| 2 | Students entering school two or more years behind in reading. | Additional small group instruction | Principal Curriculum Coordinator | Academic Assessments | Academic Assessments |
| 3 | Length of the instructional day | After school and Saturday tutoring | Principal Curriculum Coordinator Reading Coach | Academic Assessment | Academic Assessment |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C: | OJ Semmes Elementary, we do not have enough students to meet the AYP criteria to be assessed. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| NA | NA |

| 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 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D: | Maintain or increase by one percentage point the number of SWD students making AYP in reading. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: In 2011, 2012 AMO Black=34-29-40 Students with Disabilities=13-13-20 F/R Lunch= 37-30-42 | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: Maintain or increase by one percentage point the number of SWD students making AYP in reading. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|---|----------------------|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Attendance | Closely monitor attendance and tardies and notify parents of the academic impact. | Principal Guidance Counselor | Attendance reports | Attendance reports |
| 2 | Students entering school two or more years below in reading. | Additional instruction in small groups | Principal Curriculum Coordinator Reading Coach | Academic Assessments | Academic Assessments |
| 3 | Length of the school day | After school and Saturday tutoring | Principal Curriculum Coordinator | Academic Assessments | Academic Assessments |

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

| | |
|---|--|
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E: | Maintain or increase by one percentage point the number of Economically Disadvantaged students making AYP in reading. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: In 2011, 2012 AMO Black=34-29-40 Students with Disabilities=13-13-20 F/R Lunch= 37-30-42 | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: Maintain or increase by one percentage point the number of Economically Disadvantaged students making AYP in reading. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|---|---|---|--------------------|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Attendance | Closely monitor attendance and tardies and report to parents the academic impact. | Principal Guidance Counselor | Attendance reports | Attendance reports |

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--|----------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| 2 | Length of the school day | Additional instruction in small groups | Principal Curriculum Coordinator | Academic Assessments | Academic Assessments |
|---|--------------------------|--|----------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| Handing Off from Imagine It! | K-5 | Kim Gunn | School wide | September 24, 2012 | CWT with Reading Specialist | Principal |
| Inquiry from Imagine It! | K-5 | Kim Gunn | School Wide | September 18, 2012 | CWT with Reading Specialist | Principal |

Reading Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Hire a full time Curriculum Coordinator | Curriculum Coordinator | Title 1 | \$31,000.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$31,000.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$31,000.00 |

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | |
| 1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal # 1: | At OJ Semmes, we have two ELL students. |

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:

NA

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 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

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

2. Students scoring proficient in reading.

CELLA Goal #2:

At OJ Semmes, we have two ELL students.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

NA

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 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

AT OJ Semmes we have two ELL students.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

NA

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 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1a: | Maintain or improve by one percentage point the number of students achieving proficiency on FCAT Math |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In 2011 the percent of students proficient in Math was 54. In 2012 the percent of students proficient in Math was 38. | Maintain or improve by one percentage point the number of students achieving proficiency on FCAT Math |

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 | No full time Math Coach | Professional development for teachers using District personnel. | Principal Curriculum Coordinator | Classroom Walkthrough academic assessments | FCAT Math 2013 |

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

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 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 2a: | Maintain or increase by one percentage point the number of students scoring Levels 4 and 5 in Math. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In 2011 the 14% of students scored a Level 4 or 5 in Math. In 2012 33% of students made a Level 4 or 5 in Math. | Maintain or increase by one percentage point the number of students scoring Levels 4 and 5 in Math. |

| 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 | No Math Coach | Professional development for teachers using District personnel. | Principal Curriculum Coordinator | Classroom Walk through | FCAT math scores 2013 |

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

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

| 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 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

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

| | |
|---|--|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a: | Maintain or increase by one percentage point the number of students making learning gains in math |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In 2011 62% of students made Learning Gains in Math. In 2012 72% of students made a learning gain. | Maintain or increase by one percentage point the number of students making learning gains in math. |

| 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 | No full time Math Coach | Professional Development for teachers using District personnel. | Principal Curriculum Coordinator | Academic assessments | FCAT Math scores 2013 |

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. | NA |
|---|----|

| | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Mathematics Goal #3b: | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| NA | NA |

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 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

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

| | |
|---|--|
| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4: | Maintain or increase by one percentage point the number of students in the lower quartile making learning gains in math. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In 2011 80% of students in the lower quartile made learning gains. In 2012 83% of students in the lower quartile made learning gains. | Maintain or increase by one percentage point the number of students in the lower quartile making learning gains in math. |

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 | No full time Math Coach | Professional development for teachers using District personnel. | Principal Curriculum Coordinator | Academic Assessments | FCAT Math scores 2013 |

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 # In six years, OJ Semmes Elementary School, will reduce our achievement gap by 50%. 5A : | | | | | |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | 38 | 43 | 49 | 55 | 60 | |

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

| | |
|---|--|
| 5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B: | Maintain or increase by one percentage point the number of students in various subgroups not making AYP. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |

| | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|--|---|---|--------------------------|
| In 2011, 2012 AMO Black=31-35-37 Students with Disabilities=17-27-24 F/R Lunch= 34-48-40 | | Maintain or increase by one percentage point the number of students in various subgroups making AYP. | | | |
| 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 | No full time Math Coach | Provide Professional Development to teachers using District personnel. | Principal Curriculum Coordinator | Academic Assessments | FCAT Math scores in 2013 |

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: | At OJ Semmes, we do not have enough students to meet the AYP criteria to be assessed. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| NA | NA |

| | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 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 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

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: | Maintain or increase by 1 percentage point the number of Students with Disabilities making AYP. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In 2011, 2012 AMO Black=31-35-37 Students with Disabilities=17-27-24 F/R Lunch= 34-48-40 | Maintain or increase by 1 percentage point the number of Students with Disabilities. |

| | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|---|---|---|-----------------------|
| 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 | No full time Math Coach | Professional Development for teachers using District personnel. | Principal Curriculum Coordinator | Academic Assessments | FCAT Math scores 2013 |

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

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|------------------------|
| E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E: | Maintain or increase by one percentage point the number of Economically Disadvantages students making AYP in Math. | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | | |
| In 2011, 2012 AMO Black=31-35-37 Students with Disabilities=17-27-24 F/R Lunch= 34-48-40 | Maintain or increase by one percentage point the number of Economically Disadvantages students making AYP in Math. | | | | |
| 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 | No Math Coach | Professional Development for teachers provided by District personnel. | Principal Curriculum Coordinator | Academic Assessments | FCAT math scores 2013 |

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|--|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| Technology Coordinator provides staff development for teachers | K-5 | Technology Coordinator | School wide | Every other Tuesday | CWT | Principal |

Mathematics Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---|--------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Hire a full time Curriculum Coordinator | Curriculum Coordinator | Title 1 | \$31,000.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$31,000.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|-----------------------------|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | |
| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a: | | Increase the number of students achieving proficiency on FCAT Science by one percentage point. | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| In 2012 35% of students were proficient in Science. | | | Increase the number of students achieving proficiency on FCAT Science by one percentage point. | | |
| 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 coming to school with significant gaps in the knowledge and vocabulary in the area of science | Emphasis on science vocabulary Open Science lab for hands-on activities | Principal Curriculum Coordinator | Academic Assessments | FCAT Science scores in 2013 |

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

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| 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. | | Increase the number of students who score a Level 4 | | | |

| | |
|---|---|
| Science Goal #2a: | or 5 on FCAT Science in 2013 by one percentage point. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In 2012 4% of students scored a 4 or 5 on FCAT Science. | Increase the percentage of students scoring a Level 4 or 5 on FCAT Science. |

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 coming to school with significant gaps in the their knowledge of science content areas as well as in science vocabulary. | Concentrate on building Science vocabulary Use of the Science lab for hands-on experiences | Principal Curriculum Coordinator | Academic Assessments | FCAT Science 2013 |
| 2 | | | | | |

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

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

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 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| District workshops | K-5 | District | school wide | As scheduled by District | CWT | Principal |

Science Budget:

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|--|---|---|--------------------|
| 1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. | | Maintain percentage of students achieving a Level 3.5 and above in Writing. | | | |
| Writing Goal #1a: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| In 2012 84% were proficient in Writing. | | OJ Semmes Elementary will increase one percentage point or maintain our present level of achievement in Writing. | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Attendance | Closely monitor attendance and tardies and notify parents of academic impact. | Principal Guidance Counselor | Attendance reports | Attendance reports |
| 2 | Length of school day | Provide for parent/student workshops. Provide for team teaching between fourth grade teachers. | Principal Curriculum Coordinator | Monthly writing prompts | FCAT Writing |

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

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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|---|---|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| Step Up to Writing | K-5 | Language Arts Specialist and two teacher leaders. | school wide | October 2012 | CWT | Principal |

Writing Budget:

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

Attendance Goal(s)

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

| Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| 1. Attendance | | Decrease the percentage of absences by .1%. | | | |
| Attendance Goal # 1: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: | | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: | | | |
| The daily average attendance, in 2012 was 92.6% | | The expected attendance rate at the end of 2013 will be 92.7. | | | |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | | | |
| In 2011-2012 the number of students with excessive absences was 205 students. | | In 2012-2013 the expected number of students with excessive absences will decrease by 20 students. | | | |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | | | |
| In 2011-2012 the number of students with excessive tardies was 101. | | In 2012-2013 the expected number of students with excessive tardies will decrease by 5 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 | Lack of understanding of the impact on student achievement | Notify parent when academic impact is recognized. | Principal Guidance Counselor | Attendance reports | Attendance reports |
| 2 | Excessive absences and continuing tardies. | The strategy is to identify students by name and school who have excessive absences or tardies. Committees have been formed to analyze historic data and present possible solutions. | Linda Maletsidis, Director of Elementary Education. Mark Yelverton, Curriculum Coordinator and Lynda Stratton, Guidance Counselor are responsible at the school level. | Attendance and Tardy reports. School Climate reports. | Attendance and Tardy reports. School Climate reports. |

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|---|---|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| School wide Behavior Plan | PK-5 | Guidance Counselor and Curriculum Coordinator | school wide | one time per month | Track attendance data | Guidance Counselor |

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

| | |
|---|---|
| Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | |
| 1. Suspension Suspension Goal # 1: | The number of Suspensions will decrease from 2011-2012. |
| 2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions |
| 42 In-School Suspensions | 35 In-School Suspensions |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School |
| 28 students suspended in school | 25 students suspended in school |
| 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions |
| | |

| | |
|---|--|
| 152 out of school suspensions | 100 out of school suspensions |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School |
| 76 students suspended out of school | 70 students suspended out of school |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|-------------------------------|---|---|---|-----------------|
| 1 | Lack of Intervention Programs | Implementation of a modified Positive Behavior support program. | Principal Guidance | Suspension data | Suspension data |

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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|---|---|--|-----------------------------------|--|
| Review of Behavior Plan | PK-5 | Principal, Curriculum Coordinator, Guidance Counselor | school wide | August 2012 | Behavior data | Guidance Counselor Principal Curriculum Coordinator |

Suspension Budget:

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

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|-----------------|
| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | | | |
| 1. Parent Involvement | | | | | |
| Parent Involvement Goal # 1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i> | | Maintain or increase by one the number of Parent involvement activities. | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement: | | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: | | | |
| We offered 32 parent involvement activities during school year 2011-2012. | | Maintain or increase by one the number of Parent Involvement activities. | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Parents working more than one job. Parents working at night. | Vary the times for Parent Involvement activities. | Curriculum Coordinator | Feedback from parents | Sign in sheets. |

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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

Parent Involvement Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|--|---------------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Plan a variety of parent activities with input from SAC. | Depends upon the activity | Title 1 funds | \$1,700.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$1,700.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |

| Professional Development | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|-------------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$1,700.00 |

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|-----------------|
| 1. STEM STEM Goal #1: | | | The Technology Coordinator will provide a series of Professional Development to teachers. | | |
| 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 | Technology Coordinator is only here part-time. | Seek other funding sources so that he may be full-time. | Principal | Full time Technology Coordinator | Staffing form |

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 |
|---|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| Various software and hardware workshops | PK-5 | Technology Coordinator | School wide | Two times per month | Increased us of technology by teachers and students. | Principal |

STEM Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---|--------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Hire a part-time Technology Coordinator | Technology Coordinator | Title 1 | \$30,000.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$30,000.00 |
| Technology | | | |

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|--|----------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Teach teachers and students to use iPads | Purchase iPads | Technology replacement funds | \$7,000.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$7,000.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Teach studnets and teachers to use iPads | iPads and Technology Coordinator | NA | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$37,000.00 |

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

NA Goal:

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | |
| 1. NA Goal NA Goal #1: | | | NA | | |
| 2012 Current level: | | | 2013 Expected level: | | |
| NA | | | NA | | |
| 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 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA |

Budget:

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

| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
|--------------|--------------------------|----------------|----------------------------|
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of NA Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Hire a full time Curriculum Coordinator | Curriculum Coordinator | Title 1 | \$31,000.00 |
| CELLA | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| Mathematics | Hire a full time Curriculum Coordinator | Curriculum Coordinator | Title 1 | \$31,000.00 |
| Science | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| Writing | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| Attendance | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| Suspension | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| Parent Involvement | Plan a variety of parent activities with input from SAC. | Depends upon the activity | Title 1 funds | \$1,700.00 |
| STEM | Hire a part-time Technology Coordinator | Technology Coordinator | Title 1 | \$30,000.00 |
| NA | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$93,700.00 |
| Technology | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| CELLA | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| Mathematics | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| Science | | | | \$0.00 |
| Writing | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| Attendance | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| Suspension | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| Parent Involvement | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| STEM | Teach teachers and students to use iPads | Purchase iPads | Technology replacement funds | \$7,000.00 |
| NA | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$7,000.00 |
| Professional Development | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| CELLA | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| Mathematics | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| Science | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| Writing | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| Attendance | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| Suspension | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| Parent Involvement | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| STEM | Teach studnets and teachers to use iPads | iPads and Technology Coordinator | NA | \$0.00 |
| NA | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Other | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| CELLA | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| Mathematics | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| Science | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| Writing | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |

| | | | | |
|--------------------|----|----|----|---------------------------|
| Attendance | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| Suspension | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| Parent Involvement | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| STEM | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| NA | NA | NA | NA | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | | Grand Total: \$100,700.00 |

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

| Projected use of SAC Funds | Amount |
|----------------------------|--------|
| n/a | \$0.00 |

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

Re-wrote the Title Parent/School Contract. Assist with planned Family Activities.

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

| Escambia School District O. J. SEMMES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011 | | | | | | |
|---|----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------|---|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 54% | 54% | 91% | 30% | 229 | Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component. |
| % of Students Making Learning Gains | 58% | 62% | | | 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? | 48% (NO) | 80% (YES) | | | 128 | 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 | | | | | 477 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | C | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |

| Escambia School District O. J. SEMMES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010 | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------|---|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 54% | 51% | 77% | 13% | 195 | 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 | 55% | 60% | | | 115 | 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) | 80% (YES) | | | 132 | 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 | | | | | 442 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | C | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |