

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: PORT ORANGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Volusia

Principal: Bonnie Gyarfas

SAC Chair: Leah Moss

Superintendent: Margaret Smith

Date of School Board Approval: Pending School Board approval,
December 11, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/19/2012

Gerard Robinson, Commissioner
Florida Department of Education
325 West Gaines Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Dr. Mike Grego, Chancellor
K-12 Public Schools
Florida Department of Education
325 West Gaines Street
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

Note: The following links will open in a separate browser window.

| |
|--|
| School Grades Trend Data |
| Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data |
| High School Feedback Report |
| K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan |

ADMINISTRATORS

List your school's administrators and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an administrator, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide assessment performance (percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and Ambitious but achievable annual measurable objective (AMO) progress.

| Position | Name | Degree(s)/ Certification(s) | # of Years at Current School | # of Years as an Administrator | Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year) |
|-----------|----------------|--|------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|
| Principal | Bonnie Gyarfas | BA Elementary Education and Emotional Disturbance MA Educational Leadership Certification: Specific Learning Disabilities, Emotional Disturbance, Elementary Education, Educational Leadership | 3 | 16 | 2011-A School, (71%R/68%M; 66%R/82%M; 72%R/57%M)* 2010-A School, AYP 97% (90%R/90%M; 68%R/65%M; 65%R/59%M)* 2009-A School, AYP 92%(83%R/73%M; 62%R/57%M; 53%R/57%M)* 2008-B School, AYP 100%(85%R/81%M; 66%R/67%M; 47%R/67%M)* 2007-B School, AYP 90%(65%R/63%M; 64%R/77%M; 60%R/73%M)* 2006-C School, AYP 87%(53%R/52%M; 63%R/73%M; 70%R/71%M)* 2005-C School, AYP 85%(67R/45%M; 55%R/67%M; 60%R) *(Proficient Reading/Math; Learning Gains R/M; Lowest 25% R/M) Prior to 2005, Mrs. Gyarfas was a highly qualified administrator who continually improved her leadership skills through ongoing professional development. She strove to provide quality leadership and support to her faculty and staff as they |

worked toward increasing student achievement in their high poverty school.

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) |
|--------------|------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| N/A | | | | | |

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

| | Description of Strategy | Person Responsible | Projected Completion Date | Not Applicable (If not, please explain why) |
|---|--|-------------------------------|---------------------------|---|
| 1 | 1. New Teacher Programs (Individualized PD, mentors, peer classroom visits, other site visits) | Administration | June 2013 | |
| 2 | 2. Leadership Opportunities | Administration | June 2013 | |
| 3 | 3. Professional Development | Administration | June 2013 | |
| 4 | 4. PLC Activities | PLC Chairs | June 2013 | |
| 5 | 5. Celebrations/Teacher Recognition | Teacher of the Year Committee | June 2013 | |
| 6 | 6. Participation in District Job Fair and Recruitment Activities | Administration | June 2013 | |

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

| Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective. | Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective |
|--|---|
| No data submitted | |

Staff Demographics

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

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

| Total Number of Instructional Staff | % of First-Year Teachers | % of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience | % of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience | % of Teachers with Advanced Degrees | % Highly Effective Teachers | % Reading Endorsed Teachers | % National Board Certified Teachers | % ESOL Endorsed Teachers |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 30 | 3.3%(1) | 16.7%(5) | 40.0%(12) | 40.0%(12) | 46.7%(14) | 100.0%(30) | 6.7%(2) | 6.7%(2) | 23.3%(7) |

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 |
|-----------------|-----------------|---|--|
| Denise Pedicord | Michelle Moore | Michelle Moore is a first year guidance counselor being mentored by a district-assigned Peer Assistance and Review Teacher (PAR) Teacher. | Coaching, observations, collaborative lesson planning, Empowering Educator Excellence Program (E3) |
| | | | |
| | | | |

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

N/A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

N/A

Title I, Part D

N/A

Title II

N/A

Title III

N/A

Title X- Homeless

N/A

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

N/A

Violence Prevention Programs

N/A

Nutrition Programs

N/A

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

Other

N/A

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Principal, PST Chair, School Psychologist, Grade Chairs, Instructional Support TOAs

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 school based MTSS leadership team identifies school based resources (both materials and personnel) to determine the continuum of academic and behavioral supports available to students at the individual school site. Academic and behavioral data are considered in order to determine priorities and functions of other existing teams (e.g., Problem Solving Teams, Behavior Leadership Teams, and Professional Learning Communities). The Problem Solving process (i.e., Problem Identification, Analysis of Problem, Intervention Implementation and Response to Intervention) is used as the way of work of all teams and not just for individual student concerns. Adherence to the Problem Solving process ensures that individual, class-wide, and school-wide issues are addressed systematically with data; that interventions (supports) are tiered to the targeted problems; and that a plan is in place to monitor progress. The school-based MTSS leadership team meets regularly throughout the school year in order to address the academic and behavioral needs that develop throughout the year, as well as to monitor outcomes of supports and interventions.

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 school improvement plan is data driven and focuses on areas of school- based need for both specific content areas as well as specific student populations. Similarly, MTSS is a data-driven framework that seeks to find solutions/resources matched in intensity to student need in academic and behavioral areas. The MTSS framework follows the district's four-step problem solving process, with RtI as an integral component of the process. As a result, the school improvement plan is based on a strategic analysis of data, and identified resources (as identified by the MTSS school based leadership team) are matched to the needs of the students/schools. Building the SIP within the context of MTSS results in the school determining the areas of most significant need and, as importantly, enables the school to develop a plan that can be addressed based on existing resources.

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.

Pinnacle Gradebook provides evidence of performance in core instruction across content areas. In addition, information gleaned from FAIR assessments, DRAs, OPM probes, interim assessments and FCAT provide valuable information regarding reading performance for both individuals and groups of students. Interim assessments and FCAT also provide critical information regarding student performance in the areas of mathematics, science, and writing. Pinnacle Insight reports provide further information regarding performance by both individual and groups of students (disaggregated by specific groups) in

order to inform instruction and intervention. Behavioral expectations are communicated by the school to all students and parents. Those students who do not obtain proficiency in behavioral expectations are provided supports and interventions matched to student need. Office discipline data are maintained and monitored by the school site. Tier 2 and tier 3 supports/interventions and the response to these interventions are entered into the electronic PST system. Summary reports within the system are available to MTSS school-based leadership (i.e. the Principal, PST Chair, and school psychologist).

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The district Coordinator of MTSS in conjunction with the Deputy Superintendent for Instructional Services will be providing schools with relevant training materials on MTSS. In addition to an overview of MTSS that will be available to all schools, the foundational principles of MTSS and resources will be embedded within other resources and trainings (e.g., Deliberate Practice and Common Core State Standards Training).

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

School-based support for MTSS will be provided by the District MTSS Leadership Team. In turn, the school-based MTSS Leadership team will disseminate relevant MTSS information to teachers and parents. Data-based meetings throughout the school year will identify those students in need of academic and/or behavioral supports. Furthermore, based on this data-based decision making, supports will be implemented and monitored. School-specific reports, such as those available in Pinnacle Insight, will facilitate the development of a data-based MTSS framework. This data, in conjunction with identified school-based tiered resources, will ensure that a Multi-Tiered System of Supports is an overarching framework that guides the work of the school.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Principal, Teacher on Assignment and Grade Chairs.

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

The LLT meets periodically with the principal. The Literacy Leadership Team will play an integral part in the leadership of the school. The principal will empower the Literacy Leadership Team to develop and implement a variety of strategies to build a culture of reading throughout the school. Strategies may include: 1) professional development opportunities for teachers, 2) a schedule of activities that promote reading, 3) presentations at faculty meetings. The principal will provide support for the team by promoting diversified team membership, convenient times for the team to meet, leadership for productive team meetings, and resources to implement the team's plans.

Principal: The school principal is responsible for selecting and maintaining the school's literacy team. The principal is the literacy leader of the team and serves as the facilitator and promoter of literacy initiatives across the disciplines. The principal will also provide leadership in the planning and implementation of professional development, best practices, curriculum development, and will provide support in the areas of data analysis and progress monitoring to better serve the school community.

Grade Chair: Serves as the facilitator of the Professional Learning Community for her grade. Teams meet weekly to analyze data and/or plan for instruction.

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

The major initiative of the LLT for 2012 - 2013 will be: to support teachers in the implementation of the Anchor Literacy Standards of reading, writing, listening, speaking, language use, and grammar in all classes K-5.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

The District, in conjunction with the local Head Start agency, Early Learning Coalition, VPK Sites and other local pre-school facilities, coordinates efforts to promote continuity of services and effective transitions for children and their families. These include:

- . Providing the opportunity for ongoing communication between agencies to facilitate coordination of programs and shared expectations for children's learning and development as the children transition to elementary school.
- . Collaborating and participating in joint professional development, including transition-related training for school staff and pre-school staff when feasible.
- . Providing to the pre-school agencies local public school policies, kindergarten registration, kindergarten orientation and other relevant information to ease the transition of children and families.

*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: | Students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in reading will increase by 1% or remain within 3%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 15% (32) | 16% (33) |

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 | Opportunities to train new teachers, funding for follow up coaching. | Teachers will receive coaching in Kagan Strategies that promote high student engagement; receive follow up support and coaching. | Coaching Staff Administrator Teachers | Ongoing monitoring of formative and summative assessment data VSET observations and conferences Track student growth using Scantron assessments and meet regularly as grade-level teams to foster growth among all students using formative data Ongoing monitoring through VSET observations Teacher records of reflections on literacy strategy use | Reading assessment data, FAIR data, Math assessment data, Science assessment data, FCAT results |
| 2 | Students with low SES, ELL, other ethnic minority, and students with disabilities impacted by multiple barriers are moderate to high risk. | Identified students through FAIR and MacMillan Interim tests will receive additional reading instruction using scientifically research based reading strategies. | Coaching Staff Administrator Teachers | Ongoing monitoring of reading formative and summative assessment data Track student growth using Scantron assessments and meet regularly as grade-level teams to foster growth among all students using formative data | Reading assessment data, FAIR data, FCAT results |
| 3 | Teachers are not familiar enough with literacy strategies necessary to accomplish the rigor required by Common Core State Standards. | Train teachers to use High-Impact Literacy Strategies that support achieving the Anchor Literacy Standards. | Administrative Staff | Ongoing monitoring through VSET observations Teacher records of reflections on literacy strategy use | FAIR data, FCAT results |

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| | |
|---|--|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a: | Students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 4 or above) in reading will increase by 1% or remain within 3%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 56%(118) | 57%(119) |

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 | Funds to purchase advanced reading materials Finding more challenging texts that reflect the level of difficulty needed for Common Core. | Targeted students will participate in Literature Circles. | Teachers | Teacher observation Student work Weekly reading assessments | Reading Unit Tests District Assessments FCAT results |
| 2 | Limited opportunities and programs for reading enrichment. | Weekly collaborative planning among grade level teams made up of general education and gifted endorsed teachers to share enrichment strategies for students performing above proficiency. | Principal Teachers | Increased student achievement and implementation of strategies in the delivery of instruction. | Common Classroom Assessments, District Assessments and FCAT results |
| 3 | Adequate time for teachers to review data, plan differentiated instruction, and deliver the instruction within the school day. | Teams (with the support of the coaching staff) will meet in Professional Learning Communities to work collaboratively in collecting and analyzing data in order to plan effective differentiated | Coaching Staff Administrator Teachers | Ongoing monitoring of formative and summative assessment data Track student growth using Scantron assessments and meet regularly as grade-level | Reading assessment data, FAIR data, Math assessment data, Science assessment data, FCAT results |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|------------------------------|--|---------------|
| | | instruction and enrichment. | | teams to foster growth among all students | |
| 4 | More rigorous instruction is needed, with more opportunities for higher-level thinking skills. | Professional development on Charlotte Danielson's Framework 3b: Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques (Domain 1) | Coaching Staff Administrator | Ratio of higher-level questions to lower-level questions will be assessed during walk-throughs and coaching provided to those with a low percentage of higher-level questions. | Walk-throughs |
| 5 | | | | | |

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| | |
|---|--|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a: | Students making Learning Gains in reading will increase by 1% or remain within 3%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 66% (80) | 67% (81) |

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 with large gaps in reading achievement. | Intensive assistance in Reading will be provided by classroom teachers and ESE teachers supported by the evaluation and monitoring of the administrative team. | Administrators ESE Teachers | FAIR assessments will be analyzed three times each year. FCAT Explorer and District Interim Assessments will be monitored monthly to | FAIR assessments FCAT Explorer District Interim Assessments |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | | | note student improvements. | |
| 2 | Teachers using data from available resources and progress monitoring assessments to target instruction in classroom | Provide school based training on Pinnacle Gradebook and Insight reports | Pinnacle Grade Book Managers Administrators | Department Chairs Reading Coach Administrators | FCAT 2.0 FAIR assessments |
| 3 | Adequate time for teachers to review data, plan differentiated instruction, and deliver the instruction within the school day. | Teams (with the support of the coaching staff) will meet in Professional Learning Communities to work collaboratively in collecting and analyzing data in order to plan effective differentiated instruction and enrichment. | Coaching Staff Administrator Teachers | Ongoing monitoring of formative and summative assessment data Track student growth using Scantron assessments and meet regularly as grade-level teams to foster growth among all students | Reading assessment data, FAIR data, Science assessment data, FCAT results |

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: | N/A | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| N/A | N/A | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 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: | Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains will increase by 1% or remain with 3%. | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | | |
| 67% (22) | 68% (22) | | | | |
| 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 | Adequate time for teachers to review data, plan differentiated instruction, and deliver | Target below level Kindergarten and First grade students outside the reading block for | Teachers | Ongoing monitoring of formative and summative assessments | Reading Assessment FAIR Data |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| | the instruction within the school day. | additional reading instruction, Walk to Intervention. | | | |
| 2 | Funding for materials Time Volunteers | Students will also receive leveled fluency passages which will come from Approaching Teacher Resource from Macmillan reading series. | Teachers Parents Volunteer | Teacher observation Student work Weekly reading assessments | Reading Unit Tests District Assessments FCAT Results |
| 3 | Students in the lowest 25% are usually students with disabilities, low SES and/or ELL. Many are affected by these multiple barriers. | Classroom teachers will provide reading intervention in the areas of vocabulary, fluency, phonics, and comprehension instruction using scientifically based reading materials. | Classroom teachers and administration | Track student growth using Scantron assessments and meet regularly as grade-level teams to foster growth among all students using formative data. | Reading assessment data, FAIR data, FCAT results |

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 2012-2013, we will reduce the achievement gap by meeting the AMO target (78% proficient) or through Safe Harbor (74% proficient). 5A : | | | | |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | 71% | 78% | 80% | 82% | 84% | |

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: | In 2012-2013, each subgroup will reduce the achievement gap by meeting the AMO target or through Safe Harbor. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| Hispanic 82% White 68% | Hispanic 84% (Safe Harbor) White 71%(Safe Harbor) |

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 | Opportunities to train new teachers, funding for follow up coaching. | Teachers will receive coaching in Kagan Strategies that promote high student engagement; receive follow up support and coaching. | Coaching Staff Administrator | Ongoing monitoring through VSET observations | Reading assessment data, FAIR data, FCAT 2.0 |

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. | N/A |
|--|-----|

| | |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Reading Goal #5C: | |
| 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 | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | |

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: | N/A |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| N/A | N/A |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E: | In 2012-2013, the achievement gap for ED students will be reduced by meeting the AMO target or through Safe Harbor. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| ED: 61% | ED: 65% (Safe Harbor) |

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 | Challenges of working with students who do not have exposure to high-level academic vocabulary in their homes. | Implementation of a school-wide literacy system that emphasizes a unified, systematic approach to the teaching of vocabulary using research-based strategies. | Administration Literacy Leadership Team | Classroom Walkthrough Literacy Leadership Team Meetings | VSET Observations Domain 3 |
| 2 | Students needing intervention | Target below level Kindergarten and First grade students outside the reading block for additional reading instruction, Walk to Intervention. | Teachers | Ongoing monitoring of formative assessments | FAIR |

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 |
|--|---------------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| High-Impact Literacy Strategies that support achieving the Anchor Literacy Standards | K-5 | Common Core Team | School wide | Eight Early Release Days Aug. 2012-Feb. 2013 | Coaching VSET Walk-throughs and Observations | Administration and Common Core Implementation Team |
| Making Connections Training | Grades 3 -5 | District ESE / Reading Department | Grades 3 - 5 | October, 2012 1/2 day training | Monitor data VSET Walk-throughs and Observations Lesson Plans | Administration |
| Kagan Structures Training | School-wide | Marilyn Jackson Lee | School-wide | September, 2012 2 training days | Coaching VSET Walk-throughs and Observations | Administration IS TOAs |

Reading Budget:

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

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

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

| Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students. | | | | |
|---|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| 1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. | | | | |
| CELLA Goal #1: | | | | |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking: | | | | |
| | | | | |
| 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 | | | | |

| 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: | | | | |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient 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 |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient 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 |
|---------------------|----------|---|---|-----------------|
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

CELLA Budget:

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

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: | Students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in mathematics will increase by 1% or remain within 3%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 17%(36) | 18%(36) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 1 | Teachers are not yet familiar with the Common Core State Standards in math. | Provide professional development on embedding the 8 Standards for Mathematical Practices into daily instruction as appropriate Implement new math Curriculum Maps, which have these standards incorporated | Administration Classroom Teachers | Ongoing monitoring of formative assessments, summative district assessments, and teacher observations by administrators | VSET Evaluation District interims FCAT 2.0 |
| 2 | Funding | Continue to implement Thinking Math Primary, Common Core Edition strategies. | Administration Instructional Support Teacher on Assignment | District Interim Assessments | District Interim Assessments |
| 3 | Funding, Time | Provide Thinking Math Intermediate, Common Core Edition professional development, for general education teachers in grades 3- 5. | Principal, Classroom Teachers | District Interim Assessments | VSET Evaluation District interims FCAT 2.0 |

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

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

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

| | |
|---|--|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a: | Students achieving proficiency at or above (FCAT Level 4) in mathematics will increase by 1% or remain within 3% |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 51% (107) | 53% (108) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|------------------------------|
| 1 | Limited opportunities and programs for mathematics enrichment | Weekly grade level meetings to provide uninterrupted time for general education and gifted endorsed teachers to collaborate on enrichment activities and assessments. | Administration Grade Level Chair | Ongoing monitoring of formative assessments, summative district assessments, and teacher observations by administrators | VSET observation FCAT 2.0 |
| 2 | Funding, Time | Provide Thinking Math Intermediate, Common Core Edition professional development, for general education teachers in grades 3- 5. | Administration | District Interim Assessments | VSET observation FCAT 2.0 |
| 3 | Limited technology at home | Implement "Flipped-Math" in grade 5 for students achieving at FCAT level 4 and 5. | Administration | Ongoing monitoring of formative assessments, summative district assessments, and teacher observations by administrators | VSET observation FCAT 2.0 |
| 4 | Access to technology | Incorporate prescriptive on-line math tools i.e. Manga High, Sokikon, etc. | Administration | Ongoing monitoring of formative assessments, summative district assessments, and teacher observations by administrators | VSET observation FCAT 2.0 |

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

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

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

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

| | |
|--|--|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 3a: | Students making learning gains in mathematics will increase by 1% or remain within 3%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 77% (99) | 78% (100) |

| 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 | Funding | Provide Thinking Math Intermediate, Common Core Edition professional development, for general education teachers in grades 3- 5. | Administration | Ongoing monitoring of formative assessments, summative district assessments, and teacher observations by administrators | VSET observation FCAT 2.0 |
| 2 | Teachers are not yet familiar with the Common Core State Standards in math | Provide professional development on embedding the 8 Standards for Mathematical Practices into daily instruction as appropriate. Implement new math Curriculum Maps, which have these standards incorporated. | Administration Classroom Teachers | Ongoing monitoring of formative assessments, summative district assessments, and teacher observations by administrators | VSET Evaluation District interims |

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

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

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4: | Students in the lowest 25% making learning gains will increase by 1% or remain within 3%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 53%(18) | 54%(18) |

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 | Not all math teachers are familiar with incorporating literacy strategies | Provide professional development on literacy strategies appropriate for math teachers. | Administration Grade Level Chair | Ongoing monitoring of formative assessments, summative district assessments, and teacher observations by administrators | VSET Evaluation FSA, SSA, District Interims FCAT 2.0 |
| 2 | Funding | Provide Thinking Math Common Core, Ed. for teachers in grades 2-5. | Administration Instructional Support TOAs | Ongoing monitoring of formative assessments, summative district assessments, and teacher observations by administrators | VSET Evaluation FSA, SSA, District Interims FCAT 2.0 |

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 2012-2013, we will reduce the achievement gap by meeting the AMO target (75% proficient) or through Safe Harbor (71% proficient). 5A : | | | | | |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | 68% | 75% | 78% | 80% | 83% | |

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: | In 2012-2013, each subgroup will reduce the achievement gap by meeting the AMO target or through Safe Harbor. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |

| Hispanic 76% White 65% | | Hispanic 78% (Safe Harbor) White 69% (Safe Harbor) | | | |
|---|---------------------|--|---|---|--|
| 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 | Funding | Provide Thinking Math Intermediate, Common Core Edition professional development for teachers in grades 3-5. | Administration | District Interim Assessments | VSET Evaluation District Interims FACT 2.0 |

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

| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C: | N/A | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|---|---|-----------------|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| 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 |
| 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 subgroup:

| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D: | In 2012-2013, the achievement gap for SWD students will be reduced by meeting the AMO target or through Safe Harbor. | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|-----------------|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | | |
| 17% | 25% (Safe Harbor) | | | | |
| 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 |
| | The individual needs of some students in the Exceptional Student Education program are | Provide intensive, systematic instruction on foundational skills in small groups to students who | Administration Instructional Coaches | Ongoing monitoring of formative assessments | FCAT 2.0 |

| | | | | |
|---|----------------|--|--|--|
| 1 | not being met. | score below the proficient level. Typically, these groups meet between three and five times a week, for 20 to 40 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 subgroup:

| | |
|---|---|
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E: | In 2012-2013, the achievement gap for ED students will be reduced by meeting the AMO target or through Safe Harbor. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 60% | 64% (Safe Harbor) |

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 | Challenges of working with students who do not have exposure to high-level academic vocabulary in their homes | Implementation of school-wide curriculum resources, including core program and diagnostic/intervention materials that emphasize the use of multiple instructional strategies. | Administration Instructional Coaches | Classroom Walkthrough Ongoing monitoring of diagnostic, formative and summative assessments | VSET Observations Domain 3 FCAT 2.0 |
| 2 | Funding Time | Provide Thinking Math Intermediate, Common Core Edition professional development for general education teachers in grades 3- 5. | Principal Classroom Teachers | District Interim Assessments | VSET Evaluation District Interims FCAT 2.0 |

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 |
|---|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| Thinking Math Intermediate, Common Core Edition | 3-5 | District Thinking Math Trainers | Teachers in Grades 3-5 | Five full day sessions October 2012- January 2013 | Coaching | Administration |
| Provide professional development on embedding the 8 Standards for Mathematical Practices into | K-5 | Common Core Facilitator | Teachers in Grades K-5 | Early Release Days | Coaching | Administration |

| | | | | | | |
|--|-----|---------------------------------|------------------------|--|----------|----------------|
| daily instruction as appropriate. | | | | | | |
| Thinking Math Primary, Common Core Edition | K-2 | District Thinking Math Trainers | Teachers in Grades K-2 | Five full day sessions October 2012-January 2013 | Coaching | Administration |

Mathematics Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|--|----------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Thinking Math Intermediate and Primary Common Core Edition | Substitutes, Manuals, 7 Teachers | Extended Day Enrichment Programs Funds | \$3,850.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$3,850.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$3,850.00 |

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

| | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|---|---|--|------------------------------|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | |
| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. | | Students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in science will increase by 1% or remain within 3%. | | | |
| Science Goal # 1a: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| 29%(20) | | 30%(20) | | | |
| 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 | Materials and supplies | Teachers in grades K-5 will implement hands-on science lessons aligned with the | Administration | Monitor usage and implementation through: ISN (Interactive | District Interim Assessments |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---------------------------------------|---|------------------------------|
| | | curriculum maps each week. | | Student Notebooks) Science Interim Assessments | |
| 2 | Lack of knowledge of CCSS standards and literacy strategies to incorporate into science instruction | Participate in training on incorporating CCSS Literacy and Mathematics Standards in Science Lessons (such as close reading). | Principal Common Core Leadership Team | ISN (Interactive Student Notebooks) | District Interim Assessments |
| 3 | Not enough computers for each student, pending funding | Teachers in grades 3-5 will integrate technology into the science curriculum with the use of virtual simulations, video, and experimental design using the Apple iPad2 and additional technology supplied by students as a part of the "Bring Your Own Technology" program. | Teachers | Formative Assessments, ISN (Interactive Student Notebooks) Student projects | District Interim Assessments |

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a: | Students achieving proficiency at or above (FCAT Level 4) in mathematics will increase by 1% or remain within 3%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 43% (30) | 44%(30) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| | | | Monitoring | Strategy | |
|---|--|---|-------------------|--|--------------|
| 1 | Coordination of the Computer Lab schedule | Using Pixton.com students will demonstrate understanding of scientific concepts. | Classroom Teacher | District Interim Assessments | FCAT Science |
| 2 | Not enough Apple iPad2 computers for each student, pending funding | Teachers in grade 5 will integrate technology into the science curriculum with the use of virtual simulations, video, and experimental design using the Apple iPad2 and additional technology supplied by students as a part of the BYOT program. | Teachers | Formative Assessments, Science Interim Assessments | FCAT Science |

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

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

Science Goal #2b:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

Science Budget:

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group: | | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|-----------------------------|
| 1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a: | | Percentage of students scoring a FCAT level 3 or higher in writing will increase by 1% or remain within 3%. | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| 88%(53) | | 89%(53) | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Teachers are not yet familiar with the new Anchor Standards for Writing. | All grade levels follow the district English Language Arts Curriculum Maps which are aligned to Common Core Standards. | Principal | Monitor Volusia Writes scores | Volusia Writes FCAT Writing |
| 2 | Language Arts teachers are not yet familiar enough with the state changes in scoring of FCAT Writing responses. | Use the state-provided CD of 2012 students' FCAT Writing responses for professional development. Implement writing strategies provided through district training which focus on the | Principal | Monitor Volusia Writes scores | Volusia Writes FCAT Writing |

| | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|---|--|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| | | change in state writing expectations. | | | |
| 3 | Time | Provide professional development for primary teachers in the primary scoring rubric aimed at increasing interrater reliability. | Instructional Support Teacher Principal | Monitor Volusia Writes scores | Volusia Writes |
| 4 | Scheduling Challenges | Provide an additional 1/2 hour of daily writing instruction for students in 3rd and 4th grade. | Administration | Monitor Volusia Writes Scores | Volusia Writes 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: | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
| | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | |
| Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| No Data Submitted | | | | |

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

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

| PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus | Grade Level/Subject | PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader | PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide) | Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings) | Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| Primary Writing Rubric | K-2 | Instructional Support Teacher | Grade K-2 teachers | PLC | Coaching Review of Volusia Writes data | Principal |
| Use the state-provided CD of 2012 students' FCAT Writing responses for professional development | Gr. 3 and 4 | Instructional Support Teacher | Grade 3-4 Teachers | PLC | Coaching Review of Volusia Writes data | Principal |

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|---------------------------------------|
| Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | | | |
| 1. Attendance | | The attendance rate will go up by 1% while the number of excessive absences and tardies will be reduced by 10%. | | | |
| Attendance Goal # 1: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: | | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: | | | |
| 94.29% | | 95.29% | | | |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | | | |
| 163 | | 147 | | | |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | | | |
| 104 | | 94 | | | |
| 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 |
| | Transient students, Transportation Issues | Parent/guardian notification of absences/tardies | Teacher, Administration, Guidance | Analyzing data gathered from daily attendance reports to | School-wide and/or individual student |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|
| 1 | | 5, 10, 15 day absence letters and/or tardy notes and Connect Ed PST or IEP Attendance Meetings Attendance contracts w/student and/or parent/guardian | Counselor, and School Social Worker. PST Chair or IEP Facilitator/Case Manager | show patterns of non-attendance/ tardies | attendance reports |
| 2 | Compliant attendance sometimes goes unrecognized and unrewarded. | Attendance incentives/ recognition | Teacher, Administration, Guidance Counselor, | Analyzing data gathered from attendance reports | School-wide, classroom, and/or individual student attendance reports |

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| 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 |

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 in-school and out-of-school suspensions will decrease by one student. |
| 2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions |
| 3 | 2 |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School |
| 3 | 2 |
| 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions |
| 6 | 5 |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School |
| 6 | 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 | Time | Continue implementation of the Bully Proofing curriculum. One lesson per week for six weeks. Weekly class meetings to recognize students displaying caring behaviors. | Behavioral Leadership Team | Climate Survey | Discipline Data |
| 2 | Counseling services are only available part time. | Provide small group support through the guidance curriculum for students identified as victims and bullies. | Guidance Counselor | Climate Survey | Counseling Records |

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

| | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|--|------------------------------------|--|-----------------|
| Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | | | |
| 1. Parent Involvement | | | | | |
| Parent Involvement Goal #1: | | To maintain 5 Star School status by continuing consistent parent involvement at all school functions and parent/teacher conferences. | | | |
| *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated. | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement: | | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: | | | |
| 92% of our parents attended three or more school functions in the 2011-2012 school year. | | 94% of our parents will attend three or more school functions in the 2012-2013 school year. | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of | Evaluation Tool |

| | | | Monitoring | Strategy | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1 | Parent availability, transportation | The school will strive to maintain community/business partnerships, family involvement, active volunteers, student community service, and School Advisory Council through ongoing effective communication to ensure that parents are provided opportunities to meet regularly with the school to participate in decisions relating to the education of their children. | Principal | Climate Survey April 2013 | 5-Star status for 2013 school year |
| 2 | Parent availability | Implement the "Bring Your Own Technology" program and provide parent training and support in technology issues. | BYOT Team | Parent participation on Edmodo | BYOT Rubric |

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

| | | | |
|---------|---------|---------|---------------------|
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$0.00 |

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

| Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| 1. STEM STEM Goal #1: | | Teachers will use 2 project-based STEM Lessons from professional development provided by Dr. Diana Grabowski. | | | |
| 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 time to develop high-quality lessons that integrate all areas of STEM | Utilize STEM Modules modeled by Dr. Grabowski during science professional development. | Administration | Formative Assessment, District Interim Assessments | District Interim Assessments FCAT 2.0 |
| 2 | Lack of knowledge and/or interest in STEM areas. | The participation of 5th grade students in Science Fair will increase by 10%. | Administration | Formative Assessment, District Interim Assessments | Usage data |
| 3 | Lack of Volunteers | Implement an Odyssey of the Mind program. | Third Grade Teacher | Records of participation | Culminating projects |
| 4 | Discovery Center located in New Smyrna, transportation may be an issue | Marine Discovery Center Science Night | PTA Teachers Administration | Number of families participating | Sign In Forms |
| 5 | Time and money for materials | Provide a Family Science Night with emphasis on STEM activities. | Administration | Exit Sheet | Sign in Forms |

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--|-------------------------|
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Mathematics | Thinking Math Intermediate and Primary Common Core Edition | Substitutes, Manuals, 7 Teachers | Extended Day Enrichment Programs Funds | \$3,850.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$3,850.00 |
| Other | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | | Grand Total: \$3,850.00 |

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 (Uploaded on 9/16/2012)

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 |
|---|----------|
| These funds will be used for childcare for parent involvement activities and substitutes for School Improvement Planning. | \$218.00 |

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

The School Advisory Council will assist in writing the School Improvement Plan and monitor the implementation. The SAC is

participating in training in the understanding of the Common Core and PARCC.

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

| Volusia School District PORT ORANGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011 | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------|---|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 90% | 90% | 85% | 86% | 351 | 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 | 68% | 65% | | | 133 | 3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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) | 59% (YES) | | | 124 | 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 | | | | | 608 | |
| Percent Tested = 99% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | A | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |

| Volusia School District PORT ORANGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010 | | | | | | |
|---|----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------|---|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 86% | 81% | 83% | 78% | 328 | Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component. |
| % of Students Making Learning Gains | 65% | 67% | | | 132 | 3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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? | 47% (NO) | 52% (YES) | | | 99 | 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 | | | | | 559 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | B | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |