

# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

School Name: OLD KINGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Flagler

Principal: Nancy Willis

SAC Chair: Rachel Sheffield

Superintendent: Janet Valentine

Date of School Board Approval: October 16, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/15/2012

## PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

### STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

<a href="#">School Grades Trend Data</a>
<a href="#">Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data</a>
<a href="#">High School Feedback Report</a>
<a href="#">K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan</a>

### 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	Nancy Willis	Physical Education K-12 School Principal Bachelor's in Physical Education Master's Degree of Education	3	34	1998-1999 C 1999-2000 Middle School B Elementary School B 2000-2001 Elementary School B Middle School C 2001-2002 Combination A 2002-2003 Combination A 2003-2004 Combination A 2006-2007 High School C 2007-2008 High School A 2008-2009 High School D 2009-2010 2010-2011 Elementary A 2011-2012 Elementary A  AYP was not achieved in any of the above school years.
		Early Childhood Elementary Education			

Assis Principal	Jean Stahl	Varying Exceptionalities Educational Leadership Bachelor's Degree in Elementary and Special Education Master's Degree in Special Education	5	5	2007-2008 A 2008-2009 A 2009-2010 B 2010-2011 A 2011-2012 A AYP was achieved in school year 2007-2008.
Assis Principal	Nickolas Schell	Mathematics 6-12 Educational Leadership	4	6	Did not make AYP either year;

## INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide assessment performance (Percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Kathryn Hardesty	Elementary Education 1-6 ESOL Endorsement Varying Exceptionalities K-12 Reading Endorsement	2	2	School Grade for 2011-2012 School Year-A % Meeting High Standards in Reading-71% Reading Gains for Lowest 25% was 62%

## 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	District Human Resource Department will provide the school with a list of all highly qualified applicants that have applied for available positions. Administration will interview applicants and offer positions to those most qualified. Once teachers are on staff, a mentor, along with a team leader will be provided to those teachers to assist in transitioning into Flagler County Public Schools. New hires will also meet with an administrator on a monthly basis to discuss any issue that teacher may need to address or want assistance.	Nancy Willis Jean Stahl Nickolas Schell	On-going	

## 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
We currently have no teachers who are teaching out of field or who received less than an effective rating.	

## 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
79	2.5%(2)	2.5%(2)	44.3%(35)	50.6%(40)	38.0%(30)	97.5%(77)	13.9%(11)	5.1%(4)	22.8%(18)

### 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
Kimberly Christensen	Linda Fountain	1st Year 6th Teacher	<p>Teachers new to Old Kings Elementary School or new to a grade level or program will be provided a mentor teacher. Teachers with National Board Certification and/or Clinical Education training will be used as the mentors. Mentor and mentees will be required to meet on a monthly basis. Support will also be given to the new teachers from district and school administration, reading coach, guidance counselors and media specialist. Mentee teachers are also provided the opportunity to visit model classrooms within the school and district.</p> <p>If an administrator recognizes that data shows that a teacher is in need of intervention, the administrator will meet with the teacher to discuss areas of concern/need, review available options, and assist the teacher in the development or revision of the IPDP to reflect the appropriate interventions. Administrators will be reviewing data following each progress monitoring period; however through observation (both formal and informal) an administrator may identify a need for intervention at any time. Options for assisting the teacher include, but are not limited to, one on one coaching opportunities with the reading coach; assignment to a mentor teacher; or assigned to ongoing professional development offered by the district.</p>
			<p>New teachers to Old Kings Elementary School will be provided a mentor teacher. Teachers with National Board Certification and/or Clinical Education training will be used as the mentors. Mentor and mentees will be required to meet on a monthly basis. Support will also be given to the new teachers from district and school administration, reading</p>

Tiffany Fink	Linda Cody	Second year teacher	<p>coach, guidance counselors and media specialist. Mentee teachers are also provided the opportunity to visit model classrooms within the school and district.</p> <p>If an administrator recognizes that data shows that a teacher is in need of intervention, the administrator will meet with the teacher to discuss areas of concern/need, review available options, and assist the teacher in the development or revision of the IPDP to reflect the appropriate interventions. Administrators will be reviewing data following each progress monitoring period; however through observation (both formal and informal) an administrator may identify a need for intervention at any time. Options for assisting the teacher include, but are not limited to, one on one coaching opportunities with the reading coach; assignment to a mentor teacher; or assigned to ongoing professional development offered by the district.</p>
--------------	------------	---------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

## ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

### Coordination and Integration

**Note: For Title I schools only**

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

#### School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Nancy Willis, Principal  
 Jean Stahl, Assistant Principal  
 Kathryn Hardesty, Reading Coach  
 Teresa Shipp, Guidance Counselor  
 Cheri Vaniglia-Elliott, Guidance Counselor  
 Hannah Davydov-Wolcott, Guidance Counselor  
 Shoshana Mercado, School Psychologist

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 team meets on a monthly basis to analyze data and discuss success of intervention programs that have been implemented. If intervention is not being successful with a student, team makes a decision on whether to implement another intervention strategy or change tiers.

Guidance counselors and intervention specialists maintain documentation and share any information that is pertinent to child's success.

School psychologist assures that intervention strategies have been implemented with fidelity. She is also considered the case manager for each individual student.

Reading coach's role is to assist in gathering and analyzing the data. She will also assist in providing the intervention specialists with strategies.

Administrator's role is to make sure that intervention strategies are implemented with fidelity as well as provide time for meetings.

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 based MTSS Leadership team provides input for the development of the SIP. The team will meet 3 times

throughout the year to review the goals of the SIP and evaluate the school's progress towards meeting those goals.

#### 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.

The district uses FAIR, Performance Matters, PMRN, SKYWARD, Write Score as well as district made excel spreadsheets to collect and summarize data. The district has also generated graphs that align with the district adopted reading and math series.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Shoshana Mercado, school MTSS coordinator and school psychologist, will provide teachers training throughout the year on an as needed basis. School is in the 6th year of implementation and continuous individual or group trainings are provided as needed.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

### Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

#### School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Nancy Willis, Principal  
Jean Stahl, Assistant Principal  
Dustin Sims, Assistant Principal  
Kathryn Hardesty, Reading Coach  
Kim Weeks, Media Specialist  
and teachers from grades K-6.

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

The Literacy Leadership Team meets monthly to discuss reading strategies and testing. Information is then shared with the faculty in grade level meetings that are facilitated by the reading coach. The Team also coordinates grade level and entire school programs to generate interest in outside and pleasure reading.

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

The major initiatives of the Literacy Leadership Team for the 2011-2012 school year will be the Old Kings Owls Read, Reading Counts Contest, Dr. Seuss Night, Poetry Night and Battle of the Books competition with other Elementary Schools in the district.

### 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.

### \*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.

The reading coach will provide on-going training to all 6th grade content area teachers that will include reading strategies. She will also provide training that will highlight the use of literature in science, social studies and mathematics. She will be responsible for checking the fidelity of implementation of these strategies and providing follow-up to those in need.

Also, all content area teachers have received professional development in Learning Focused with a focus on standards, vocabulary and writing. Again, the fidelity will be assessed using classroom walk thrus by the administration.

### \*High Schools Only

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

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

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

### Postsecondary Transition

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

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

## 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:	The percentage of students who scored proficient in reading is 31% or 203 students.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Grade 3 25% (41 students)  Grade 4 27% (48 students)  Grade 5 33% (53 Students)  Grade 6 37% (61 students)	An increase of at least 3% of students scoring FCAT Level 3 or higher.

#### 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	83% of the students at Old Kings are reading at or above grade level. We continue to have a changing population which includes a significantly higher percentage of low socioeconomic and exceptional education students. Previous professional development has not focused on the special needs of these two populations.	Bi-monthly progress monitoring meetings will be held with all grade level teachers to determine progress of students. Professional development that focuses specifically on the needs of ese and low ses students.	Administration	Teachers will be responsible for coming to the table with data on each student they have in their classroom. Teachers have already identified students according to their AYP cells and their achievement data. They have also identified the students strengths and weaknesses using prior year data.	On-going progress monitoring implemented by the district in the areas of reading, writing, science and math.
3	A higher percentage of low SES population than the school has ever experienced.	Student progress will be monitored using FAIR, Performance Matters, district developed assessments and Harcourt Reading Program assessments.	Reading Coach, Administration and Guidance Counselors	Same as above	Assessment data results and comparisons to previous assessments.
	Lack of time to implement	An added 400 minutes a	Administration and	Same as above	Same as above



4	effective strategies to all, including higher performing students.	month has been added to each teachers schedule.	Reading Coach		
5	Stagnant or flatline scores for some students on FCAT for 2 or more years.	Implementation of "Failure Free Reading" to be used for those students who have flat lined.	Reading Coach, Administration and Intervention Specialist	Same as above	Same as above
6	A higher percentage of low SES population than the school has ever experienced.	Students in K-1 will be taught using the Reading Mastery Program daily.	Reading teachers Reading coach and administration	Same as above	Same as above
7	Implementation of new program for alternate assessment students.	Implementation, with fidelity, Unique Learning Systems into self-contained alternate assessment classrooms.	Classroom teachers, staffing specialist, administration	Same as above	Same as above
8	Lack of instruction on specific areas of weaknesses prevalent in grade levels as a whole	Reading coach and literacy team will identify areas of weakness using progress monitoring data. Professional development will then be offered to enhance instruction in those areas.	Administration and Literacy Team	Comparison of progress monitoring data.	FAIR and Performance Matters

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:		24% (4/17 students) scored at levels 4-6 in reading on Florida Alternate Assessment in Reading.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
Grade 3 20% (1 Student) Grade 4 25% (1 Students) Grade 5 33% (2 Students) Grade 6 0% (0 Students)		30% or higher will score at levels 4-6 in reading on Florida Alternate Assessment 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	Students disabilities	All strategies from Goal 1A will apply	Administration, Reading Coach and ESE Department	Progress monitoring	Student Assessment Data

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading.  Reading Goal #2a:		The percentage of students achieving above proficiency in reading is 39% or 259 students.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
Grade 3 45% (73 students) Grade 4 42% (74 students) Grade 5 34% (54 students) Grade 6 35% (58 students)		3% increase for students scoring at or above proficiency for SY 12/13.			
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	A loss of focus on progress monitoring data and student achievement	During SY 12/13 all teachers will meet with administration, reading coach and guidance counselors on a bi-monthly basis to review data of each student in classroom.	Administration	Increase in student achievement as well as identification of students in need of intervention.	FCAT, FAIR, Performance Matters and MTSS as well as district implemented progress monitoring tools.
2	Same as above	400 minutes of additional planning time has been given to each teacher for common planning and PLCs to share best practices	Leadership Team and Administration	Same as above	Same as above

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:	50% (7 Students) scored at or above Achievement Level 7 in Reading on Florida Alternate Assessment in SY 11/12.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Grade 3 0% (0 Students) Grade 4 50% (2 Students) Grade 5 50% (3 Students) Grade 6 100% (2 Students)	An increase of 3% or higher of students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in Reading on Florida Alternate Assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student disabilities	All strategies from Goal 1A will apply	Administration Reading Coach and ESE Department	Progress monitoring	Student assessment data

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.  Reading Goal #3a:	The percentage of students making learning gains increased 2 percentage points ( 70% SY 10/11 to 72% SY 11/12).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
72% or 362 students made learning gains in reading	75% of the students will make learning gains in reading for SY 12/13.

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
	Loss of focus on progress monitoring and individual	During SY 12/13 all teachers will meet with	Administration	Increase in student achievement as well as	FCAT, FAIR, Performance

1	student achievement in reading.	administration, reading coach and guidance counselors on a bi-monthly basis to review data of each student in classroom.	identification of students in need of intervention.	Matters and MTSS data as well as district implemented progress monitoring tools.
---	---------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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:	83% of students made learning gains in reading on the FAA.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
83% of students made learning gains in reading on the FAA.	The goal is that 100% of students make learning gains.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student disabilities	All strategies in Goal 1A will apply	Administration, Reading Coach, ESE Department	Progress monitoring	Student assessment data

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.  Reading Goal #4:	An increase of 6 percentage points ( 62% SY 10/11 to 68% SY 11/12) of students in Lowest 25% made learning gains in reading. There were 106 students included in Old Kings lowest 25%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
68% (72 students)of students in Lowest 25% made learning gains in reading for SY 11/12.	75% of students in Lowest 25% 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	Low SES and high mobility rate	During SY 12/13 all teachers will meet with administration, reading coach and guidance counselors on a bi-monthly basis to review data of each student in classroom.	Administration	Review of student achievement data	Classroom assessments and progress monitoring
2	Low SES and high mobility rate	90 minute reading block at all grade levels and an additional 30 minute Triple III time.	Administration and reading coach	Review of student achievement data	Classroom assessments and progress monitoring
3	Low SES and high mobility rate	Reading Mastery Program used in Kindergarten, First and Some second grades	Administration and Reading Coach	Review of student achievement data	Classroom assessments and progress monitoring

4	Low SES and high mobility rate	Failure Free Reading used for Tier 3 students and some ESE students	Administration and Reading Coach	Review of student achievement data	Classroom assessments and progress monitoring
---	--------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Reading Goal # The goal is to decrease the achievement gap between black and white subgroups by at least 50% by the year 2016-2017. 5A :				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	24%	21%	18%	15%	12%	

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:	The ultimate goal is that students in all subgroups would make satisfactory progress on the 2013 FCAT Reading test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27% White, 51% Black, 28% Hispanic, 30% Asian did not make satisfactory progress on the FCAT Reading Test.	The expected level of performance would be that 100% of students in each subgroup make satisfactory progress on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Low SES and high mobility population	Differentiated instruction in the 90 minute reading block.	Administration and Reading Coach	Review of student achievement data	Classroom assessments and progress monitoring
2	Low SES and high mobility population	The "Failure Free Reading" program will be used for all students in Grades 3-6 who are on Tier 3 in MTSS.	Administration and Reading Coach	Review of student achievement data	Classroom assessments and progress monitoring

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:	50% of the students did not make satisfactory progress in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% of the students did not make satisfactory progress in reading.	The expectation is that 100% of students in this subgroup will make satisfactory progress on the FCAT 2013 Reading Test.

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	Low SES, language barrier and high mobility	Teachers will use ESOL strategies with students as applicable	Administration and Reading Coach	Review of student achievement data	classroom assessments and progress monitoring
2	Low SES, language barrier and high mobility	90 minute reading block allows time to provide for more differentiated instruction based on student needs.	Administration and Reading Coach	Review of student achievement data	Classroom assessments and progress monitoring
3	Low SES, language barrier and high mobility	Use of Rosetta Stone Program	Administration and Reading Coach	Review of student achievement data	Classroom assessments and progress monitoring

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:	73% of the students did not make satisfactory progress in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
73% of the students did not make satisfactory progress in reading.	The expectation is that 100% of students in this subgroup will make satisfactory progress on the FCAT 2013 Reading Test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Low SES, High Mobility,	Failure Free Reading Program used in self-contained classrooms.	Administration and Reading Coach	Review of student achievement data	classroom assessments and progress monitoring
2	Low SES, High Mobility,	Unique Learning Systems program used in some self-contained classrooms	Administration and Reading Coach	Review of student achievement data	Classroom assessments and progress monitoring
3	Low SES, High Mobility,	Exposure to general education curriculum and skills at student level	Administration and Reading Coach	Review of student achievement data	Classroom assessments and progress monitoring

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:	36% of the students did not make satisfactory progress in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
36% of the students did not make satisfactory progress in reading.	The expectation is that 100% of students in this subgroup would make satisfactory progress on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test.

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	Low SES and high mobility population	All strategies used in Goal #1 will be used to increase student achievement in this subgroup	Administration and Reading Coach	Review of student achievement data.	Classroom assessments and progress monitoring

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
Data meetings to review student progress	K-6	Administration and Reading Coach	Teachers in Grades K-6	Monthly	Copies of Agendas and Sign-Ins	Administration and Reading Coach
CCSS Training	K-1	Jean Stahl, Assistant Principal and Nicole Castanheria, Teacher	K & 1 Teachers	September 2012	Walk Thrus and Lesson Plans	Administration
Science and Social Studies in the Reading Block	K-6	Reading Coach	Teachers in K-6	September 2012	Administrative Walk Thrus and Lesson Plans	Administration and Reading Coach
Rtl 101	K-6	School Psychologist	K-6 Teachers	October 2012	Review of student data	Reading Coach, Guidance Counselors and Administration
Literacy Committee	K-6	Kathryn Hardesty	K-6 Teachers	Monthly during SY 12/13	Agendas and sign in sheets	Reading Coach

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Core Instruction	Harcourt Reading Materials	General Fund (School Budget)	\$4,725.00
Reading Intervention	Reading Mastery	General Fund (School Budget)	\$11,748.00
Progress Monitoring	GRADE(Grades 1 & 2)	General Fund	\$9,440.00
Progress Monitoring	Performance Matters (Grades 3-6)	General Fund	\$8,956.00
			Subtotal: \$34,869.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Instruction/Intervention/Enrichment	Kid's College	School Budget	\$4,500.00
Instruction/Intervention/Enrichment	SuccessMaker	School Budget	\$3,700.00
			Subtotal: \$8,200.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

Professional Development	Reading Coach, Assistant Principal, School Psychologist salaries	School Budget	\$170,000.00
Using Science and Social Studies Text to support reading	Reading Coach salary	School Budget	\$50,000.00
			Subtotal: \$220,000.00
<b>Other</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
<b>Grand Total: \$263,069.00</b>			

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:		62% (18 students) grades K-6 scored proficient in listening/speaking.		
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:				
62% (18 students) grades K-6 scored 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:		38% (11 students) of students in grades K-6 scored proficient in reading.		
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:				
38% (11 students) of students in grades K-6 scored 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:

35% (10 students) grades K-6 scored proficient in writing.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

35% (10 students) grades K-6 scored 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
Progress Monitoring	CELLA Testing Materials	District Funds	\$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
Test Administration	Training for teachers to administer CELLA Tests	District Funds	\$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:	The percentage of students who scored proficient in math was 30% or 197 students.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Grade 3 29% (47 students) Grade 4 28% (50 students) Grade 5 28% (45 students) Grade 6 33% (55 students)	Lower the percentage of students scoring at a Level 1 or 2 by 3%; increasing the percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or higher by 3%.

### 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	Loss of focus on progress monitoring and individual student achievement in math.	Bi-monthly progress monitoring meetings will be held with all grade level teachers to determine progress of students.	Administration	Increase in student achievement as well as identification of students in need of intervention.	FCAT, Performance Matters as well as district implemented progress monitoring tools.
2	Highest percentage of low SES population ever attending the school.	Implementation of Pearson Math series with Fidelity	Administration and Leadership Team	Same as above	Same as above
3	Same as above	Baseline assessments will be administered at all levels	Administration and Guidance Counselors	Same as above	Same as above
4	Same as above	Math Fluency will be implemented in every grade level	Administration	Review of student achievement data	Same as above
5	Same as above	Implementation of CCSS in grades K-6	Administraton	Review of student achievement data	Same as above

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:	29% (5 Students) scored Levels 4-6 in Mathematics on Florida Alternate Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Grade 3 0% (0 Students) Grade 4 25% (1 Student) Grade 5 50% (3 Students) Grade 6 50% (1 Student)	32% of Students will score Levels 4-6 in Mathematics on Florida Alternate Assessment.

### 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	Low SES and student disabilities	All strategies in Goal 1a will apply	Administration and ESE Department	Review of student achievement data	Classroom assessments and progress

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:	The percentage of students achieving above proficiency in math was 34% or 227 students.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Grade 3 37% (60 students) Grade 4 30% (53 students) Grade 5 29% (46 students) Grade 6 41% (68 students)	3% increase of students achieving above proficiency in math for the 2012-2013 SY.

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	Loss of focus on progress monitoring and individual student achievement in math.	Bi-monthly progress monitoring meetings will be held with all grade level teachers to determine progress of students.	Administration	Increase in student achievement as well as identification of students in need of intervention.	FCAT, Performance Matters, as well as district implemented progress monitoring tools.
2	Highest percentage of low SES population ever attending the school.	Use of Vennlogic strategies and Numeracy centers for spiral review	Administration	Same as above	Same as above

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:	18% (3 Students) Scored at or above achievement Level 7 in mathematics on Florida Alternate Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Grade 3 0% (0 Students) Grade 4 50% (2 Students) Grade 5 0% (0 Students) Grade 6 50% (1 Student)	21% of students will score at or above achievement level 7 in mathematics on Florida Alternate Assessment.

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	Low SES and student disabilities	Apply strategies from Goal 1A	Administration, ESE Department	Review of student achievement data	Classroom assessments and progress monitoring

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:	An increase of 10% (64% SY 10/11 to 74% SY 11/12) of students making learning gains in mathematics.
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
74% of students made learning gains in math.	77% of students will make 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	Low SES and high mobility rate	Same strategies from Goal 1A apply	Administration	Review student achievement data	FCAT, Performance Matters as well as district implemented progress monitoring tools.

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:	50% of the students made learning gains in mathematics on the FAA.
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% of the students made learning gains in mathematics on the FAA.	The goal is that 100% of the students make learning gains in mathematics.

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	Low Ses and student disabilities	All strategies in Goal 1A will apply	Administration and ESE Department	Review of student achievement data	Classroom assessments and progress monitoring

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:	A 4% increase (58% SY 10/11 to 62% SY 11/12) of students in the lowest 25% making leaning gains in math.
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
62% of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in math.	An increase of 3% of students (71%)in lowest 25% 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
	Low SES and high mobility rate	All strategies from Goal 1A apply	Administration	Review student achievement data	FCAT, Performance Matters, as well as

1					district implemented progress monitoring tools.
---	--	--	--	--	-------------------------------------------------

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Elementary School Mathematics Goal #					
	The goal is to decrease the achievement gap between black and white subgroups by at least 50% by the year 2016-2017.					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	23%	20%	17%	14%	12%	

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:	The ultimate goal is that all subgroups will make satisfactory progress.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
34% of Whites, 51% of Blacks, 34% of Hispanics, 20% of Asians did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics.	The expected performance would be that 100% of all subgroups would make satisfactory progress on the 2013 FCAT Math Test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Low SES and high mobility	All strategies listed in Goal 1 will be used with students in all ethnic groups	Administration	Review of student achievement data	Classroom assessments and progress monitoring

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:	50% of students did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% of students did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics.	The expected level of performance is that 100% of students in this subgroup will make satisfactory progress on the 2013 FCAT Math Test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Language barriers and	Teachers will incorporate	Administration	Review of lesson plans	Classroom

1	Low SES	ESOL strategies in their lessons where applicable	and student achievement data	assessments and progress monitoring
---	---------	---------------------------------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------------

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:	77% of students did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
77% of students did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics.	The expected level of performance is that 100% of students in this subgroup will make satisfactory progress on the 2013 FCAT Math Test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student disabilities	Teachers will use manipulatives and hands on activities when appropriate	Administration	Review of student achievement data	Classroom assessments and progress monitoring
2	Student disabilities	Teachers will use the Virtual Manipulatives on the Matti-Math site to provide hands on activities for students	Administration	Review of student achievement data	Classroom assessments and progress monitoring
3	Student disabilities	Students will be exposed to instruction from Pearson Mathematics Series on grade level.	Administration	Review of student achievement data	Classroom assessments and progress monitoring

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:	44% of students did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
44% of students did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics.	The expected level of performance is that 100% of students in this subgroup will make satisfactory progress on the 2013 FCAT Math Test.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Low SES and high mobility rate.	All strategies from Goal 1A apply	Administration	Review of student achievement data	FCAT, as well as district implemented progress monitoring tools.
2					

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
PLC Groups	K-6	Administration	Teachers K-6	Monthly, through 2012-2013 school year	Review of lesson plans and classroom walk thrus	Administration
Dr. Chew Inquiry Method Training	Grades 2-6 Math and Science	Jose Nunez (District Office)	Teachers grades 2-6	September 2012	Review of lesson plans and classroom walk thrus	Administration

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Core Instruction	Pearson Mathematics	School Budget	\$1,145.00
Core Instruction	Prentice Hall	School Budget	\$50.00
Progress Monitoring	GMADE (Grades 1 & 2)	School Budget	\$9,440.00
Progress Monitoring	Performance Matters (Grades 2-6)	School Budget	\$8,956.00
			Subtotal: \$19,591.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Assessments	Performance Matters	Race to the Top Grant	\$8,956.00
Instruction/Intervention/Enrichment	Kids College	School Funding	\$4,500.00
Instruction/Enrichment/Intervention	Successmaker	District Funding	\$3,700.00
			Subtotal: \$17,156.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Dr. Chew Inquiry Model	Workshop	Title II	\$2,500.00
			Subtotal: \$2,500.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$39,247.00

End of Mathematics Goals

## Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement

Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	32% or 51 students scored at a Level 3 on the 10-11 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Grade 5 32%(51 students)	60% of students will score proficient or higher on FCAT in 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	Low SES and high mobility	Implement science progress monitoring. Bi-monthly progress monitoring meetings will be held with all grade level teachers to determine progress of students.	Administration	Increase in student achievement as well as identification of students in need of intervention.	FCAT, Performance Matters as well as district implemented progress monitoring tools.
2	Highest percentage of low SES ever attending school.	Use of school science lab to conduct hands on activities as well as incorporate the scientific method	Administration and Leadership Team	Same as above	Same as above
3	Same as above	Performance Matters Science assessment will be administered to all 3rd-5th grade students two times per year	Administration	Same as above	Same as above
4	Same as above	Implementation of scientific method into lessons on a regular basis.	Administration	Review of lesson plans and classroom walk thrus	Progress monitoring
5	Same as above	Grades 3-6 will administer science progress monitoring 2 times a year.	Administration	Review data	Progress monitoring
6	Same as above	Grades K-6 will use DiscoveryEd.com in their daily science instruction.	Administration	Review of student data	Progress monitoring and FCAT

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:	25% (2 Students)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
25% (2 Students)	100% of the students will score at or above level 4.

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 disabilities	Implementation of Inquiry Method coupled with implementation of Unique Learning Systems Program	Administration	Review of student performance data	Classroom assessments and progress monitoring
---	-----------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------

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:	7% or 11 students scored above proficiency in science.
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

Grade 5 7% (11 students)	35% of students achieving above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 & 5) in 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	Low SES and High mobility	All strategies from Goal 1A apply	Administration	Review of student achievement data	FCAT, Performance Matters as well as district implemented progress monitoring tools.

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:	13% (1 Student)
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

13% (1 Student)	100% of the students will score at or above achievement score 7.
-----------------	------------------------------------------------------------------

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student disabilities	Implementation of Inquiry Method coupled with implementation of Unique Learning Systems Program	Administration	Review of student achievement data	classroom assessments and progress monitoring



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
Developing Discovery Education Lessons	K-6	Margaret Campanella and Lora Dunnigan	Teachers K-6	September 2012- November 2012	Classroom walk-thrus and review of lesson plans	Administration
SUMMIT training with UCF	3-6 Science teachers	Jose Nunez	Teachers Grades 3-6	2012-2013 School Year	Lesson Studies	Jose Nunez and Administration
Dr. Chew's Inquiry Model	2-6 Math and Science	Jose Nunez, District Science Co-Ordinator	Teachers Grades 2-6	September 2012	Classroom Walk thrus and review of lesson plans	Administration

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Instruction	Discovery Science Materials	School Budget	\$6,075.00
Instruction	Dr. Chew Inquiry Model	Title II	\$0.00
Progress Monitoring	Performance Matters (Grades 3-6)	General Fund	\$8,956.00
			Subtotal: \$15,031.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Progress Monitoring	Performance Matters Grades 3-6	Race to the Top Grant	\$8,956.00
			Subtotal: \$8,956.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Instruction	Dr. Chew	Title II	\$0.00
SUMMIT	UCF and Dr. CHew	Grant	\$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: \$23,987.00

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:	97% of students scored Levels 3 or higher writing to a expository prompt in SY 10/11. 83% of students scored Levels 3 or higher writing to a narrative prompt in SY 11/12.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

83% (146 students)		An increase of 10% of students achieving (FCAT Levels 4 or higher) 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	Highest percentage of low SES ever enrolled in school.	Teachers will use the PDA strategies for instruction in writing.	Administration	Monthly rubric scored writing samples from grades K-6 will be submitted to administration.	FCAT
2	Same as above	Teachers will incorporate writing into all content areas.	Administration	Examples of writing will be evident in teachers' classrooms.	FCAT
3	Loss of focus on individual student achievement	Implement progress monitoring tool for 3rd and 4th grade students.	Administration	Bi-monthly meetings to review individual student progress.	FCAT and Write Score Progress Monitoring
4	Same as above	PLCs in grades 2-4 with teachers sharing writing strategies and best practices.	Grade level lead teachers	Increased writing scores within grade levels	FCAT and Progress Monitoring tool.

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:	75% (3 students)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
75% (3 students)	50% of the students will score at a 4 or higher

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student disabilities	All strategies in Goal 1A apply	Administration and ESE Department	Review of student achievement data	Writing samples from common assessments and progress monitoring

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
------------------------------------	---------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------

Rubric Scoring	3 & 4	Jill Lively, District Office	3rd & 4th Grade Teachers	September 2012	Review of rubriced papers	Jean Stahl and Kathryn Hardesty
CCSS	2	Nicole Castanheria	Grade 2 Teachers	February 2013	Same as above	Jean Stahl and Nicole Castanheria
CCSS	K & 1	Nicole Castanheria	Grades K & 1 Teachers	Spetember 2012	Same as above	Jean Stahl and Nicole Castanheria

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Progress Monitoring	Write Score for Grades 3-4	District Funding	\$2,207.00
			Subtotal: \$2,207.00
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: \$2,207.00

End of Writing Goals

## Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	Old Kings increased their daily attendance rate .737% from the 2010/2011 SY to the 2011/2012 SY.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
Old Kings Elementary had a daily attendance rate of 95% for the 11/12 SY.	An increase of 2% in teh daily attendance rate for the 2012/2013 SY.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
37% or 402 students had 10 or more absences in the 11/12 school year.	35% or 398% students will have 10 or more absences in the 12/13 school year.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
9% or 99 students had excessive tardies in the 11/12	7% or 80 students will have excessive tardies in the

school year.		11/12 school year.			
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	Single parent families as well as highest percentage of low SES ever enrolled in the school. Also, Flagler County has the highest unemployment rate in the state of Florida.	A message will be sent out to all parents via the phone messenger and principal newsletter about the importance of daily attendance.	Administration	A comparison of rates for previous year to current year using MIS.	End of year reports will be pulled to compare 10/11 and 11/12 rates.
2	Same as above	A postcard will be sent out encouraging students to continue their attendance.	Classroom Teachers	Same as above	Same as above
3	Same as above	Meetings with parents and students will be held with guidance counselors for any student with excessive absences or tardies.	Guidance Counselors and Attendance Clerk	Same as above	Same as above
4	Same as above	District student services department will be notified of any student who is over the allowable limit of unexcused absences. That department will follow-up with parent and required paperwork.	Guidance Counselors	Same as above	Same as above

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
<b>Professional Development</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
<b>Other</b>			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			<b>Grand Total: \$0.00</b>

*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:	A school wide implementation of Positive Behavior Supports
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
There were 107 days of in-school suspension during the 11/12 school year.	There will be 90 days of in-school suspension during the 12/13 school year.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
73 students received in-school suspension for the 11/12 school year.	60 students will receive in-school suspension for the 12/13 school year.
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
There were 39 out of school suspensions for the 11/12 school year.	There will be 35 days of out of school suspensions for the 11/12 school year.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
26 students received out of school suspension for the 11/12 school year.	15 students will receive out of school suspension for the 12/13 school year.

### 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
	Highest percentage of low SES school has ever had in attendance. Inability to get parents involved in student behavior plans.	OKES has implemented Positive Behavior Supports. Teachers will implement several strategies such as students given Owl Bucks for following the school rules. Post cards	Administration, Guidance Counselors, teachers and non-instructional staff	Comparison of number of students who are suspended in the 10/11 year to the students who are suspended in the 11/12 school year.	SWIS and Skyward programs used by district.

1	are sent to parents letting them know their children are Living Above the Line (following school rules). A once a week drawing to reward children for following school rules. Twice a year a golden ticket is given to any student whom has not received a referral and large prizes are given for those drawn.		
---	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

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:

<p>1. Parent Involvement</p> <p>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</p> <p><i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i></p>	<p>Old Kings offers a minimum of two parent face to face conferences with all parents. The first conference is held at the end of the first nine week period. The second is scheduled for the third interim report. The reason for the parent conference at interim is due to giving a student a chance to make improvements before it was too late. A back to school meet and greet happens the Friday before school begins and an open house will happen in mid-September. The teachers will share their expectations with parents at the mid-September meeting. A monthly calendar and newsletter goes home with each student as well as it being attached to the web site. Parents are also a majority of our SAC and PTO.</p>
<p>2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:</p>
<p>83% Face to Face Conferences; 10% Phone Conference</p>	<p>93% combined face to face and phone conferences</p>

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	Single Parent Families and Child Care	Parents will be encouraged to attend all parent meetings via phone master; parent news letters; e-mail; school marquee; and school web page	Administration	Review number of parents attending each function.	Sign In Sheets at Conferences and all parent events.
2	Flagler County has the highest unemployment rate in state of Florida. Mobility rate extremely high. Many times phone numbers are not working or have changed and school has not been made aware of change.	Continuous parent contact. Teachers are required to make parent contact with parents regarding issues as related to the student before asking guidance or administration to get involved.	Administration	Teacher parent contact logs. Increase in parent attendance to activities.	Sign in sheets to all events.  Survey regarding communication will be given to parents.
3	Same as above	Use of Skylert, Parent Portal, Planners, e-mail, weekly and monthly calendars will used to keep parents informed.	School Personnel	Sign in sheets and parent attendance to activities.	Same as above
4	Same as above	Introduction to CCSS parent night	Administration and Reading Coach	Same as above	Same as above

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
			<b>Grand Total: \$0.00</b>

*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 goal is to raise the percent of students scoring at or above proficiency in science by at least 30%.		
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	Low SES and high mobility rate	Teachers will attend Dr. Chew (UCF Professor) Science and Math Inquiry Workshop Training	Administration	Review of Lesson Plans; Classroom Walk- Thrus	Classroom assessments and progress monitoring
2	Low SES and high mobility rate	Teachers in K-6 will focus science instruction on Physical Science and Nature of Science	Administration	Review of Lesson Plans; Classroom Walk- Thrus	Classroom assessments and progress monitoring



3	Low SES and high mobility rate	Training in Text Structure, Text Complexity and Text Features for all Science Teachers	Administration and Reading Coach	Review of Lesson Plans; Classroom Walk- Thrus	Classroom assessments and progress monitoring
---	--------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------------------

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
Inquiry Based Learning with Dr. Chew	2-6	Jose Nunez	2-6 Science and Math Teachers	September 2012	Classroom Walk Thrus and Lesson Plans	Administration
Using Science Text to Teach Information Text	K-6	Kathryn Hardesty	K-6 Teachers	SY2012-2012	Classroom Walk Thrus and Lesson Plans	Administration and Reading Coach

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
Reading	Core Instruction	Harcourt Reading Materials	General Fund (School Budget)	\$4,725.00
Reading	Reading Intervention	Reading Mastery	General Fund (School Budget)	\$11,748.00
Reading	Progress Monitoring	GRADE(Grades 1 & 2)	General Fund	\$9,440.00
Reading	Progress Monitoring	Performance Matters (Grades 3-6)	General Fund	\$8,956.00
CELLA	Progress Monitoring	CELLA Testing Materials	District Funds	\$0.00
Mathematics	Core Instruction	Pearson Mathematics	School Budget	\$1,145.00
Mathematics	Core Instruction	Prentice Hall	School Budget	\$50.00
Mathematics	Progress Monitoring	GMADE (Grades 1 & 2)	School Budget	\$9,440.00
Mathematics	Progress Monitoring	Performance Matters (Grades 2-6)	School Budget	\$8,956.00
Science	Instruction	Discovery Science Materials	School Budget	\$6,075.00
Science	Instruction	Dr. Chew Inquiry Model	Title II	\$0.00
Science	Progress Monitoring	Performance Matters (Grades 3-6)	General Fund	\$8,956.00
Writing	Progress Monitoring	Write Score for Grades 3-4	District Funding	\$2,207.00
				Subtotal: \$71,698.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Instruction/Intervention/Enrichment	Kid's College	School Budget	\$4,500.00
Reading	Instruction/Intervention/Enrichment	SuccessMaker	School Budget	\$3,700.00
Mathematics	Assessments	Performance Matters	Race to the Top Grant	\$8,956.00
Mathematics	Instruction/Intervention/Enrichment	Kids College	School Funding	\$4,500.00
Mathematics	Instruction/Enrichment/Intervention	Successmaker	District Funding	\$3,700.00
Science	Progress Monitoring	Performance Matters Grades 3-6	Race to the Top Grant	\$8,956.00
				Subtotal: \$34,312.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Professional Development	Reading Coach, Assistant Principal, School Psychologist salaries	School Budget	\$170,000.00
Reading	Using Science and Social Studeies Text to support reading	Reading Coach salary	School Budget	\$50,000.00
CELLA	Test Administration	Training for teachers to administer CELLA Tests	District Funds	\$0.00
Mathematics	Dr. Chew Inquiry Model	Workshop	Title II	\$2,500.00
Science	Instruction	Dr. Chew	Title II	\$0.00
Science	SUMMIT	UCF and Dr. CHew	Grant	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$222,500.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00

## 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
Update circulation items in media center	\$10,000.00

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

SAC will meet a minimum of 4 times during the SY12/13. The SAC will work directly with the school to monitor the progress towards attaining the goals of the SIP.

# 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

Flagler School District OLD KINGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	87%	81%	73%	60%	301	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	70%	64%			134	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?	62% (YES)	58% (YES)			120	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					555	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Flagler School District OLD KINGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	83%	80%	83%	58%	304	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	59%	61%			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)	57% (YES)			105	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					529	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested