2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Breakfast Point Academy
601 N RICHARD JACKSON BLVD
Panama City Beach, FL 32407
850-767-1190
http://www.bayschools.com/schools/bpa

School Demographics

School Type	Title I	Free and Reduced Lunch Rate
Combination School	No	51%

Alternative/ESE Center	Charter School	Minority Rate
No	No	21%

School Grades History

2013-14	2012-13	2011-12	2010-11	2009-10
A	A	A	A	A

SIP Authority and Template

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds, as marked by citations to the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or with a grade of F within the prior two years. For all other schools, the district may use a template of its choosing. All districts must submit annual assurances that their plans meet statutory requirements.

This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridacims.org. Sections marked "N/A" by the user and any performance data representing fewer than 10 students or educators have been excluded from this document.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. A corollary at the district level is the District Improvement and Assistance Plan (DIAP), designed to help district leadership make the necessary connections between school and district goals in order to align resources. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: Current School Status

Part I summarizes school leadership, staff qualifications and strategies for recruiting, mentoring and retaining strong teachers. The school's Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) is described in detail to show how data is used by stakeholders to understand the needs of all students and allocate appropriate resources in proportion to those needs. The school also summarizes its efforts in a few specific areas, such as its use of increased learning time and strategies to support literacy, preschool transition and college and career readiness.

Part II: Expected Improvements

Part II outlines school performance data in the prior year and sets numeric targets for the coming year in ten areas:

1. Reading
2. Writing
3. Mathematics
4. Science
5. Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM)
6. Career and Technical Education (CTE)
7. Social Studies
8. Early Warning Systems (EWS)
9. Parental Involvement
10. Other areas of concern to the school

With this overview of the current state of the school in mind and the outcomes they hope to achieve, the planning team engages in an 8-Step Planning and Problem-Solving Process, through which they define and refine their goals (Step 1), identify and prioritize problems (barriers) keeping them from reaching those goals (Steps 2-3), design a plan to help them implement strategies to resolve those barriers (Steps 4-7), and determine how they will monitor progress toward each goal (Step 8).

Part III: Coordination and Integration

Part III is required for Title I schools and describes how federal, state and local funds are coordinated and integrated to ensure student needs are met.

Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals

Appendix 1 is the professional development plan, which outlines any training or support needed for stakeholders to meet the goals.

Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals

Appendix 2 is the budget needed to implement the strategies identified in the plan.

Differentiated Accountability

Florida's Differentiated Accountability (DA) system is a statewide network of strategic support, differentiated by need according to performance data, and provided to schools and districts in order to improve leadership capacity, teacher efficacy and student outcomes. DA field teams collaborate with district and school leadership to design, implement and refine school improvement plans, as well as provide instructional coaching, as needed.

DA Regions

Florida's DA network is divided into five geographical regions, each served by a field team led by a regional executive director (RED).

DA Categories

Traditional public schools are classified at the start of each school year, based upon the most recently released school grades (A-F), into one of the following categories:

- Not in DA – currently A or B with no F in prior two years; all charter schools; all ungraded schools
- Monitoring Only – currently A or B with at least one F in the prior two years
- Prevent – currently C
- Focus – currently D
    ◦ Year 1 – declined to D, or first-time graded schools receiving a D
    ◦ Year 2 – second consecutive D, or F followed by a D
    ◦ Year 3 or more – third or more consecutive D, or F followed by second consecutive D
- Priority – currently F
    ◦ Year 1 – declined to F, or first-time graded schools receiving an F
    ◦ Year 2 or more – second or more consecutive F

DA Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses

Additionally, schools in DA are subject to one or more of the following Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses:

- Former F – currently A-D with at least one F in the prior two years. SIP is monitored by FDOE.
- Post-Priority Planning – currently A-D with an F in the prior year. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Planning – Focus Year 2 and Priority Year 1. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Implementing – Focus Year 3 or more and Priority Year 2 or more. District is implementing the Turnaround Option Plan (TOP).

2013-14 DA Category and Statuses

DA Category	Region	RED
Not in DA	N/A	N/A

Former F	Post-Priority Planning	Planning	Implementing TOP
No	No	No	No

Current School Status

School Information

School-Level Information

School
Breakfast Point Academy

Principal
Denise Kelley

School Advisory Council chair
Patty Taylor

Names and position titles of the School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT)

Name	Title
Denise Kelley	Principal
Keri Weatherly	Assistant Principal
Gay Speights	Assistant Principal
Clint Whitfield	Administrative Assistant
Rebecca Christopher	Student Services Instructional Specialist
Amy Joyner	Kdg Department Chair/PBS Cochair
Rebecca Cornell	1st Grade Department Chair/Reading Cochair
Holly Allain	2nd Grade Department Chair/Math Cochair
Karen Bruckschen	3rd Grade Department Chair/Science Cochair
Amanda Walker	4th Grade Department Chair/Writing Chair
Erica West	5th Grade Department Chair/MTSS Cochair
Lori Spiller	PBS Chair
Erin Brack	Science Chair/Middle School Department Chair
Alana Simmons	Social Science Middle School/Writing Cochair
Jennifer Mann	Reading Middle School Department Chair
Kathy Pickrell	Math Middle School Department Chair/ESE Chair/ASPIRE Team Leader
Alison Moreira	MTSS Chair

District-Level Information

District
Bay

Superintendent
Mr. William V Husfelt

Date of school board approval of SIP
12/10/2013

School Advisory Council (SAC)

This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Membership of the SAC

SAC Chair (Parent)
Vice-Chair (Parent)
Secretary (Parent)
Historian (Parent)
Denise Kelley (Principal)
12 Teachers
1 Educational Support Person
2 Community/Business Members
17 parents

Involvement of the SAC in the development of the SIP

The School Advisory Council will assist in the development of the school improvement plan by reviewing the draft, providing feedback, and approving the final revisions.

Activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year

The SAC shall review school performance data, monitor implementation of SIP, and discuss curriculum updates.

Projected use of school improvement funds, including the amount allocated to each project

Projected SAC funds = $0.00

Compliance with section 1001.452, F.S., regarding the establishment duties of the SAC

In Compliance

If not in compliance, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements

Highly Qualified Staff

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(C) and 1115(c)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Administrators

# of administrators
4

 # receiving effective rating or higher
(not entered because basis is < 10)

Administrator Information:

Denise Kelley		
Principal	Years as Administrator: 14	Years at Current School: 6

Credentials	B.S. –Elementary Education; M.S.- Educational Leadership Certifications: Primary Ed. K-3, Elementary Ed. 1-6, School Principal – all levels, Endorsement: ESOL
Performance Record	Principal of Breakfast Point Academy: 2012-2013 Grade A; School VAM - Highly Effective; Reading Proficiency 71%; Math Proficiency 68%; Reading LG 75%; Math LG 75%; Reading Lowest 25% LG 78%; Math Lowest 25% LG 76%; Writing Proficiency 64%; Science Proficiency 64%; Reading AMO Target Met: Asian, Hispanic, and Economically Disadvantaged; Reading AMO Target not met: Black/African American, White, ELL, and Students with Disabilities; Math AMO Target Met: Asian; Math AMO Target not met: Black/African American; Hispanic; White, ELL; Students with Disabilities; Economically Disadvantaged 2011-2012: Grade A. Reading Proficiency 70%, Math Proficiency 68%, Science Proficiency 70%, Writing Proficiency 85%, Reading LG 72% , Math LG 66%, Reading Lowest 25%: 74%, Math Lowest 25%: 71%, The White Subgroup did not meet the AMO Target in Reading; Asian, Hispanic, and White did not meet the AMO Target in Math 2010-2011: Grade A. Reading Proficiency: 83%, Math Proficiency: 84%, Science Proficiency: 64%, Reading LG: 74%, Math LG: 74%, Reading Lowest 25% LG: 62%, Math Lowest 25% LG: 75%, SWD and ED did not make AYP in reading and math. 2010-2011: Grade A. Reading Proficiency: 83%, Math Proficiency: 84%, Science Proficiency: 64%, Reading LG: 74%, Math LG: 74%, Reading Lowest 25% LG: 62%, Math Lowest 25% LG: 75%, SWD and ED did not make AYP in reading and math. 2009-2010: Grade A. Reading Proficiency: 83%, Math Proficiency: 84%, Science Proficiency: 58%, Reading LG: 66%, Math LG: 66%, Reading Lowest 25% LG: 58%, Math Lowest 25% LG: 62%, SWD and ED did not make AYP in reading. Ed did not make AYP in math. 2008-09: Grade A. Reading Proficiency: 82%, Math Proficiency: 81%, Science Proficiency: 53%, Reading LG: 69%, Math LG: 65%, Reading Lowest 25% LG: 59%, Math Lowest 25% LG: 53%, SWD did not make AYP in reading and math.

Gay Speights		
Asst Principal	Years as Administrator: 12	Years at Current School: 1

Credentials	B.S. Elementary Education, Masters of Counseling and Psychology, Specialist in Education Certifications: Elementary Ed 1-6; Guidance And Counseling PK-12; MG Math 5-9; School Principal All Levels
Performance Record	Assistant Principal 2012-2013 Bay High School - School Grade Pending 2011-2012 New Horizons Learning Center School Grade: Ungraded; Reading Proficiency 19%; Math Proficiency 27%; Learning Gains Reading 26%; 27% Math Learning Gains; Reading Lowest 27% gains 27%; Math lowest 25% gains 25%; Science Proficiency 4% 2010-2011 New Horizons Learning Center 2009-2010 New Horizons Learning Center 2008-2009 New Horizons Learning Center

Keri Weatherly		
Asst Principal	Years as Administrator: 4	Years at Current School: 2

Credentials	B.S. Business Administration; M.S. Educational Leadership Certifications: Elementary Ed K-6; Mathematics 5-9; Business Education 6-12; Educational Leadership (all levels); School Principal (all levels) Endorsement: ESOL
Performance Record	Assistant Principal - Breakfast Point Academy 2012-2013 Grade A; School VAM - Highly Effective; Reading Proficiency 71%; Math Proficiency 68%; Reading LG 75%; Math LG 75%; Reading Lowest 25% LG 78%; Math Lowest 25% LG 76%; Writing Proficiency 64%; Science Proficiency 64%; Reading AMO Target Met: Asian, Hispanic, and Economically Disadvantaged; Reading AMO Target not met: Black/African American, White, ELL, and Students with Disabilities; Math AMO Target Met: Asian; Math AMO Target not met: Black/African American; Hispanic; White, ELL; Students with Disabilities; Economically Disadvantaged Administrative Assistant – Mowat Middle School 2011-2012 Grade A Reading Proficiency 70%, Math Proficiency 69%, Science Proficiency 59%, Reading LG 74%, Math LG 75%, Reading Lowest 25% LG: 74%, Math Lowest 25% LG 72%,Writing Proficiency 81%; Asian, Black/African American, SWD, and ED did not meet the AMO Target in Reading; Black/African American and ED did not meet the AMO Target in Math 2010-2011 Grade A Reading Proficiency: 81%, Math Proficiency: 81%, Science Proficiency: 62% Reading LG: 64%, Math LG: 76% Reading Lowest 25% LG: 70%, Math Lowest 25% LG: 73%, SWD, Economically Disadvantaged, African American did not make AYP in Reading and Math

Instructional Coaches

# of instructional coaches
3

 # receiving effective rating or higher
(not entered because basis is < 10)

Instructional Coach Information:

Lisa Womack		
Part-time / District-based	Years as Coach: 2	Years at Current School: 1
Areas	Reading/Literacy	
Credentials	Bachelors Degree- Elementary K-6 Certifications/Endorsements: Middle Grades Integrated 5-9, National Boards- Early Adolescence Science, ESOL Endorsement, Gifted Endorsement, Enrolled in Practicum for Reading Endorsement	
Performance Record	I am highly qualified to work with site-based faculty to build their capacity with instructional and structural practices to facilitate school improvement.	

Tracy Rogers		
Part-time / District-based	Years as Coach: 2	Years at Current School: 1
Areas	Reading/Literacy	
Credentials	BS & FL certification Elementary Education 1-6 MS & FL certification Reading K-12 National Board Certification middle childhood generalist 2004-2014	
Performance Record	I am highly qualified to work with faculty members at schools across the district to build their capacity with instructional and structural practices to facilitate school improvement focusing in the area of English Language Arts.	

Margo Anderson		
Part-time / District-based	Years as Coach: 2	Years at Current School: 2
Areas	Reading/Literacy	
Credentials	M.A. Language and Literature B.A. English Reading Endorsement (last component to be completed Oct 2013) 6-12 Secondary English certification	
Performance Record	I am highly qualified to work with site-based faculty to build their capacity with instructional and structural practices to facilitate school improvement.	

Classroom Teachers

# of classroom teachers

87

 # receiving effective rating or higher
86, 99%

 # Highly Qualified Teachers
100%

 # certified in-field
87, 100%

 # ESOL endorsed
38, 44%

 # reading endorsed
16, 18%

 # with advanced degrees
36, 41%

 # National Board Certified
5, 6%

 # first-year teachers
11, 13%

 # with 1-5 years of experience
29, 33%

 # with 6-14 years of experience
30, 34%

 # with 15 or more years of experience
17, 20%

Education Paraprofessionals

# of paraprofessionals
30

 # Highly Qualified
30, 100%

Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies
This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Strategies to recruit and retain highly qualified, certified-in-field, effective teachers to the school, including the person responsible

1. Meet regularly with new teachers (Principal, Denise Kelley)
2. ESOL Endorsement and Reading Endorsement opportunities provided to all staff members via district initiatives. (Principal, Denise Kelley)
3. On-going professional development provided that align to the district adopted framework for effective teaching. (Principal, Denise Kelley and Assistant Principal, Keri Weatherly)
4. New Teachers will participate in Bay District Schools New Teacher Induction Program (Assistant Principal, Keri Weatherly)
5. New Teachers will be partnered with veteran staff. (Keri Weatherly, Assistant Principal)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Teacher mentoring program/plan, including the rationale for pairings and the planned mentoring activities

*New Teachers are partnered with veteran staff on their grade level and will meet weekly during grade level meetings.
*New Teachers will participate in Bay District's New Teacher Induction Program.
*New Teachers are provided with a district mentor who will provide support and guidance during the first year.
*Administrators will meet regularly with new teachers.

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

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iv) and 1115(c)(1)(A)-(C), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Data-based problem-solving processes for the implementation and monitoring of MTSS and SIP structures to address effectiveness of core instruction, resource allocation (funding and staffing), teacher support systems, and small group and individual student needs

The MTSS team will meet monthly (or more often if needed) to build consensus and make decisions about implementation. The MTSS Leadership Team will conduct on-going AYP, FCAT data, and other Universal Screening data to match interventions to student needs and stakeholder accountability. We will review progress monitoring data and common assessments at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting or exceeding benchmarks and students who are at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the MTSS team will identify and ensure professional development. The MTSS team is responsible for school-wide implementation. The MTSS team provides training and coaching to school staff. School administrators will use individual student performance data to determine activities and the MTSS structures needed to best meet the needs of their students. The MTSS process will be integrated in the District Reading Plan, District Student Progression Plan, and School Improvement Plan.

Function and responsibility of each school-based leadership team member as related to MTSS and the SIP

Principal : Denise Kelley
Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities.
Assistant Principal: Keri Weatherly
Assist with providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities.
Student Services Instructional Specialist: Rebecca Christopher
Provides guidance on K-12 reading plan; supports schools with the implementation of MTSS; shares information with administrators, provides professional development to faculty and staff based on area of need; attends School Based Leadership Team Meetings; assists with data analysis and development of intervention plans and periodically reviews MTSS information for compliance.
School Psychologist: Janice Shipbaugh
Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention

plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation; facilitates data-based decision making activities.

Speech Language Pathologist: Stacy Prater & Amy Ezell

Educates the team in the role language plays in curriculum, assessment, and instruction, as a basis for appropriate program design; assists in the selection of screening measures; and helps identify systemic patterns of student need with respect to language skills.

Regular Education Teachers – Amy Joyner, Rebecca Cornell, Holly Allain, Karen Bruckschen, Amanda Walker, Erica West

Provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.

Regular Education Teachers - middle/high schools: Alison Moreira, Alana Simmons, Kathy Pickrell

Provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3.

ESE Teacher: Katherine Pickrell

Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching.

Guidance Counselors: Janet Bailey, Robin Jones

Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students; assist the school and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral and social success.

Systems in place that the leadership team uses to monitor the fidelity of the school's MTSS and SIP

The MTSS Leadership Team meets monthly in order to analyze data and set clear expectations for instruction by focusing on the following four questions:
What do we expect students to learn?
How will we know if they are learning?
What will we do when students are already proficient?
How do we respond when students don't learn?
Administration will meet with each grade level PLC monthly to provide guidance and assistance related to data analysis and using the data to plan instruction and provide interventions/enrichment to students. Teachers will meet monthly with the Student Services Coordinator and Administration to discuss individual student progress monitoring data and appropriate interventions for students already receiving tier 2 or tier 3 interventions as well as discuss students who consistently fail to meet established grade level benchmarks that demonstrate a need for tier 2 interventions.

Data source(s) and management system(s) used to access and analyze data to monitor the effectiveness of core, supplemental, and intensive supports in reading, mathematics, science, writing, and engagement

FOCUS, PMRN, FAIR (Kindergarten only), Ray Writes, Discovery Education, FCAT, SME6, DIBELS Next and EasyCBM, RTIB, ENRICH

Plan to support understanding of MTSS and build capacity in data-based problem solving for staff and parents

Grade level department chairs will conduct weekly PLC meetings with grade level teachers to analyze common assessments and discuss intervention data in order to track student progress and plan for instruction. Administration will meet with each grade level PLC on a monthly basis to provide support. Teachers will meet with the parents of students receiving tier 2 and tier 3 interventions in order to keep

the parents informed of student progress. Administration will meet monthly with the School Advisory Council to keep them updated on school-wide progress and school initiatives

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

Names and position titles of the members of the school-based LLT

Name	Title
Denise Kelley	Principal
Keri Weatherly	Assistant Principal
Rebecca Christopher	Student Services Coordinator
Kathy Pickrell	Math Chair/ESE Teacher.Middle School
Alison Moreira	MTSS Chair/Middle School
Jennifer Mann	ELA Chair/Middle School
Alana Simmons	Writing Cochair/Middle School
Erin Brack	Science Chair/Middle School
Amy Joyner	PBS Cochair/Kdg
Rebecca Cornell	ELA Cochair/1st grade
Holly Allain	Math Cochair/2nd grade
Karen Bruckschen	Science Cochair/3rd grade
Amanda Walker	Writing Chair/4th grade
Erica West	MTSS Cochair/5th grade
Lori Spiller	PBS Chair/Middle School

How the school-based LLT functions

The LLT meets monthly to discuss student achievement data and the implementation of school-wide initiatives. LLT members serve as chairpersons of their respective committees which are comprised of teacher representatives from each grade level. LLT members represent each committee at monthly LLT meetings and communicate LLT initiatives with faculty on a regular basis. It is the responsibility of the LLT to implement the CRP with fidelity.

Major initiatives of the LLT

Use Discovery Education Assessment and Common Grade Level Assessment data to drive instruction in reading, math, and science. Participate in district mandated writing three times a year school wide. Develop and utilize school-wide instructional focus calendars for reading, math, and science and continue to develop and revise common grade level assessments. Incorporate Common Core Standards across all grade levels and across all subject areas with Kindergarten through 2nd grade delivering Common Core based instruction exclusively.

Every Teacher Contributes to Reading Instruction

How the school ensures every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student

*Professional Development is provided to all teachers related to the Common Core State Standards.
*ESOL Endorsement and Reading Endorsement opportunities provided to all staff members via Bay District
initiatives.

*Reading Strategies are incorporated in instruction across all content areas.
*PLC Teams are comprised of teachers across all content areas and they frequently review DEA, FCAT, and classroom performance data in order to target students in need of additional support.
* Middle School content area teachers are given opportunities to observe the elementary reading block model in order to gain knowledge of appropriate reading strategies that can be used in their classrooms.

Preschool Transition

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(G) and 1115(c)(1)(D), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Strategies for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs

In the Spring, the preschool and head start classes from the preschool program visit the kindergarten classes. The parents are also invited to attend. This assists with easing the transition from preschool to kindergarten.

Expected Improvements

Area 1: Reading

Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on FCAT 2.0, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	72%	71%	No	75%
American Indian				
Asian	67%	78%	Yes	70%
Black/African American				
Hispanic	67%	71%	Yes	70%
White	73%	72%	No	76%
English language learners				
Students with disabilities	51%	42%	No	56%
Economically disadvantaged	63%	64%	Yes	66%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	196	28%	31%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	291	41%	44%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		21%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		67%

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA)	534	75%	78%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0)	139	78%	81%

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking (students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	25	58%	61%
Students scoring proficient in reading (students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	15	36%	39%
Students scoring proficient in writing (students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	14	31%	34%

Area 2: Writing

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0) Students scoring at or above 3.5	100	64%	65%
Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) Students scoring at or above Level 4	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		100%

Area 3: Mathematics

Elementary and Middle School Mathematics

Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on FCAT 2.0 and EOC assessments, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	74%	68%	No	77%
American Indian				
Asian	75%	72%	No	78%
Black/African American				
Hispanic	67%	50%	No	70%
White	76%	70%	No	78%
English language learners				
Students with disabilities	53%	45%	No	58%
Economically disadvantaged	63%	59%	No	66%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	227	32%	35%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	243	34%	37%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		39%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		48%

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Learning Gains	536	75%	78%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and EOC)	139	78%	81%

Area 4: Science

Elementary School Science

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	41	29%	32%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	49	34%	37%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		0%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	*[data excluded for privacy reasons]*		100%

Area 5: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM)

All Levels

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target
# of STEM-related experiences provided for students (e.g. robotics competitions; field trips; science fairs)	4		5
Participation in STEM-related experiences provided for students	172	58%	61%

Area 8: Early Warning Systems

Elementary School Indicators

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students who miss 10 percent or more of available instructional time	174	19%	16%
Students retained, pursuant to s. 1008.25, F.S.	42	5%	4%
Students who are not proficient in reading by third grade	41	33%	30%
Students who receive two or more behavior referrals	74	9%	6%
Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that lead to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S.	36	4%	3%

Middle School Indicators

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students who miss 10 percent or more of available instructional time	57	19%	16%
Students who fail a mathematics course	0	0%	0%
Students who fail an English Language Arts course	0	0%	0%
Students who fail two or more courses in any subject	0	0%	0%
Students who receive two or more behavior referrals	33	11%	10%
Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that leads to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S.	15	5%	4%

Area 9: Parent Involvement

Title I Schools may use the Parent Involvement Plan to meet the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(F) and 1115(c)(1)(G), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Parental involvement targets for the school

We plan to increase our parental involvement volunteer hours to 4697 by:
- Volunteer coaching
- Classroom Volunteers
- PTO Events like Trunk or Treat, Golf Tournament, Winter Festival
- Event volunteers for Book Fair, Health Screenings, and Picture Days

Specific Parental Involvement Targets

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Increase Volunteer Hours to 4697	4561	na%	na%

Area 10: Additional Targets

Additional targets for the school

Specific Additional Targets

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %

Goals Summary

G1. Continue to develop and implement common assessments across grade levels and content areas to increase student levels of proficiency

Goals Detail

G1. Continue to develop and implement common assessments across grade levels and content areas to increase student levels of proficiency

Targets Supported

- Reading (AMO's, FCAT2.0, FAA, Learning Gains, CELLA, Postsecondary Readiness)

- Writing

- Math (Elementary and Middle School, Elementary and Middle AMO's, Elementary and Middle FCAT 2.0, Elementary and Middle FAA, Elementary and Middle Learning Gains, Middle School Acceleration)

- Algebra 1 EOC

- Social Studies

- Civics EOC

- Science

- Science - Elementary School

- Science - Middle School

- STEM

- STEM - All Levels

- CTE

- Parental Involvement

- EWS

- EWS - Elementary School

- EWS - Middle School

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- MTSS Process

- Common Planning Time

- Guided Group Instruction

- Common Assessments

- Professional Development

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Lack of faculty buy-in and understanding of the rigor and relevance of common core state standards in order to develop quality common assessments

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Student levels of proficiency will increase from baseline to midyear as measured by summative common assessments and DEA.

Person or Persons Responsible
Leadership Team MTSS/RTI Team Administration

Target Dates or Schedule:
Monthly Leadership Team Meetings

Evidence of Completion:
1. Data Reports 2. Grade Book

Action Plan for Improvement

Problem Solving Key

G = Goal   **B** = Barrier   **S** = Strategy

G1. Continue to develop and implement common assessments across grade levels and content areas to increase student levels of proficiency

G1.B1 Lack of faculty buy-in and understanding of the rigor and relevance of common core state standards in order to develop quality common assessments

G1.B1.S1 Build Professional Learning Communities (PLC) at each grade level to develop common assessments and analyze the common assessment data.

Action Step 1

All teachers will participate in grade level PLCs in order to develop common assessments and analyze common assessment Data.

Person or Persons Responsible

1. Teachers 2. Administration will provide support and professional development during this process 3. Student Services Coordinator and Instructional Coaches will provide support and professional development.

Target Dates or Schedule

On Going

Evidence of Completion

Common Assessments, Grade Level Meetings, Lesson Plans, Grade Book

Facilitator:

1. Administration 2. Student Services Coordinator 3. Instructional Coaches

Participants:

All Teachers

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B1.S1

1. Once a month grade level meeting with administration 2. Administration will monitor lesson plans in-depth three times a year. 3. Student Services Coordinator will review common assessments and provide feedback as well as grade books and pacing guides 4. Monthly Leadership meetings with the grade level chairs and SIP team.

Person or Persons Responsible

1. Administration 2. Student Services Coordinator 3. Grade Level chair

Target Dates or Schedule

On-Going

Evidence of Completion

Common Assessments, Grade Level Meetings, Lesson Plans, Grade Book

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B1.S1

1. Grade Level Common Assessment Data 2. DEA 3. FCAT 4.Grade Book

Person or Persons Responsible

1. Administration 2. Student Services Coordinator 3. Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

At established assessment windows

Evidence of Completion

1. Data Reports

Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support School Improvement Goals

This section will satisfy the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b), by demonstrating high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, for pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff is being offered to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

Professional development opportunities identified in the SIP as action steps to achieve the school's goals.

G1. Continue to develop and implement common assessments across grade levels and content areas to increase student levels of proficiency

G1.B1 Lack of faculty buy-in and understanding of the rigor and relevance of common core state standards in order to develop quality common assessments

G1.B1.S1 Build Professional Learning Communities (PLC) at each grade level to develop common assessments and analyze the common assessment data.

PD Opportunity 1

All teachers will participate in grade level PLCs in order to develop common assessments and analyze common assessment Data.

Facilitator

1. Administration 2. Student Services Coordinator 3. Instructional Coaches

Participants

All Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

On Going

Evidence of Completion

Common Assessments, Grade Level Meetings, Lesson Plans, Grade Book