

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2011-2012 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: JANIE HOWARD WILSON SCHOOL

District Name: Polk

Principal: Beverly Lynne

SAC Chair: Nicole Almeida

Superintendent: Mr. Jesse Jackson

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 9/24/2011

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

[School Grades Trend Data](#)

(Use this data to complete Sections 1-4 of the reading and mathematics goals and Section 1 of the writing and science goals.)

[Adequate Yearly Progress \(AYP\) Trend Data](#)

(Use this data to complete Section 5 of the reading and mathematics goals and Section 3 of the writing goals.)

[Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test \(FCAT\) Trend Data](#)

(Use this data to inform the problem solving process when writing goals.)

HIGHLY QUALIFIED ADMINISTRATORS

List your school's highly qualified 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 performance (Percentage data for Proficiency, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).

Position	Name	Degree(s) / Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT (High Standards, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AYP information along with the associated school year)
Principal	Beverly Lynne	BS in Education: University of Tennessee; MA in Education: University of South Florida; Educational Leadership Certification: University of South Florida; Principal Certification: State of Florida	5	16	Principal Janie Howard Wilson Elem. 2010-11: School Grade-A; 67% reading mastery, 73% math mastery, 90% writing mastery, 46% science mastery; 60 % reading learning gains, 69% math learning gains, 52% reading learning gains in bottom 25%, 84% math learning gains in bottom 25%; Met 87% of AYP objectives; subgroups not making AYP in reading: black, Hispanic, econ. disadvantaged; subgroups not making AYP in math: white 2009-10: School Grade-C; 65% reading mastery, 71% math mastery, 78% writing mastery, 49% science mastery; Met 77% of AYP objectives; only white students met AYP in math 2008-09: School Grade-A; 75% reading mastery, 73% math mastery, 88% writing mastery, 47% science mastery; Met 100% of AYP 2007-08: School Grade-C; 72% reading mastery, 68% math mastery, 86% writing mastery, 37% science mastery; Met 92% of AYP; Black & SWD students did not meet AYP in math; SWD students did not meet

					<p>AYP in reading 2006-07: School Grade-C; 66% reading mastery, 65% math mastery, 91% writing mastery, 17% science mastery; Met 95% of AYP; SWD did not meet AYP in math & reading</p> <p>Hillcrest Elementary 2005-06: School Grade-B; 68% reading mastery, 69% math mastery, 78% writing mastery; Met 95% of AYP; Black subgroup did not meet AYP in reading</p>
Assis Principal	Steven Whitaker	BS in Education: University of Florida; MA in Education: Nova Southeastern University; Educational Leadership Certification: Nova Southeastern University	8	5	<p>Janie Howard Wilson Elem. 2010-11: School Grade-A; 67% reading mastery, 73% math mastery, 90% writing mastery, 46% science mastery; 60 % reading learning gains, 69% math learning gains, 52% reading learning gains in bottom 25%, 84% math learning gains in bottom 25%; Met 87% of AYP objectives; subgroups not making AYP in reading: black, Hispanic, econ. disadvantaged; subgroups not making AYP in math: white</p> <p>2009-10: School Grade-C; 65% reading mastery, 71% math mastery, 78% writing mastery, 49% science mastery; Met 77% of AYP objectives; only white students met AYP in math</p> <p>2008-09: School Grade-A; 75% reading mastery, 73% math mastery, 88% writing mastery, 47% science mastery; Met 100% of AYP</p> <p>2007-08: School Grade-C; 72% reading mastery, 68% math mastery, 86% writing mastery, 37% science mastery; Met 92% of AYP; Black & SWD students did not meet AYP in math; SWD students did not meet AYP in reading</p> <p>2006-07: School Grade-C; 66% reading mastery, 65% math mastery, 91% writing mastery, 17% science mastery; Met 95% of AYP; SWD did not meet AYP in math & reading</p>

HIGHLY QUALIFIED INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

List your school's highly qualified 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 performance (Percentage data for Proficiency, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). 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 (Proficiency, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AYP information along with the associated school year)
Reading: AIF	Deloris O'Hern	BS in Elementary Education Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania ESOL endorsement	22	6	<p>Janie Howard Wilson Elem. 2010-11: School Grade-A; 67% reading mastery, 73% math mastery, 90% writing mastery, 46% science mastery; 60 % reading learning gains, 69% math learning gains, 52% reading learning gains in bottom 25%, 84% math learning gains in bottom 25%; Met 87% of AYP objectives; subgroups not making AYP in reading: black, Hispanic, econ. disadvantaged; subgroups not making AYP in math: white</p> <p>2009-10: School Grade-C; 65% reading mastery, 71% math mastery, 78% writing mastery, 49% science mastery; Met 77% of AYP objectives; only white students met AYP in math</p> <p>2008-09: School Grade-A; 75% reading mastery; Met 100% of AYP</p> <p>2007-08: School Grade-C; 72% reading mastery; Met 92% of AYP; SWD students did not meet AYP in reading</p> <p>2006-07: School Grade-C; 66% reading mastery; Met 95% of AYP; SWD did not meet AYP in reading</p>
					<p>Janie Howard Wilson Elem. 2010-11: School Grade-A; 67% reading mastery, 73% math mastery, 90% writing mastery, 46% science mastery; 60 % reading learning gains, 69% math learning gains, 52% reading learning gains in</p>

Math Resource	Donna Borders	A.A. degree from Polk Community College B.S. degree from Florida Southern College	33	6	bottom 25%, 84% math learning gains in bottom 25%; Met 87% of AYP objectives; subgroups not making AYP in reading: black, Hispanic, econ. disadvantaged; subgroups not making AYP in math: white 2009-10: School Grade-C; 65% reading mastery, 71% math mastery, 78% writing mastery, 49% science mastery; Met 77% of AYP objectives; only white students met AYP in math 2008-09: School Grade-A; 73% math mastery; Met 100% of AYP 2007-08: School Grade-C; 68% math mastery; Met 92% of AYP; Black and SWD students did not meet AYP in math; 2006-07: School Grade-C; 65% math mastery; Met 95% of AYP; SWD did not meet AYP in math
Writing Resource	Amy Harris	A.A. Degree from Polk Community College B.S. Degree in Elementary Education from Warner Southern University	13	6	Janie Howard Wilson Elem. 2010-11: School Grade-A; 67% reading mastery, 73% math mastery, 90% writing mastery, 46% science mastery; 60 % reading learning gains, 69% math learning gains, 52% reading learning gains in bottom 25%, 84% math learning gains in bottom 25%; Met 87% of AYP objectives; subgroups not making AYP in reading: black, Hispanic, econ. disadvantaged; subgroups not making AYP in math: white 2009-10: School Grade-C; 65% reading mastery, 71% math mastery, 78% writing mastery, 49% science mastery; Met 77% of AYP objectives; only white students met AYP in math 2008-09: School Grade-A; 88% writing mastery; Met 100% of AYP 2007-08: School Grade-C; 86% writing mastery; Met 92% of AYP; Black and SWD students did not meet AYP in math; SWD students did not meet AYP in reading 2006-07: School Grade-C; 91% writing master.; Met 95% of AYP; SWD did not meet AYP in math & reading
Intermediate Science Resource	Nicole McClain	B.A. Degree in Geology from Florida Atlantic University Earned teaching certificate through Polk State College, Educator Preparation Institute including Reading Endorsement Competency 2 and ESOL	5	5	Janie Howard Wilson Elem. 2010-11: School Grade-A; 67% reading mastery, 73% math mastery, 90% writing mastery, 46% science mastery; 60 % reading learning gains, 69% math learning gains, 52% reading learning gains in bottom 25%, 84% math learning gains in bottom 25%; Met 87% of AYP objectives; subgroups not making AYP in reading: black, Hispanic, econ. disadvantaged; subgroups not making AYP in math: white 2009-10: School Grade-C; 65% reading mastery, 71% math mastery, 78% writing mastery, 49% science mastery; Met 77% of AYP objectives; only white students met AYP in math 2008-09: School Grade-A; 88% writing mastery; Met 100% of AYP 2007-08: School Grade-C; 86% writing mastery; Met 92% of AYP; Black and SWD students did not meet AYP in math; SWD students did not meet AYP in reading 2006-07: School Grade-C; 91% writing master.; Met 95% of AYP; SWD did not meet AYP in math & reading
Primary Science Resource	Molly Garrett	B.S. Degree in Business from Webber International University Earned education certificate by completing elementary education courses at Warner University	6	5	Janie Howard Wilson Elem. 2010-11: School Grade-A; 67% reading mastery, 73% math mastery, 90% writing mastery, 46% science mastery; 60 % reading learning gains, 69% math learning gains, 52% reading learning gains in bottom 25%, 84% math learning gains in bottom 25%; Met 87% of AYP objectives; subgroups not making AYP in reading: black, Hispanic, econ. disadvantaged; subgroups not making AYP in math: white 2009-10: School Grade-C; 65% reading mastery, 71% math mastery, 78% writing mastery, 49% science mastery; Met 77% of AYP objectives; only white students met AYP in math 2008-09: School Grade-A; 88% writing mastery; Met 100% of AYP 2007-08: School Grade-C; 86% writing mastery; Met 92% of AYP; Black and SWD students did not meet AYP in math; SWD students did not meet AYP in reading

HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1. Encourage teachers to take interns from local colleges	Principal, AP, Reading Resource Teacher, Other teachers at school	May 2012	
2	2. Increased technology in classrooms	Technology Committee, Principal, Assistant Principal, Teachers who are proficient in technology	May 2012	
3	3. Advantages of being at a charter school	Principal, Assistant Principal, Teachers and other staff	May 2012	
4	4. Implementing positive programs and updated research based materials	All Staff	May 2012	

Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

List all instructional staff and paraprofessionals who are teaching out-of-field and/or who are NOT highly qualified.

Name	Certification	Teaching Assignment	Professional Development/Support to Become Highly Qualified
None			

Staff Demographics

Please complete the following demographic information about the instructional staff in the school who are teaching at least one academic course.

**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 Qualified Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
40	10.0%(4)	42.5%(17)	32.5%(13)	15.0%(6)	30.0%(12)	100.0%(40)	2.5%(1)	2.5%(1)	70.0%(28)

Teacher Mentoring Program

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program 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
Deloris O'Hern	Savannah Taylor, 4th Grade Teacher	AIF training to organize and manage classrooms, materials and lessons	Continued meetings throughout year on concerns and strategies; modeling in class
Deloris O'Hern	Tiffany Weaver, Art Teacher	AIF training to organize and manage classrooms, materials and lessons	Continued meetings throughout year on concerns and strategies; modeling in class

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 A, funds school-wide services to Janie Howard Wilson Elementary. The Title I funds provide supplemental instructional resources and interventions for students with academic achievement needs. Title I, Part A, may include but not limited to support to provide after-school and summer instructional programs, supplemental instructional materials, resource teachers, technology for students, professional development for the staff, and resources for parents.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Migrant students enrolled in Janie Howard Wilson Elementary will be assisted by the school and by the District Migrant Education Program (MEP). Students will be prioritized by the MEP for supplemental services based on need and migrant status. MEP Teacher Advocates, assigned to schools with high percentages of migrant students, monitor the progress of these high need students and provide or coordinate supplemental academic support. Migrant Home-School Liaisons identify and recruit migrant students and their families for the MEP. They provide support to both students and parents in locating services necessary to ensure the academic success of these students whose education has been interrupted by numerous moves.

Title I, Part D

NA

Title II

Professional development resources are available to Title I schools through Title II funds. In addition, School Technology Services provide technical support, technology training, and licenses for software programs and web-based access via Title II-D funds. Funds available to Janie Howard Wilson are used to purchase but not limited to Beginning Teacher Program and various professional needs at the individual school.

Title III

The LEA which include Janie Howard Wilson will work together to provide such services as but not limited to: parent building capacity events, translation of documents, use of the T.A.L.K. System, and etc.

Title X- Homeless

The Hearth program, funded through Title X, provides support for identified homeless students. Title I provides support for this program, and many activities implemented by the Hearth program are carried out in cooperation with the Migrant Education Program (MEP) funded through Polk County's grant. This is the final year of their competitive grant and Janie Howard Wilson will receive services under Polk County's direction.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI unit(s) provided to Janie Howard Wilson Elementary enhance student achievement by providing two reading intervention teachers to work with at risk students in small group instruction daily for an hour.

Violence Prevention Programs

Title IV provides violence and drug prevention programs in schools in order to promote a safe school environment. Examples of violence prevention programs include anti-bullying and drug awareness.

Nutrition Programs

This school is not a location for a summer feeding program for the community.

Housing Programs

Students with housing needs are referred to the Homeless Student Advocate.

Head Start

NA

Adult Education

Family Literacy meets at JHW twice a week after school for GED classes. The Learning Resource Center provides parenting skills on Thursdays.

Career and Technical Education

NA

Job Training

NA

Other

Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI)

School-based RtI Team

Identify the school-based RtI Leadership Team.

Beverly Lynne, Principal; Steven Whitaker, Asst. Principal; Dee O'Hern, AIF; Laurncille Anderson, School Counselor

Describe how the school-based RtI Leadership Team functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). How does it work with other school teams to organize/coordinate RtI efforts?

The PSLT meets to analyze school wide data and proficiency levels of all students and subgroups. The team determines grade level and classroom instruction effectiveness. The team determines students at risk and places them in intervention groups, such as, FastForWord, Read 180, and AmeriCorps. The PSLT coordinates with the PST and reviews and evaluates Tier 1 and Tier 2 services.

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

The RtI team is involved with strategies to meet our goals in the SIP.

RtI Implementation

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

Tier 1: FCAT, SAT10, Universal Screenings/Benchmarks, Discovery Learning Assessments, Grade level writing prompts/rubrics, discipline referral information, PBS data.
Tier 2: Classroom test, comprehension quizzes, fluency passages, sight word checklist, math fact assessments, tally sheets, self-monitoring sheets, star charts. Teacher assesses students at specific intervals (bi-monthly/monthly) and graphs are created to summarize data.
Tier 3: Classroom test, comprehension quizzes, fluency passages, sight word checklist, math fact assessments, tally sheets, self-monitoring sheets, star charts. Teacher assesses students at specific intervals (weekly/daily) and graphs are created to summarize data.

Describe the plan to train staff on RtI.

The staff is trained on the Problem Solving Process during grade level meetings with the school counselor and/or school psychologist. Follow-up is conducted individually during the Problem Solving process.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Team members are Deloris O'Hern(AIF), Patricia McDowell, Lisa Comparato, Lucy Gomez, Marissa Story, Liz Anderson, Charlotte Weis, Valerie Wellman, Sallie Gwinn, Libbie Matteson, Tricia Nettleton

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

The Literacy Leadership Team meets once a month on Wednesdays. Members have been assigned tasks: time keeper, data gather, and recorder. Research based reading strategies are discussed along with our Focus Calendar and data analysis of our students from last years' FCAT and current Discovery scores to discuss strengths and weaknesses of our students .We also plan and carry out reading family nights to involve our parents and students in the reading process.

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

The major initiative this year will be the analysis of our intervention groups to establish their effectiveness.

NCLB Public School Choice

Notification of (School in Need of Improvement) SINI Status
No Attachment

Public School Choice with Transportation (CWT) Notification
No Attachment

Notification of (School in Need of Improvement) SINI Status
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.

In April, we host a Kindergarten Round-Up program, where staff members go into the community and distribute notes to future Kindergarten students' parents to attend the Kindergarten Registration and Orientation program night. Fliers are sent to local pre-schools informing the parents of the Kindergarten Orientation and Registration Program. During the meeting, staff members address the parents and tell them the skills needed by their child to be ready for Kindergarten, and show them strategies to prepare their child for the fall.

Kindergarten teachers in the Lake Wales Charter System have designed an assessment of Kindergarten readiness skills for all of the kindergartners entering school. This early assessment is also used in the spring with our preschoolers to identify those students who still need extra help. Those students who are identified as not being ready are recommended to attend our K-Week program prior to the start of the school year. School rules, procedures, and parent involvement are targeted, as well as readiness lessons for students. Teachers model reading aloud, homework procedures, and behavior strategies for the parents. Our Kindergarten Teachers, K Support Teacher and Paraprofessional, Gail Crum, director of K Support, and some of our First Grade Teachers are responsible for this intervention. Four year old children are also solicited to participate in the Volunteer Pre-K programs conducted during the summer.

Additionally, we have a Kindergarten Support program, funded by a private grant, in which a highly qualified teacher and paraprofessional work with those students who have been identified as at-risk through teacher recommendation, DIBELS screenings, and the ESI-K assessment. This program is a pull-out program designed to provide additional support to these students to better prepare them for the rigors of the kindergarten classroom. Parents and teachers will provide feedback through a survey conducted at the end of the year. We also use data from all the assessments to evaluate our effectiveness with the K Support. We are completing the fifth year for the longitudinal study of the first group of kindergartners this year for the donor to follow the progress of these students.

Lake Wales Charter System has another grant that our families are involved in: Family Literacy. The Family Literacy Program involves the entire family for parenting skills, dinner, GED help, homework help, and baby-sitting.

*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.

NA

*High Schools Only

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

NA

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?

NA

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 [School Feedback Report](#)

NA

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:

1. Students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in reading Reading Goal #1:	By the Spring of 2010-11, Achievement Level 3 students will increase by 3% as indicated by the INDV File – School Grade.
2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
34%	37%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Minimal time spent with "eyes on text" and engagement with text.	1.1 Independent exploration of text prior to formal instruction., extended reading passages used all year to develop cognitive endurance. Assignment of interesting book reports for homework to encourage more reading of material. Crate of books to be used at lunch time for students that have finished eating to give access of reading materials to students Use of AR to motivate students to read more.	1.1 Principal, AP, SAI Teachers, Media Specialist	1.1 On-going progress monitoring. Assessing of benchmark skills according to targeted needs of students Data analysis of Discovery assessments & ongoing progress monitoring through Discovery Accelerated Reader reports	1.1 Progress of students on assessments
2	1.2 Interventions do not address specific student needs.	1.2 Use of progress monitoring data to match intervention to individual student needs.	1.2 SAI Teachers, Classroom Teachers	1.2 Ongoing progress monitoring	1.2 Progress of students on assessments
3	1.3 Instructional time lost/misused during the literacy block.	1.3 Protect instructional time in the literacy block with 100% of teachers' time being spent on instruction and working with students.	1.3 Principal , AP, Classroom Teachers, SAI Teachers	1.3 Ongoing progress monitoring	1.3 Progress of students on assessments

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

2. Students achieving above proficiency (FCAT	
---	--

Levels 4 and 5) in reading Reading Goal #2:	By the Spring of 2010-11, Achievement Level 3 students will increase by 2% as indicated by the INDV File – School Grade.
2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
32%	34%

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	2.1 Lack of motivation or interest in reading.	2.1 Homogenous grouping of students in reading with more rigor required of them. Teachers using more higher level thinking questions during instruction Incorporate content area text through multiple reading resources and materials/authentic text, match student to their interest and read alouds.	2.1 Principal, AP	2.1 Analyzing of reports from Discovery assessment to determine student placement and needs. Differentiated Instruction Ongoing progress monitoring through Discovery Education	2.1 Progress of students on assessments
2	2.2 Increased need to reinforce skills.	2.2 Differentiated instruction within each reading classroom. A revised 90 minute block schedule for teachers to follow.	2.2 Principal , AP	2.2 Weekly progress monitoring Using mini-assessments	2.2 Progress of students on assessments.

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

3. Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading Reading Goal #3:	By the Spring of 2011, 55% of students will make Learning Gains as reported by School Grade Report.
2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
52%	55%

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
	3.1 Struggling students need additional time.	3.1 Additional minutes on a daily basis outside of the reading block. Group size 3-5 students	3.1 Principal, AP	3.1 Weekly fluency and comprehension checks. Analysis of test data to address student needs Differentiated	3.1 Progress of students on assessments

1		<p>ESE students will be given extra help in this reading class from the ESE Resource teacher daily.</p> <p>Active student engagement using promethean board, foldable, graphic organizers and visual clues.</p> <p>Revised 90 minute reading block that emphasizes reading benchmarks.</p>		Instruction	
2	3.2 Students need extra reinforcement to succeed in reading.	<p>3.2 Extra 30 minutes of reading daily using Read 180 for our Level 2 students.</p> <p>Special area and/or resource teachers assisting in the reading block with struggling students</p> <p>Before school tutoring</p>	3.2 Principal, AP, SAI Teachers, Special Area Teachers, Resource Teachers	<p>3.2 Analyzing of test data</p> <p>Differentiated Instruction</p>	3.2 Progress of students on assessments.
3					

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

4. Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading Reading Goal #4:	By the Spring of 2011, 55% of students will make Learning Gains as reported by School Grade Report.
2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
50%	55%

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
	4.1 Students need extra time to become proficient in benchmark skills.	<p>4.1 30 minute intervention groups daily using Fast Forward for our Level 1 students</p> <p>Increased use of summarizing to reinforce comprehension</p> <p>Small group instruction with 1-3 students per group</p> <p>Special area, resource, and ESE teachers assisting the reading teacher</p>	4.1 Principal, AP, SAI, ESE, Special Area, Resource Teachers	<p>4.1 Differentiated Instruction</p> <p>Analyzing of test data</p>	4.1 Progress of students on assessments

1	<p>Targeting these students in grades 4 & 5 through BUG Club.</p> <p>Tracking of these students and making sure special area teachers are aware of them.</p> <p>Assigning these students to SAI teachers for daily intervention in reading.</p> <p>Planning between teachers and media specialist ways to motivate these students to read more independently.</p> <p>Focus on effective reading strategies in all academic and special area classes during professional development trainings throughout the year.</p> <p>Active student engagement using promethean boards, foldable, graphic organizers and visual clues</p>			
---	--	--	--	--

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

5A. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in reading Reading Goal #5A:	By the Spring of 2011, subgroups will make AYP Safe Harbor as indicated by the NCLB-AYP Report.
---	---

Reading Goal #5A: Ethnicity
(White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian)

2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
White: 69% Black: 51% Hispanic: 58%	White: 72% Black: 56% Hispanic: 62%

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	5A.1 White: Black: Hispanic: Students enter school with limited expressive and receptive language.	5A.1 Stimulate oral language skills through: conversations, use of descriptive words, rhymes, songs, interactive reading & choral reading, and authentic realia.	5A.1 Principal, AP, Classroom teachers, Special area and resource teachers	5A.1 Weekly fluency and comprehension checks. Analyzing of test data Differentiated instruction	5A.1 Progress of students on assessments.
	5A.2 Students have limited background knowledge and life	5A.2 Use of Promethean Boards for virtual field trips, hands on	Principal, AP, Classroom, Special area,	5A.2 Analyzing of test data to determine students' needs.	5A.2 Progress of students on assessments.

2	experience	experiences, project based learning, immersion in vocabulary instruction and games.	Resource, ESE Teachers		
---	------------	---	------------------------	--	--

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 not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in reading Reading Goal #5B:	NA
---	----

Reading Goal #5B: English Language Learners (ELL)

2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
--------------------------------------	---------------------------------------

NA	NA
----	----

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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

5C. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in reading Reading Goal #5C:	NA
---	----

Reading Goal #5C: Students with Disabilities (SWD)

2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
--------------------------------------	---------------------------------------

NA	NA
----	----

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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

5D. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in reading Reading Goal #5D:	By the Spring of 2011, subgroup will make AYP Safe Harbor as indicated by the NCLB-AYP Report.
---	--

Reading Goal #5D: Economically Disadvantaged

2011 Current Level of Performance: *		2012 Expected Level of Performance: *			
61%		65%			
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	5D.1 Students have limited access to reading material and technology at home.	5D.1 Smaller group size to provide more individualized attention to students' needs. Intervention groups daily to reinforce skills. Encourage checkout of materials at school media center, use of AR. Use of technology in the classroom.	5D.1 Principal, AP, Classroom, ESE, Special area, Resource Teachers, Media Specialist	5D.1 Weekly mini assessments to monitor learning. Differentiated Instruction Analysis of data	5D.1 Progress on assessments
2	5D.2 Poor background in their oral language development.	5D.2 Fancy Nancy (SAI) introduces 3 Tier 2 words weekly on FNN (closed circuit TV). Students practice in their classroom illustrating and using these words in sentences.	5D.2 Principal, AP, SAI Teacher, Classroom Teachers	5D.2 Student participation in writing sentences and submitting them in their grade level Fancy Nancy box. The students that perform the best or improve in writing sentences and illustrations are rewarded on FNN and given a book to keep.	5D.2 Progress on assessments

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules(e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
LFS and high-yield strategies	K-5 Reading	SAI Teachers, LFS Coach and LFS trainers	Grade levels school-wide	Early release/staff development; monthly	PD specific: classroom observation, student products, lesson plans	SAI and Leadership Team

Reading Budget:

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Use of non-fiction materials during flexible grouping	National Geographic magazines	Title I	\$1,590.00
			Subtotal: \$1,590.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Progress monitoring	Discovery Learning	FTE	\$5,277.00
Use of technology tools like slates, document cameras, and Promethean boards to engage students and create flipcharts to use in all curriculum areas	"In house" technology training in skill level groups	FTE	\$350.00
Software for computer labs and excess at home	Fast Forward, Kids' College, Imagination Station	FTE	\$11,000.00
			Subtotal: \$16,627.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Progress Monitoring, curriculum development and Parent Involvement	Program Facilitator: salary and benefits	Title I	\$49,054.00
			Subtotal: \$49,054.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Assist classroom teachers, Fast Forward labs, PD, and modeling	Two SAI teachers: salary and benefits	FTE	\$134,110.00
			Subtotal: \$134,110.00
			Grand Total: \$201,381.00

End of Reading Goals

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:

1. Students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in mathematics Mathematics Goal #1:	By the Spring of 2011, JHW will increase the Achievement Level 3 students by 2 % as indicated by the School Grade Report.
2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
35%	37%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1 Going to Next Generation Sunshine State Standards	1.1 Morning Math Lab New standards benchmarks practice SES Tutoring Acaletics	1.1 Principal, Assistant Principal, Math Resource Teacher	1.1 Differentiated instruction Acaletics Data Analysis Analysis of data and on-going progress monitoring through Discovery Learning Assessment	1.1 Progress of students on assessments including B-M-E

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:

2. Students achieving above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in mathematics Mathematics Goal #2:	By the Spring of 2011, JHW will increase the Achievement Level 4 and 5 students by 1% as indicated by the School Grade Report.
2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
36%	37%

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	2.1 Next Generation Sunshine State Standards	2.1 Math Lab New standards benchmarks practice Homogeneous grouping for math in classrooms Higher level thinking questions in instruction	2.1 Principal, Assistant Principal, Math Resource Teacher	2.1 Differentiated instruction Acaletics Data Analysis Analysis of data and on-going progress monitoring through Discovery Learning Assessment	2.1 Progress of students on assessments including B-M-E
	2.2 Math groups too	2.2 Resource teacher	2.2 Principal,	2.2 Differentiated	2.2 Progress of

2	large Lack of real world applications	and ESE teacher assist teachers in math class Reteaching of math skills in iii groups Use of math manipulatives Graphic Organizers Apply skills to real world situations	Assistant Principal, Resource teacher, ESE teacher	instruction Acaletics Data Analysis Analysis of data and on-going progress monitoring through Discovery Learning Assessment	students on assessments including B-M-E
---	--	--	--	---	---

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:

3. Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics Mathematics Goal #3:	By the Spring of 2011, JHW will increase 5% the learning gains component for all students as indicated by the School Grade Report.
2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
60%	63%

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	3.1 Math groups too large	3.1 Resource and ESE teachers assist in math class Reteaching of math skills in iii groups Use of math manipulatives Graphic Organizers	3.1 Principal, Assistant Principal, resource and ESE teacher	3.1 Differentiated instruction Acaletics Data Analysis Analysis of data and on-going progress monitoring through Discovery Learning Assessment	3.1 Progress of students on assessments including B-M-E
2	3.2 Loss of concept knowledge as the year progresses and new skills are taught.	3.2 Math Resource Teacher will teach math class of lowest 25%, assisted by ESE teacher or para Active student engagement using promethean board, foldables, graphic organizers and visual clues Reviewing and previewing skills/concepts during Math Club on a daily basis.	3.2 Principal, Assistant Principal, Resource Teacher, ESE teacher, ESE Para	3.2 Differentiated instruction Acaletics Data Analysis Analysis of data and on-going progress monitoring through Discovery Learning Assessment	3.2 Progress of students on assessments including B-M-E

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. Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics Mathematics Goal #4:	By the Spring of 2011, JHW will increase 3% the lowest quartile learning gains component for all students as indicated by the School Grade Report.
--	--

2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
67%	70%

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	4.1 Math groups too large	4.1 Resource and ESE teachers assist teacher in math class Reteaching of math skills in iii groups Use of math manipulatives Graphic Organizers Acaletics SES Tutoring Active student engagement using promethean board, foldables, graphic organizers and visual clues 30 minutes intervention groups daily using FastForward for Level 1 students	4.1 Principal, Assistant Principal, Resource and ESE Teachers	4.1 Differentiated instruction Acaletics Data Analysis Analysis of data and on-going progress monitoring through Discovery Learning Assessment	4.1 Progress of students on assessments including B-M-E
2	4.2 New Next Generation Sunshine State Standards Loss of concept knowledge as the year progresses and new skills are taught.	4.2 Math Resource Teacher works with small groups Reteaching of math skills in iii groups Use of math manipulatives Graphic Organizers Reviewing and previewing skills/concepts during Math Club on a daily basis.	4.2 Principal, Assistant Principal	4.2 Differentiated instruction Acaletics Data Analysis Analysis of data and on-going progress monitoring through Discovery Learning Assessment	4.2 Progress of students on assessments including B-M-E

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

5A. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in mathematics Mathematics Goal #5A:	By the Spring of 2011, subgroups will make AYP – Safe Harbor as indicated by the NCLB-AYP report.
---	---

Mathematics Goal #5A: Ethnicity
(White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian)

2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
--------------------------------------	---------------------------------------

Black: 50% Hispanic 66%	Black: 55% Hispanic 70%
-------------------------	-------------------------

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	5A.1 Black: Hispanic: Fluency with Math Facts	5A.1 Computer Programs: Times Attack Math Facts in a Flash Math Facts competition between grade levels (3-5). (k-2) monthly math test given by teachers Use of manipulatives Graphic Organizers Word Problems FNN-Math Party Song and Facts of the month shown daily on closed circuit TV	5A.1 Principal, Assistant Principal, Math Resource Teacher	5A.1 Math Resource Teacher will give a monthly math facts test to grades 3-5 with winning classrooms in each grade level. Classroom teachers give math test to (k-2) grades. Winning classrooms get to display a Trophy.	5A.1 Progress of students on assessments including B-M-E
2	5A.2 No homework help	5A.2 Math Resource Teacher-2nd dose math instruction	5A.2 Principal, Assistant Principal, Math Resource Teacher	5A.2 Differentiated instruction Acaletics Data Analysis Analysis of data and on-going progress monitoring through Discovery Learning Assessment	5A.2 Progress of students on assessments including B-M-E

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 not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in mathematics Mathematics Goal #5B:	NA
Mathematics Goal #5B: English Language Learners (ELL)	
2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
NA	NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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

5C. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in mathematics Mathematics Goal #5C:	NA
---	----

Mathematics Goal #5C: Students with Disabilities (SWD)

2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
NA	NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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

5D. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in mathematics Mathematics Goal #5D:	By the Spring of 2011, subgroup will make AYP – Safe Harbor as indicated by the NCLB-AYP report.
---	--

Mathematics Goal #5D: Economically Disadvantaged

2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
64%	68%

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	5D.1 Next Generation Math Standards	5D.1 Math lab NGSSS Benchmark Practice	5D.1 Principal, Assistant Principal, Math Resource Teacher	5D.1 Differentiated instruction Acaletics Data Analysis Analysis of data and on-going progress monitoring through Discovery Learning Assessment	5D.1 Progress of students on assessments including B-M-E
	5D.2 Fluency with Math Facts	5D.2 Computer Programs: Times Attack Math Facts in a Flash Math Facts competition between grade levels (3-5). (k-2) monthly math test given by teachers	5D.2 Principal, Assistant Principal, Math Resource Teacher	5D.2 Math Resource Teacher will give a monthly math facts test to grades 3-5 with winning classrooms in each grade level. Classroom teachers give math test to (k-2) grades. Winning classrooms get to	5D.2 Progress of students on assessments including B-M-E

2		Use of manipulatives Graphic Organizers Word Problems FNN-Math Party Song and Facts of the month shown daily on closed circuit TV		display a Trophy.	
3	5D.3 No homework help	5D.3 Math Resource Teacher teaches remediation groups	5D.3 Principal, Assistant Principal, Math Resource Teacher	5D.3 Differentiated instruction Acaletics Data Analysis Analysis of data and on-going progress monitoring through Discovery Learning Assessment	5D.3 Progress of students on assessments including B-M-E

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 and Schedules(e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
LFS and high-yield strategies	K-5 Math	Math Resource Teacher	Grade levels school-wide	Early release/staff development; monthly	PD specific: classroom observation, student products, lesson plans	Math Resource Teacher and Leadership Team
ACALETICS	Kindergarten-Grade 5	Math Resource Teacher	Kindergarten-Grade 5	September/ November/January/ March	Classroom observations, lesson plans, data analysis	Math Resource Teacher and Administrators

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Go Math program	Materials for K-5	FTE	\$5,000.00
Acaletics	Materials for Acaletics	FTE	\$29,000.00
			Subtotal: \$34,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Progress monitoring	Discovery Learning	FTE	\$5,000.00
Use of technology tools like slates, document cameras, and Promethean boards to engage students and create flipcharts to use in all curriculum areas	"In house" technology training in skill level groups	FTE	\$350.00
			Subtotal: \$5,350.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

Math intervention for at risk math students	Teacher training and consumable materials for students in ACALETICS	FTE	\$9,000.00
			Subtotal: \$9,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Experienced teacher for modeling and PD	Math Resource Teacher: salary and benefits	Title 1	\$66,960.00
			Subtotal: \$66,960.00
			Grand Total: \$115,310.00

End of Mathematics Goals

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:

1. Students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in science Science Goal #1:	By the Spring of 2011, Achievement Level 3 students will increase by 2% as indicated by the School Grade Report.
2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
39%	41%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1 Providing enough time for science in the daily schedule	1.1 5th grade students attend science lab for a total of 225 minutes per week. In addition, teachers will be using scientific text during the reading block.	1.1 Science Resource teacher, Classroom Teachers	1.1 Harcourt chapter tests, lab notebook checks, weekly quizzes, daily science inquiry checks, FCAT Explorer	1.1 Discovery Assessments
2	1.2 Lowest quartile in intervention and miss out in instruction	1.2 Work into schedule time where lowest quartile will be able to attend science lab 225 minutes per week. Provide scaffolding and vocabulary support for struggling students	1.2 Science Resource teacher, Classroom Teachers	1.2 Harcourt chapter tests, lab notebook checks, weekly quizzes, daily science inquiry checks	1.2 Discovery Assessments

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

2. Students achieving above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in science Science Goal #2:	By the Spring of 2011, Achievement Level 4 and 5 students will increase by 2% as indicated by the School Grade Report.
2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *

10%						12%
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	2.1 Providing students who are at a level 3 achievement level with science enrichment opportunities.	2.1 Differentiated instruction Invite students who are at level 3 to FCAT tutoring for acceleration opportunities	2.1 Science Resource teacher	2.1 Weekly assessments Hands-on evaluations	2.1 Discovery Assessments, FCAT tutoring 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 and Schedules(e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Force & Motion	K-5	Nicole McClain	School-wide	Aug. 17, 2010	NA	NA
LFS and high-yield strategies	K-5 Reading	AIF	Grade levels school-wide	Early release/staff development; monthly	PD specific: classroom observation, student products, lesson plans	AIF and Leadership Team

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Progress Monitoring	Discovery Learning	Title 1	\$0.00
Use of technology tools like slates, document cameras, and Promethean boards to engage students and create flipcharts to use in all curriculum areas	"In house" technology training in skill level groups	FTE	\$350.00
			Subtotal: \$350.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Steve Spangler Science Camp	Ways to connect "hands-on" learning in classrooms for Intermediate and Primary science teachers	FTE	\$398.00
			Subtotal: \$398.00
Other			

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Hands on activities in science lab	Primary science teacher: salary and benefits	Title 1	\$44,298.00
Hands on activities in science lab	Intermediate science teacher: salary and benefits	FTE	\$40,000.00
			Subtotal: \$84,298.00
			Grand Total: \$85,046.00

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:

1. Students achieving Adequate Yearly Progress (FCAT Level 3.0 and higher) in writing Writing Goal #1:	NA
2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
94%	90% 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	Students are not exposed to enough writing during the school day or at home	1.1 Students will use writing process daily 1.2 All writing will be recorded in a journal, notebook, or work folder for monitoring of growth across time 1.3 Students will be exposed to proper grammar and different types of writing 1.4 Struggling writers will have a double dose of writing after school 2 times a week 1.5 Resource teacher will work with small groups during school hours	Principal, Assistant Principal, Writing ResourceTeacher, classroom teachers	School wide student portfolios and rubric will be used to monitor progress.	Progress of students assessments and BMME.

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:

2. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in writing Writing Goal #2A:	NA
Writing Goal #2A: Ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian)	
2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *

NA		NA			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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

2. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in writing Writing Goal #2B:		NA			
Writing Goal #2B: English Language Learners (ELL)					
2011 Current Level of Performance: *			2012 Expected Level of Performance: *		
NA			NA		

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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

2. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in writing Writing Goal #2C:		NA			
Writing Goal #2C: Students with Disabilities (SWD)					
2011 Current Level of Performance: *			2012 Expected Level of Performance: *		
NA			NA		

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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

2. Student subgroups not making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in writing Writing Goal #2D:	NA
--	----

Writing Goal #2D: Economically Disadvantaged

2011 Current Level of Performance: *	2012 Expected Level of Performance: *
NA	NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
LFS and high-yield strategies	K-5 Reading	Reading and Writing Resource Teachers	Grade levels school-wide	Early release/staff development; monthly	PD specific: classroom observation, student products, lesson plans	Reading and Writing Resource Teachers
Writing across all content areas	K-5 all content areas	Reading and Writing Resource Teacher	Grade levels school-wide	Early release/staff development; monthly	PD specific: classroom observation, student products, lesson plans	Reading and Writing Resource Teachers

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Use of technology tools like slates, document cameras, and Promethean boards to engage students and create flipcharts to use in all curriculum areas	"In house" technology training in skill level groups	FTE	\$350.00
			Subtotal: \$350.00

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
Experienced teacher to model and PD	Writing Resource Teacher: salary and benefits	Title 1	\$49,558.00
			Subtotal: \$49,558.00
			Grand Total: \$49,908.00

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		Our attendance goal is to decrease our absentee rate of 5.19% to 5.00%.			
Attendance Goal # 1:					
2011 Current Attendance Rate: *		2012 Expected Attendance Rate: *			
94.81%		95.00%			
2011 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)		2012 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)			
201		175			
2011 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)		2012 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)			
109		100			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	One barrier we have is that we have a lot of bused students and when they miss the bus, they usually do not come to school.	We will use our PBS strategies and rewards to hopefully get kids motivated to get up and be responsible on their own to make it to the bus stop and get to school on time.	Guidance Counselor/Assistant Principal	Running attendance reports and monitoring kids who are bus riders and their absences.	Genesis
2		We will also be doing home visits at the beginning of school to target our kids who are attendance issues.	Guidance Counselor/Assistant Principal, Dean, Superintendent		

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 and Schedules(e.g. , Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PBS	ALL	AP/PBS Team	School-wide	All Year	Monitoring student attendance through Genesis	Guidance Counselor

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s) /Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
0	0	0	\$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 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:	Our goal is to decrease the amount of suspension we have total (ISS and OSS) from 131 overall to 110 overall.
2011 Total Number of In –School Suspensions	2012 Expected Number of In- School Suspensions
12	12

2011 Total Number of Students Suspended In School	2012 Expected Number of Students Suspended In School
12	12
2011 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2012 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
97	80
2011 Total Number of Students Suspended Out of School	2012 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out of School
57	45

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	One barrier we have is that with our group of students, a lot of them lack some of the social skills and confidence to perform well academically and thus making them susceptible to discipline issues.	We will utilize PBS strategies school wide to help decrease the amount of suspensions.	PBS team/Assistant Principal	Using our PBS data as well as data from Genesis to monitor the amount of kids who are discipline problems and focus on them in order to minimize the use of suspension as a consequence.	Genesis
2		We will be making proactive home visits in order to try and get parents involved before the discipline issues arise.	PBS team/Assistant Principal & Dean		

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 and Schedules (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:

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)

Dropout Prevention Goal(s)

Note: Required for High School - F.S., Sec. 1003.53

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Dropout Prevention Dropout Prevention Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of students who dropped out during the 2009-2010 school year.</i>			NA		
2011 Current Dropout Rate: *			2012 Expected Dropout Rate: *		
NA			NA		
2011 Current Graduation Rate: *			2012 Expected Graduation Rate: *		
NA			NA		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates and Schedules (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						

Dropout Prevention 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 Dropout Prevention 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>Increase parental involvement by 3% during the 2011-2012 school year.</p>
2011 Current Level of Parent Involvement: *	2012 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: *

89%					92%
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	Parent participation may be limited because of their work schedule.	JHW will offer several evening meetings and serve families a light meal to accommodate parents' work schedules.	Administrative team, committees, and Program Facilitator	Meeting evaluation sheets and comments.	Sign-in sheets; Parent phone calls and notes; Student responses.
2	Parents may lack the knowledge of the potential skills students will be tested on in the Spring of 2012.	Provide parents with the opportunity to participate in several informative parental meetings in which a variety of hands-on academic enhancement activities will be presented by staff members.	Administration and committees	Meeting evaluation sheets and comments.	Sign-in sheets; Parent phone calls and notes; Student responses.

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 and Schedules (e.g., Early Release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Title I Parental Involvement Development Meeting	K-5th	Angela Heyward	School-wide	Beginning and middle of the school year	Title I requirements	Principal/AP, Program Facilitator
Reading	K-5th	Deloris O'Hern	School-wide	Once per month	Progress Monitoring	Principal/AP, Program Facilitator
Math	K-5th	Donna Borders	School-wide	Once per month	Progress Monitoring	Principal/AP, Program Facilitator
Writing	K-5th	Amy Harris	School-wide	Once per month	Progress Monitoring	Principal/AP, Program Facilitator

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Communication with parents	Agendas	Title 1	\$3,220.00
Subtotal:			\$3,220.00
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
Parent involvement for Family Nights	Light refreshments, signs, etc.	Title 1	\$500.00
			Subtotal: \$500.00
			Grand Total: \$3,720.00

End of Parent Involvement 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	Use of non-fiction materials during flexible grouping	National Geographic magazines	Title I	\$1,590.00
Mathematics	Go Math program	Materials for K-5	FTE	\$5,000.00
Mathematics	Acaletics	Materials for Acaletics	FTE	\$29,000.00
Attendance	0	0	0	\$0.00
Parent Involvement	Communication with parents	Agendas	Title 1	\$3,220.00
				Subtotal: \$38,810.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Progress monitoring	Discovery Learning	FTE	\$5,277.00
Reading	Use of technology tools like slates, document cameras, and Promethean boards to engage students and create flipcharts to use in all curriculum areas	"In house" technology training in skill level groups	FTE	\$350.00
Reading	Software for computer labs and excess at home	Fast Forward, Kids' College, Imagination Station	FTE	\$11,000.00
Mathematics	Progress monitoring	Discovery Learning	FTE	\$5,000.00
Mathematics	Use of technology tools like slates, document cameras, and Promethean boards to engage students and create flipcharts to use in all curriculum areas	"In house" technology training in skill level groups	FTE	\$350.00
Science	Progress Monitoring	Discovery Learning	Title 1	\$0.00
Science	Use of technology tools like slates, document cameras, and Promethean boards to engage students and create flipcharts to use in all curriculum areas	"In house" technology training in skill level groups	FTE	\$350.00
Writing	Use of technology tools like slates, document cameras, and Promethean boards to engage students and create flipcharts to use in all curriculum areas	"In house" technology training in skill level groups	FTE	\$350.00
				Subtotal: \$22,677.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Progress Monitoring, curriculum development and Parent Involvement	Program Facilitator: salary and benefits	Title I	\$49,054.00
Mathematics	Math intervention for at risk math students	Teacher training and consumable materials for students in ACALETICS	FTE	\$9,000.00
Science	Steve Spangler Science Camp	Ways to connect "hands-on" learning in classrooms for Intermediate and Primary science teachers	FTE	\$398.00
				Subtotal: \$58,452.00
Other				

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Assist classroom teachers, Fast Forward labs, PD, and modeling	Two SAI teachers: salary and benefits	FTE	\$134,110.00
Mathematics	Experienced teacher for modeling and PD	Math Resource Teacher: salary and benefits	Title 1	\$66,960.00
Science	Hands on activities in science lab	Primary science teacher: salary and benefits	Title 1	\$44,298.00
Science	Hands on activities in science lab	Intermediate science teacher: salary and benefits	FTE	\$40,000.00
Writing	Experienced teacher to model and PD	Writing Resource Teacher: salary and benefits	Title 1	\$49,558.00
Parent Involvement	Parent involvement for Family Nights	Light refreshments, signs, etc.	Title 1	\$500.00
				Subtotal: \$335,426.00
				Grand Total: \$455,365.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

<input type="checkbox"/> Intervene	<input type="checkbox"/> Correct II	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent II	<input type="checkbox"/> Correct I	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent I	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	------------------------------------	------------------------------------	-----------------------------

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.

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

Continue to look at ways to get the community involved with our school
 Review and make recommendations for our SIP
 Make recommendations about our academic Family Nights
 Recommend how to spend A+ money

AYP DATA

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2010-2011
 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2009-2010
 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2008-2009

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

Polk School District JANIE HOWARD WILSON SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	67%	73%	90%	46%	276	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	60%	69%			129	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	52% (YES)	84% (YES)			136	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					541	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Polk School District JANIE HOWARD WILSON SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	65%	71%	78%	49%	263	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	52%	60%			112	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?	50% (YES)	67% (YES)			117	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					492	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Polk School District JANIE HOWARD WILSON SCHOOL 2008-2009						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	75%	73%	88%	47%	283	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	67%	75%			142	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?	66% (YES)	64% (YES)			130	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