

# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2009 - 2010 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



**School Name: BAYVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL**

**District Name: Broward**

**Principal: JoEllen Scott**

**SAC Chair: Denise Lowe**

**Superintendent: James Notter**

**Date of School Board Approval: pending**

**Last Modified on: 09-16-2009**

**Dr. Eric J. Smith, Commission**  
Florida Department of Education  
325 West Gaines Street  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

**Dr. Frances Haithcock, Chance**  
K-12 Public Schools  
Florida Department of Education  
325 West Gaines Street  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

## VISION and MISSION STATEMENTS

### Mission:

Bayview Elementary is dedicated to meeting the educational needs of all students in a safe learning environment.

### Vision:

94% of students will be at or above grade level in Reading by June 2010.

94% of students will be at or above grade level in Math by June 2010.

93% of students in Grade 4 will score at or above a level 4 in Writing by June 2010.

89% of students in Grade 5 will score a level 3 or above in Science by June 2010.

## PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

### SCHOOL PROFILE/DEMOGRAPHICS

#### Brief History and Background of the School

Bayview Elementary became a school in 1958. Bayview sits on a small piece of property surrounded by the Middle River, George English Park, and the Coral Ridge subdivision. 86% of our students are brought to school via private transportation, while 14% utilize public school buses. Bayview Elementary offers a private after school care program under the direction of Sunshine Child Care. Approximately 26% of the students attend this program. There are 317 approved volunteers. The school has earned the Golden School Award for 27 consecutive years. In addition, Bayview Elementary's PTA membership exceeds 90%. This organization prides itself in the numerous programs and events provided for the students throughout the school year.

#### Unique School Strengths for Next Year

Bayview has a minimal mobility rate for students and staff. Based on the calendared events for 2009-2010, the PTA will continue to be a strong supporter of the school community. We project that parent involvement will continue at a high rate.

#### Unique School Weaknesses for Next Year

Due to state and district budget reductions, Bayview Elementary will need to surplus teachers and support staff. Additionally, funding for materials, supplies, and technology will be restricted.

#### Student Demographics

Based on 2008-2009 school data, the following demographic information is on file: White-81.6, Black- 5.3%, Hispanic-9.8%, Asian-2%, American Indian-0%, and MultiRacial-1.4%.

#### Student Attendance Rates

For 2008-2009 school year, approximately 95.5% of students attend school on a monthly basis.

#### Student Mobility

Mobility rate for 2008-2009 school year was 12.4%.

#### Student Suspension Rates

External Suspension - 0% Alternative to External Suspension - <.5% Internal Suspension - <2%

#### Student Retention Rates

There will be 1.5% of students retained in the 2009-2010 school year.

#### Class Size

Bayview plans on meeting the state class size average criteria of: K-3 – 18 students, 4-5 – 22 students.

#### Academic Performance of Feeder Pattern

Sunrise Middle School - 2008 Grade: B AYP: N  
 Ft. Lauderdale High School - 2008 Grade: C AYP: N

#### Partnerships and Grants

Barnes and Noble, Sunshine Child Care, Whole Foods Market, Bank United, Outback Steakhouse, and Honeybaked Ham

### STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

[School Grades Trend Data](#)

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

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

### HIGHLY QUALIFIED ADMINISTRATORS

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record *
Principal	JoEllen Scott	Masters in Science / Ed. Leadership, Elementary Education, Varying Exceptionalities ESOL Endorsement	2	9	2008-2009 - Grade: A AYP: Y High Standards Reading: 92% High Standards Math: 94% High Standards Writing: 97% High Standards Science: 86% Learning Gains Reading: 79% Learning Gains Math: 74% Learning Gains Lowest 25% in Reading: 81% Learning Gains Lowest 25% in Math: 85%  2007-2008 - Grade: A AYP: Y High Standards Reading: 94% High Standards Math: 96% High Standards Writing: 97% High Standards Science: 84% Learning Gains Reading: 71% Learning Gains Math: 83% Learning Gains Lowest 25% in Reading: 88% Learning Gains Lowest 25% in Math: 81%
Assis Principal	Theresa Sumner	Masters in Education / Ed. Leadership, Supervision, Early Childhood, Elementary, Special Education: SLD, Middle School English, ESOL Endorsemen	6	6	2008-2009 - Grade: A AYP: Y High Standards Reading: 92% High Standards Math: 94% High Standards Writing: 97% High Standards Science: 86% Learning Gains Reading: 79% Learning Gains Math: 74% Learning Gains Lowest 25% in Reading: 81% Learning Gains Lowest 25% in Math: 85%  2007-2008 - Grade: A AYP: Y High Standards Reading: 94% High Standards Math: 96% High Standards Writing: 97% High Standards Science: 84% Learning Gains Reading: 71% Learning Gains Math: 83% Learning Gains Lowest 25% in Reading: 88% Learning Gains Lowest 25% in Math: 81%

\* Note: Prior Performance Record (including prior School Grades and AYP information along with the associated school year)

### HIGHLY QUALIFIED INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as a Coach	Prior Performance Record *
					2008-2009 -Grade: A AYP:Y High Standards Reading: 92% High Standards Math: 94% High Standards Writing: 97% High Standards Science: 86% Learning Gains Reading: 79% Learning Gains Math: 74%

Reading	Patricia Robinson	Masters in Reading/ Early Childhood, Elementary Education, Reading, ESOL Endorsement	25	13	Learning Gains Lowest 25% in Reading: 81% Learning Gains Lowest 25% in Math: 85%  2007-2008 –Grade: A AYP:Y High Standards Reading: 94% High Standards Math: 96% High Standards Writing: 97% High Standards Science:84% Learning Gains Reading: 71% Learning Gains Math: 83% Learning Gains Lowest 25% in Reading: 88% Learning Gains Lowest 25% in Math: 81%
---------	-------------------	--	----	----	--

\* Note: Prior Performance Record (including prior School Grades and AYP information along with the associated school year)

## HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS

Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1. New Educator Support System	Michael Hinesley	June 2010	
2. Team Leader as a Mentor	Robbin Michaels Patricia Robinson Denise Lowe Anthony Thompson Christine Katsikas Stephanie Witt	June 2010	
3. Professional Development Workshops / Learning Communities based on Needs Assessment	JoEllen Scott Patricia Robinson	June 2010	
4. Assign a Grade Level Mentor	JoEllen Scott Theresa Sumner	June 2010	

## Non-Highly Qualified Instructors

Name	Certification	Teaching Assignment	Professional Development/Support to Become Highly Qualified
Nancy Green	Elementary Education, ESE, ESOL Endorsement	Part Time Varying Exceptionalities Teacher	Researching

## Staff Demographics

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	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed
35	0	14	23	63	31	97	11	11	91

## Teacher Mentoring Program

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Robbin Michaels	Debra Soper	Change in Grade Level	Balanced Literacy Training
Patricia Robinson	Jeri Jo Flores	Change in Grade Level	Balanced Literacy Training
Denise Lowe	Janet Malewicz	Change in Grade Level	Grade Level Standards/Expectations Training
Anthony Thompson	Paula Balezentis	Change in Grade Level	Grade Level Standards/Expectations Training

## ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

### Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only  
Title I, Part A

N/A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

N/A

Title I, Part D

N/A

Title II

N/A

Title III

Materials purchased and sent from district multicultural department

Title X- Homeless

N/A

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Funds are allocated for individual or small group instruction

Violence Prevention Programs

N/A

Nutrition Programs

N/A

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

Other

N/A

Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI)

**School-based RtI Team**

Identify the school-based RtI Leadership Team.

JoEllen Scott - Principal, Theresa Sumner - Assistant Principal, Patricia Robinson - Reading Coach, Jennifer Lai - ESE Specialist, Jennifer Fitzgerald - School Psychologist, Team Leaders - Case Managers as needed

Describe how the school-based RtI Leadership Team functions (e.g. meeting processes and roles/functions).

The RtI works in conjunction with the Collaborative Problem Solving Team to discuss data and interventions on specific students after reviewing data from the Progress Monitoring Plan.

The roles/functions of the RtI Leadership Team is to provide interventions with the teacher for instruction to at-risk students/students not making adequate gains with the core curriculum.

Describe the role of the school-based RtI Leadership Team in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan

The RtI Team met with the School Advisory Council (SAC) and principal to help develop the SIP.

### **RtI Implementation**

Describe the data management system used to summarize tiered data.

Baseline data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Broward Assessment Tests (BAT 1 & 2 for reading, math, and science)

Describe the plan to train staff on RtI.

Professional development will be provided during teachers' planning time, ER, and planning days throughout the year. Two professional development sessions entitled: "RtI: Problem Solving Model: Building Consensus Implementing and Sustaining Problem-Solving/RtI" and "RtI: Challenges to Implementation Data-based Decision-Making, and Supporting and Evaluating Interventions" will take place in mid-August and throughout the year. Team Leaders will be trained as case managers on team leader release days.

## School Wide Florida's Continuous Improvement Model

### **Plan**

#### **Data Disaggregation 2008-2009 FCAT Data**

What strengths and weaknesses were identified in the 2009 data by grade level, subject area, and clusters/strands?

Strengths – Across all grade levels, 89% of students scores were level 3 or above in Reading. Across all grade levels, 91% of students scores were level 3 or above in Math. 86% of Grade 5 students scored at or above a level 3 on FCAT Science test. Weaknesses: Across all grade levels, the lowest content area in math is Number Sense. Grade 3 and 4 scores well in Geometry, while grade 5 scores lower. Across all grade levels, students score lower in Main Idea.

#### **Instructional Calendar Development**

What is the process for developing, implementing, and monitoring an Instructional Focus Calendar for reading, writing, mathematics, and science?

Focus Calendar will be provided for each content area by the district office and will be posted to the Broward Enterprise Education Portal (BEEP) for use by classroom teachers. Implementation will be facilitated by each grade level at the school. A progress monitoring chart has been developed by the staff at Bayview. Assessment of student achievement will be administered according to the progress monitoring plan.

Which instructional Benchmarks will be given priority focus, based on need, for each content area (reading, writing, mathematics, and science)?

Reading – Main Idea, Math – Number Sense, Writing - Expository, Science – Earth and Space

What is the process to ensure instruction is based on individual students' needs, as opposed to the master schedule?

Assessment of student achievement will be administered according to the progress monitoring plan. Individual interventions and strategies will be assigned to students and implemented by the teacher as assessment data is analyzed.

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

N/A

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

N/A

### **DO**

#### **Direct the Instructional Focus**

How are lesson plans and instructional delivery aligned across grade levels and subject areas?

According to the district guidelines and instructional focus calendars.

How are instructional focus lessons developed and delivered?

The instructional focus calendar developed by the district are implemented based on the needs of the students.

How will instructional focus lessons be revised and monitored?

Based on results of September and November 2009 assessment data.

## CHECK

### Assessment

Describe the types of ongoing formative assessments to be used during the school year to measure student progress in core, supplemental, and intensive instruction/intervention.

Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA), Fluency Probes, BEEP Mini Assessments in Reading, Math, and Science, Writing Samples, Phonics Inventory, Concepts of Print, YOPP Singer, ROSNER, Broward Dictation Test, QBAT, FCAT, SAT.

How are assessments used to identify students reaching mastery and those not reaching mastery?

A criteria benchmark will be set for each grade level and reviewed quarterly to determine content mastery.

### Maintenance

How is ongoing assessment and maintenance of Benchmark mastery for each grade level and content area built into the Instructional Focus Calendar?

Instructional Focus Calendar is cross referenced with Progress Monitoring Plan and assessment data.

Describe the process and schedule for teams to review progress monitoring data (summative and mini assessments) to identify the required instructional modifications that are needed to increase student achievement.

Grade level teams will meet with administration and support staff on a monthly basis to review progress monitoring data.

### Monitoring

Describe the Principal's and Leadership Team's roles as instructional leaders and how they will be continuously involved in the teaching and learning process.

The Principal and Leadership Team will play a role in the teaching and learning process through grade level progress monitoring meetings, RTI discussions by student need, and classroom walkthroughs.

## ACT

### Supplemental and Intensive Instruction/Interventions

Identify the core, supplemental, and intensive instruction and interventions.

Reading – Macmillan/McGraw-Hill Treasures, Phonics for Reading, Intermediate Rewards, Read Well, Great Leaps, Road to Code, Wilson, Foundations, Quick Reads, Multi-Sequence Drills, Recipe for Reading  
Math – Harcourt Math  
Science – Harcourt Science

How are supplemental and intensive instruction/interventions and tutorials structured to re-teach non-mastered target areas?

Data analysis drives small group instruction. Students are placed in groups according to need. Groups are fluid in nature.

How does the school identify staff's professional development needs to improve their instructional strategies?

Professional development needs are linked to the goals and objectives of the SIP. Additionally, a needs assessment survey is conducted.

Which students will be targeted for supplemental and intensive instruction/interventions?

The lowest quartile, economically disadvantaged, and student with disabilities will be targeted for supplemental and intensive interventions. Students not meeting mastery in a particular skill area will also be included in supplemental and intensive instruction.

How will the effectiveness of the interventions be measured throughout the year?

The effectiveness of the interventions will be measured through assessments on the progress monitoring plan.

#### Enrichment

Describe alternative instructional delivery methods to support acceleration and enrichment activities.

Enrichment activities include KidBiz3000, literature circles, curriculum compacting, and differentiated instruction.

Describe how students are identified for enrichment strategies.

Through data analysis of FCAT, BAT, and Chapter Tests.

#### Professional Learning Communities

PLC Organization (grade level, subject, etc.)	PLC Leader	Frequency of PLC Meetings	Schedule (when)	Primary Focus of PLC (include Lesson Study and Data Analysis)
LINKS	Linda Barnett	Monthly	Afterschool	Technology
Cup of Curriculum	Patricia Robinson	Quarterly	Planning Time	Curriculum
Leadership	Administration	Monthly	Planning Days	Leadership Skills

#### NCLB Public School Choice

Note: For Title I schools only

- Notification of (School in Need of Improvement) SINI Status  
**No Attached Notification of (School in Need of Improvement) SINI Status**
- Public School Choice with Transportation (CWT) Notification  
**No Attached Public School Choice with Transportation (CWT) Notification**
- Notification of (School in Need of Improvement) SINI Status  
**No Attached Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification**

#### Pre-School Transition

Orientation will be held prior to the start of the school year for Kindergarten students and their families to familiarize them with the school and expectations for the coming year.

School tours are given by the Leadership team to newly registered Kindergarten students.

Screening data will be collected and aggregated prior to September 4, 2009 assessing Letters and Sounds, Phonological Awareness/Processing, and Broward County Dictation. Data will be used to drive daily academic instruction for all students and for individual students who may need intervention beyond core instruction.

Screening tools will be re-administered mid-year and at the end of the year in order to determine student learning gains. As well as any additional assessments to determine the need for changes to instructional/intervention programs.

#### Postsecondary Transition

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

N/A



## PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

### Reading Goal

<b>Needs Assessment:</b>	Based on School Grade and Adequate Yearly Progress Data:  Did the total percent proficient increase or decrease? What is the percent change?  What clusters/strands, by grade level, showed decrease in proficiency?  Did all student subgroups meet AYP targets? If not, which subgroups did not meet the targets?  Did 50% or more of the lowest 25% make learning gains? What is the percent of the lowest 25% of students making learning gains?  Did 50% or more of the total number tested make learning gains? What is the percent of students making learning gains?
--------------------------	--

Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement		Objective Linked to Area of Improvement		
In grades 3-5, 92% of students achieved a level 3 or above on the 2009 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.		In grades 3-5, 94% of the students will achieve a level 3 or better for reading on the 2010 FCAT Reading Test.		
	Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Students will utilize a variety of computer software to reinforce reading skills including but not limited to Accelerated Reader, Riverdeep, KidBiz3000, etc. Results will be monitored and progress documented to be used for conferencing and individualized student instruction.	1. Reading Coach, Teacher	1. Review of all data and regrouping students and revising instruction as needed	1. School created assessments utilizing Reading Benchmarks and Fluency Probes.
2	2. Students will include higher order questioning techniques during reading instruction and show proof of answers utilizing the text.	2. Administration and Reading Coach	2. Classroom Walkthroughs	2. Classroom Walkthroughs log, Reading Comprehension Tests, Mini BATs and selected assessments from the Progress Monitoring Plan
3	3. Teachers will group students according to reading skills based on State and District assessments and data from the school's Progress Monitoring Plan.	3. Reading Coach, Teacher	3. Observation and review of data by teacher, reading coach, and administrators	3. Reading Comprehension Tests, Mini BATs, and selected assessments from the Progress Monitoring Plan

Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement		Objective Linked to Area of Improvement		
Based on the 2009 FCAT Reading data, 81% of students in the lowest quartile scored at or above Level 3.		Increase the percent of lowest quartile students scoring at or above a Level 3 from 81% to 84% on the 2010 FCAT Reading Test		
	Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step	Evaluation Tool
1	1. Tier 1: Determine core instructional needs by reviewing common assessment data for all students in each grade level within bottom quartile. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence-based instruction/ interventions within the reading block.	1. Administrators	1. Grade-level teams will review results of common assessment data every 6 weeks to determine progress toward benchmark.	1. Grade level assessments on reading benchmarks given weekly
2	Tier 2: Plan supplemental instruction/ interventions	Administrators	Grade level teams will review results of common	Grade level assessments on reading benchmarks given

	for students not responding to core instruction. Focus of instruction is determined by review of common assessment data and will include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice. Supplemental instruction is provided in addition to core instruction.		assessment data every 4 weeks to determine progress toward benchmark.	weekly
3	Tier 3: Plan targeted intervention for students not responding to core plus supplemental instruction using problem-solving process. Interventions will be matched to individual student needs, be evidence-based, and provided in addition to core instruction.	RtI Team	Grade-level teams will review results of common assessment data bi-weekly to determine progress toward benchmark.	Grade level assessments on reading benchmarks

<b>Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement</b>		<b>Objective Linked to Area of Improvement</b>		
Based on the 2009 FCAT Reading data, 75 % of Students with Disabilities (SWD) scored at or above Level 3.		Increase the percent of SWD scoring at or above a Level 3 from 75% to 78% on the 2010 FCAT Reading Test.		
	<b>Action Step</b>	<b>Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step</b>	<b>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step</b>	<b>Evaluation Tool</b>
1	Identified at risk students will be instructed utilizing one or a variety of the following strategies/materials: Wilson, Foundations, Rode to the Code, Read Well, Visualizing and Verbalizing, Elements of Reading, Super QAR, Great Leaps, Reader's Theater, Triumphs Intervention Series, Quick Reads, Multi-Sequence Speed Drills, STARS, Recipe for Reading, Phonics for Reading, Intermediate Rewards	Reading Coach, Teachers	Observation and review of data by teacher, reading coach, and administrators. Review progress of Tier 1, 2, 3 interventions	Reading Comprehension Tests, Mini BATs, and selected assessments from the Progress Monitoring Plan Monitor progress within the given intervention.

<b>Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement</b>		<b>Objective Linked to Area of Improvement</b>		
Based on the 2009 FCAT Reading data, 78 % of Students who are Economically Disadvantaged scored at or above Level 3.		Increase the percent of Students who are Economically Disadvantaged scoring at or above a Level 3 from 78% to 81% on the 2010 FCAT Reading Test.		
	<b>Action Step</b>	<b>Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step</b>	<b>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step</b>	<b>Evaluation Tool</b>
1	Identified at risk students will be instructed utilizing one or a variety of the following strategies/materials: Wilson, Foundations, Rode to the Code, Read Well, Visualizing and Verbalizing, Elements of Reading, Super QAR, Great Leaps, Reader's Theater, Triumphs Intervention Series, Quick Reads, Multi-Sequence Speed Drills, STARS, Recipe for Reading, Phonics for Reading, Intermediate Rewards	Reading Coach, Teachers	Observation and review of data by teacher, reading coach, and administrators. Review progress of Tier 1, 2, 3 interventions	Reading Comprehension Tests, Mini BATs, and selected assessments from the Progress Monitoring Plan Monitor progress within the given intervention.

**Professional Development Aligned with Objective:**

Objective Addressed	Content/Topic	Facilitator	Target Date	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person Responsible for Monitoring
In grades 3-5, 94% of the students will achieve a level 3 or better for reading on the 2010 FCAT Reading Test.	Crosswalk of previous Reading Sunshine State Standards with newly revised 2010 Standards	Train the Trainer HRD Reading Coach	August 2009	Common planning minutes will be reviewed to ensure data trends are discussed and lesson plans are developed	Principal, Reading Coach

**For Schools with Grades 6-12, Describe the Plan to Ensure the Responsibility of Teaching Reading for Every Teacher**

N/A

**Budget:**

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	\$0.00
<b>Total: \$0.00</b>		
Technology		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
KidBiz3000 - Differentiated Reading for Gifted/High Achieving Students	General	\$8,000.00
<b>Total: \$8,000.00</b>		
Professional Development		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Visualizing and Verbalizing - Reading Intervention for Comprehension	Inservice	\$5,000.00
Balanced Literacy	Inservice	\$2,512.00
Intermediate Rewards - Multi-syllabic Word Strategies	Inservice	\$375.00
<b>Total: \$7,887.00</b>		
Other		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	\$0.00
<b>Total: \$0.00</b>		
<b>Final Total: \$15,887.00</b>		

*End of Reading Goal*

**Mathematics Goal**

**Needs Assessment:** Based on School Grade and Adequate Yearly Progress Data:

Did the total percent proficient increase or decrease? What is the percent change?

What clusters/strands, by grade level, showed decrease in proficiency?

Did all student subgroups meet AYP targets? If not, which subgroups did not meet the targets?

Did 50% or more of the lowest 25% make learning gains? What is the percent of the lowest 25% of students making learning gains?

Did 50% or more of the total number tested make learning gains? What is the percent of students making learning gains?

Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement		Objective Linked to Area of Improvement	
Based on the 2009 FCAT Math data, 78% of Students with Disabilities (SWD) scored at or above Level 3.		Increase the percent of SWD scoring at or above a Level 3 from 78% to 81% on the 2010 FCAT Math Test.	
Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step	Evaluation Tool

1	Students in K-5, including ESE, PMP, ESOL, and 504 will solve daily FCAT practice problems.	Administrators	Daily FCAT math practice problems will be completed as morning work	Progress of students on assessments
2	Students will increase the use of manipulatives to reinforce mathematics concepts.	Administrators	Team Meetings to discuss implementation of math centers and stations, and administration will ensure activities are implemented.	Progress of students on assessments
3	Identify and closely monitor the progress of the lowest 25 percentile consistently; revise instruction and intervention groups as indicated by student progress.	Administrators	Grade-level teams will review results of common assessment data every 6 weeks to determine progress toward benchmark.	Common assessments tied to Next Generation Math Standards administered weekly.

<b>Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement</b>		<b>Objective Linked to Area of Improvement</b>		
Based on the 2009 FCAT Math data, 85% of students in the lowest quartile scored at or above Level 3.		Increase the percent of lowest quartile students scoring at or above a Level 3 from 85% to 88% on the 2010 FCAT Math Test		
	<b>Action Step</b>	<b>Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step</b>	<b>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step</b>	<b>Evaluation Tool</b>
1	Tier 1: Determine core instructional needs by reviewing common assessment data for all students in each grade level within bottom quartile. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence-based instruction/interventions within the mathematics block.	Administrators	Grade-level teams will review results of common assessment data every 6 weeks to determine progress toward benchmark.	. Common assessments tied to Next Generation Math Standards administered weekly.
2	Tier 2: Plan supplemental instruction/ interventions for students not responding to core instruction. Focus of instruction is determined by review of common assessment data and will include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice. Supplemental instruction is provided in addition to core instruction.	Administrators	Grade level teams will review results of common assessment data every 4 weeks to determine progress toward benchmark.	Common assessments tied to Next Generation Math Standards administered weekly
3	Tier 3: Plan targeted intervention for students not responding to core plus supplemental instruction using problem-solving process. Interventions will be matched to individual student needs, be evidence-based, and provided in addition to core instruction.	RtI Team	Grade-level teams will review results of common assessment data bi-weekly to determine progress toward benchmark.	Common assessments tied to Next Generation Math Standards.

<b>Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement</b>		<b>Objective Linked to Area of Improvement</b>		
Based on the 2009 FCAT Math data, 82% of Students who are Economically Disadvantaged scored at or above Level 3.		Increase the percent of Students who are Economically Disadvantaged scoring at or above a Level 3 from 82% to 85% on the 2010 FCAT Math Test.		
	<b>Action Step</b>	<b>Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step</b>	<b>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step</b>	<b>Evaluation Tool</b>
1	Students in K-5, including ESE, PMP, ESOL, and 504 will solve daily FCAT practice problems.	Administrators	Daily FCAT math practice problems will be completed as morning work.	Progress of students on assessments
2	Students will increase the use of manipulatives to reinforce mathematics concepts.	Administrators	Team Meetings to discuss implementation of math centers and stations, and administration will ensure	Progress of students on assessments

			activities are implemented.	
3	Identify and closely monitor the progress of the lowest 25 percentile consistently; revise instruction and intervention groups as indicated by student progress.	Administrators	Maintain a record of strategies and interventions utilized with the lowest 25 percentile.	Increased achievement between assessments

**Professional Development Aligned with Objective:**

Objective Addressed	Content/Topic	Facilitator	Target Date	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Increase the percent of lowest quartile students scoring at or above a Level 3 from 85% to 88% on the 2010 FCAT Math Test	Crosswalk of previous Science Sunshine State Standards with newly revised 2010 Standards	Train the Trainer HRD Math cohort of teachers to train remaining staff members	August 2009 and ongoing	Common planning minutes will be reviewed to ensure data trends are discussed and lesson plans are developed	Administrators

**Budget:**

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	\$0.00
<b>Total: \$0.00</b>		
Technology		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	\$0.00
<b>Total: \$0.00</b>		
Professional Development		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Singapore Math	Inservice	\$5,525.00
<b>Total: \$5,525.00</b>		
Other		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	\$0.00
<b>Total: \$0.00</b>		
<b>Final Total: \$5,525.00</b>		

*End of Mathematics Goal*

## Science Goal

**Needs Assessment:** Based on School Grade Data:  
 Did the total percent proficient increase or was the percent proficient maintained?  
 What clusters/strands showed decrease in proficiency?

Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement		Objective Linked to Area of Improvement		
Based on 2009, FCAT Science data, 86% of students achieved a level 3 and above		Given instruction based on the Sunshine State Standards, 89% will score at or above the level 3 on the 2010 FCAT Science Assessment.		
Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step	Evaluation Tool	
1	Teachers	Grade-level teams will review results of common assessments every 6 weeks to determine progress in meeting benchmarks.	Science Mini BATs and/or assessments aligned to the Florida Science Standards	

	investigations.			
2	Students will utilize interactive activities / lessons presented on the Promethean Board.	Principal and Assistant Principal	Classroom Walk Through conducted by trained support team along with administrators	Classroom Walk Through conducted by trained support team along with administrators

**Professional Development Aligned with Objective:**

Objective Addressed	Content/Topic	Facilitator	Target Date	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Given instruction based on the Sunshine State Standards, 89% will score at or above the level 3 on the 2010 FCAT Science Assessment.	Crosswalk of previous Science Sunshine State Standards with the New Generation Science Standards	Train the Trainer HRD Science cohort of teachers to train remaining staff members	August 2009 and ongoing	Common planning minutes will be reviewed to ensure data trends are discussed and lesson plans are developed	Principal, Science Cohort

**Budget:**

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	\$0.00
<b>Total: \$0.00</b>		
Technology		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	\$0.00
<b>Total: \$0.00</b>		
Professional Development		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Training will occur during preplanning and/or planning days throughout the school year.	N/A	\$0.00
Science Journaling Grades 3-5 - High Yield Strategy Summarizing and Note Taking	N/A	\$0.00
<b>Total: \$0.00</b>		
Other		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	\$0.00
<b>Total: \$0.00</b>		
<b>Final Total: \$0.00</b>		

*End of Science Goal*

## Writing Goal

**Needs Assessment:** Based on School Grade Data:  
 Did the total percent proficient increase or was the percent proficient maintained?  
 What clusters/strands showed decrease in proficiency?

Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement		Objective Linked to Area of Improvement		
On the 2009 FCAT Writing Test, 90% of the students in level 4 or above.		On the 2010 administration of the FCAT Writing Test, 93% of the students will achieve a level 4 or above.		
Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step	Evaluation Tool	
1 Students will use the writing process daily; all writing will be dated and recorded in a journal, notebook, or work folder for	Administrators	A school wide consistent method of saving student work will be established.	Progress Monitoring Plan (Beginning, Mid-year, End Year) Writing Samples	

monitoring of growth across time			
----------------------------------	--	--	--

**Professional Development Aligned with Objective:**

Objective Addressed	Content/Topic	Facilitator	Target Date	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person Responsible for Monitoring
On the 2010 administration of the FCAT Writing Test, 93% of the students will achieve a level 4 or above.	Cross Grade Level Strategies Plan	Administration	September 2009	Classroom Walkthroughs	Administration

**Budget:**

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	\$0.00
		<b>Total: \$0.00</b>
Technology		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	\$0.00
		<b>Total: \$0.00</b>
Professional Development		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	\$0.00
		<b>Total: \$0.00</b>
Other		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	\$0.00
		<b>Total: \$0.00</b>
		<b>Final Total: \$0.00</b>

*End of Science Goal*

## Parent Involvement Goal

**Needs Assessment:** Based on information from School Grade and Adequate Yearly Progress Data:  
 Were parent involvement activities and strategies targeted to areas of academic need?  
 Based on information from surveys, evaluations, agendas, or sign-ins:  
 Was the percent of parent participation in school activities maintained or increased from the prior year?  
 Generally, what strategies or activities can be employed to increase parent involvement?

Based on the Needs Assessment, Identify Area(s) for Improvement		Objective Linked to Area of Improvement		
Based on survey data, stakeholders responded that there was a demonstrated need for a better understanding of the interpretation of criterion referenced tests and scores.		Parents will increase their knowledge of criterion referenced tests and scores.		
	Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring the Action Step	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Action Step	Evaluation Tool
1	Parents of students in grade 3-5 will have an opportunity to attend FCAT parent training	Administrators and Support Staff	Collect attendance sheets from the training	Training Evaluation Sheet
2	Parents of students in grade 1 and 2 will have an opportunity to attend district criterion referenced test parent training	Administrators and Support Staff	Collect attendance sheets from the training	Training Evaluation Sheet

3	Parents of Kindergarten students will have an opportunity to attend a reading workshop focusing on strategies for assisting their child at home.	Administrators and Support Staff	Collect attendance sheets from the training	Training Evaluation Sheet
---	--	----------------------------------	---	---------------------------

**Professional Development Aligned with Objective:**

Objective Addressed	Content/Topic	Facilitator	Target Date	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person Responsible for Monitoring
No data submitted					

**Budget:**

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	\$0.00
		<b>Total: \$0.00</b>
Technology		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	\$0.00
		<b>Total: \$0.00</b>
Professional Development		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	\$0.00
		<b>Total: \$0.00</b>
Other		
Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	\$0.00
		<b>Total: \$0.00</b>
		<b>Final Total: \$0.00</b>

End of **Parent Involvement** Goal

## Other Goals

No Other Goals were submitted for this school

## FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Goal	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			<b>Total: \$0.00</b>
Technology			
Goal	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	KidBiz3000 - Differentiated Reading for Gifted/High Achieving Students	General	\$8,000.00
			<b>Total: \$8,000.00</b>
Professional Development			
Goal	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Visualizing and Verbalizing - Reading Intervention for Comprehension	Inservice	\$5,000.00
Reading	Balanced Literacy	Inservice	\$2,512.00
Reading	Intermediate Rewards - Multi-syllabic Word Strategies	Inservice	\$375.00
Mathematics	Singapore Math	Inservice	\$5,525.00
Science	Training will occur during preplanning and/or planning days throughout the school year.	N/A	\$0.00
Science	Science Journaling Grades 3-5 - High Yield Strategy Summarizing and Note Taking	N/A	\$0.00
			<b>Total: \$13,412.00</b>
Other			
Goal	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			<b>Total: \$0.00</b>
			<b>Final Total: \$21,412.00</b>

## Differentiated Accountability

### School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

Intervene
  Correct II
  Prevent II
  Correct I
  Prevent I
  NA

**No Attached school's Differentiated Accountability Checklist of Compliance**

## 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
Student materials and supplies for instruction	2845

### Describe the Activities of the School Advisory Council for the Upcoming Year

The School Advisory Council facilitates the development, monitors the implementation, and evaluates the effectiveness of the School Improvement Plan (SIP). The Council will review and ratify the SAC By Laws.

## SAC Members

### Members

- 1) JoEllen Scott, Principal
- 2) Denise Lowe, SAC Chair
- 3) Debra Moran, Teacher
- 4) Marcea Cazal, Business Member
- 5) Nikita Turk, Business Member
- 6) Collen Gulla, Business Member
- 7) Josh Buckley, Business Member
- 8) Marc Childers, Business Member
- 9) Jack Brennan, Parent
- 10) Patricia Gomez, Parent
- 11) Garnett Byrd, Parent
- 12) Malease Berg, Parent
- 13) Alexandria Isreal, Parent
- 14) Patricia Robinson, School Support Personnel
- 15) Tim Krajewski, Union Steward

# AYP DATA

2008-2009 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Report - Page 2														Broward BAYVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 0641																
Number of students enrolled in the grades tested: <a href="#">Click here to see Number of students in each group</a>														Read: 318 Math: 318		2008-2009 School Grade <sup>1</sup> : A		Did the School make Adequate Yearly Progress?		YES										
This section shows the percent tested and performance for each group used to determine AYP (Parts a and c <sup>2</sup> ).														This section shows the improvement for each group used to determine AYP via safe harbor (Part b <sup>2</sup> ).						This section shows the percent of students "on track" to be proficient used to determine AYP via the growth model.										
Group	Reading Tested 95% of the students?		Math Tested 95% of the students?		65% scoring at or above grade level in Reading?		68% scoring at or above grade level in Math?		Improved performance in Writing by 1%?			Increased Graduation Rate <sup>3</sup> by 1%?			Percent of Students below grade level in Reading		Safe Harbor Reading		Percent of Students below grade level in Math		Safe Harbor Math		% of students on track to be proficient in reading		Growth model reading		% of students on track to be proficient in math		Growth model math	
	2009	Y/N	2009	Y/N	2009	Y/N	2009	Y/N	2008	2009	Y/N	2007	2008	Y/N	2008	2009	2008	Y/N	2008	2009	2008	Y/N	2009	Y/N	2009	Y/N	2009	Y/N	2009	Y/N
TOTAL <sup>4</sup>	100	Y	100	Y	89	Y	91	Y			Y				NA	8	11	NA			9	NA	88	NA	88	NA	86	NA		
WHITE	100	Y	100	Y	92	Y		Y			Y				NA	6	8	NA				NA	90	NA	90	NA				
BLACK		NA		NA		NA		NA			NA				NA			NA				NA								
HISPANIC	100	Y	100	Y		NA		NA			NA				NA			NA				NA								
ASIAN		NA		NA		NA		NA			NA				NA			NA				NA								
AMERICAN INDIAN		NA		NA		NA		NA			NA				NA			NA				NA								
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	99	Y	99	Y	78	Y	82	Y			NA				NA		22	NA			18	NA	80	NA	74	NA				
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS		NA		NA		NA		NA			NA				NA			NA				NA								
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	100	Y	100	Y	75	Y	78	Y			NA				NA	17	25	NA	12	22	NA	NA	81	NA	77	NA				

2007-2008 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Report - Page 2														Broward BAYVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 0641																
Number of students enrolled in the grades tested: <a href="#">Click here to see Number of students in each group</a>														Read: 266 Math: 266		2007-2008 School Grade <sup>1</sup> : A		Did the School make Adequate Yearly Progress?		YES										
This section shows the percent tested and performance for each group used to determine AYP (Parts a and c <sup>2</sup> ).														This section shows the improvement for each group used to determine AYP via safe harbor (Part b <sup>2</sup> ).						This section shows the percent of students "on track" to be proficient used to determine AYP via the growth model.										
Group	Reading Tested 95% of the students?		Math Tested 95% of the students?		58% scoring at or above grade level in Reading?		62% scoring at or above grade level in Math?		Improved performance in Writing by 1%?			Increased Graduation Rate <sup>3</sup> by 1%?			Percent of Students below grade level in Reading		Safe Harbor Reading		Percent of Students below grade level in Math		Safe Harbor Math		% of students on track to be proficient in reading		Growth model reading		% of students on track to be proficient in math		Growth model math	
	2008	Y/N	2008	Y/N	2008	Y/N	2008	Y/N	2007	2008	Y/N	2006	2007	Y/N	2007	2008	2007	Y/N	2007	2008	2007	Y/N	2008	Y/N	2008	Y/N	2008	Y/N	2008	Y/N
TOTAL <sup>4</sup>	100	Y	100	Y	92	Y		Y			Y				NA	8		NA				NA	80	NA	87	NA				
WHITE	100	Y	100	Y	94	Y		Y			Y				NA	6		NA				NA	81	NA	88	NA				
BLACK		NA		NA		NA		NA			NA				NA			NA				NA								
HISPANIC		NA		NA		NA		NA			NA				NA			NA				NA								
ASIAN		NA		NA		NA		NA			NA				NA			NA				NA								
AMERICAN INDIAN		NA		NA		NA		NA			NA				NA			NA				NA								
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED	100	Y	100	Y		NA		NA			NA				NA			NA				NA								
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS		NA		NA		NA		NA			NA				NA			NA				NA								
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	100	Y	100	Y	83	Y	88	Y			NA				NA	17		NA	10	12	NA	NA	74	NA	80	NA				

2006-2007 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Report - Page 2														Broward BAYVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 0641																
Number of students enrolled in the grades tested: <a href="#">Click here to see Number of students in each group</a>														Read: 269 Math: 269		2006-2007 School Grade <sup>1</sup> : A		Did the School make Adequate Yearly Progress?		YES										
This section shows the percent tested and performance for each group used to determine AYP (Parts a and c <sup>2</sup> ).														This section shows the improvement for each group used to determine AYP via safe harbor (Part b <sup>2</sup> ).						This section shows the percent of students "on track" to be proficient used to determine AYP via the growth model.										
Group	Reading Tested 95% of the students?		Math Tested 95% of the students?		51% scoring at or above grade level in Reading?		56% scoring at or above grade level in Math?		Improved performance in Writing by 1%?			Increased Graduation Rate <sup>3</sup> by 1%?			Percent of Students below grade level in Reading		Safe Harbor Reading		Percent of Students below grade level in Math		Safe Harbor Math		% of students on track to be proficient in reading		Growth model reading		% of students on track to be proficient in math		Growth model math	
	2007	Y/N	2007	Y/N	2007	Y/N	2007	Y/N	2006	2007	Y/N	2005	2006	Y/N	2006	2007	2006	Y/N	2006	2007	2006	Y/N	2007	Y/N	2007	Y/N	2007	Y/N	2007	Y/N
TOTAL <sup>4</sup>	100	Y	100	Y		Y		Y			Y				NA	10		NA	8			NA	90	NA	92	NA				
WHITE	100	Y	100	Y		Y		Y			Y				NA	8		NA	6			NA	90	NA	91	NA				
BLACK		NA		NA		NA		NA			NA				NA			NA				NA								
HISPANIC		NA		NA		NA		NA			NA				NA			NA				NA								
ASIAN		NA		NA		NA		NA			NA				NA			NA				NA								
AMERICAN INDIAN		NA		NA		NA		NA			NA				NA			NA				NA								
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED		NA		NA		NA		NA			NA				NA			NA				NA								
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS		NA		NA		NA		NA			NA				NA			NA				NA								
STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES	100	Y	100	Y		Y	90	Y			NA				NA			NA	17	10	NA	NA	92	NA	94	NA				

## SCHOOL GRADE DATA

Broward School District BAYVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2008-2009						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
<b>% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)</b>	92%	94%	97%	86%	369	<b>Writing and Science:</b> Takes into account the % scoring 3.5 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.
<b>% of Students Making Learning Gains</b>	79%	74%			153	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Improve FCAT Levels</li> <li>● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5</li> <li>● Improve more than one year within Level</li> </ul>

						1 or 2
<b>Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?</b>	81% (YES)	85% (YES)			166	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.
Points Earned					688	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
<b>School Grade</b>					<b>A</b>	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

<b>Broward School District BAYVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2007-2008</b>						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
<b>% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)</b>	94%	96%	97%	84%	371	<b>Writing and Science:</b> Takes into account the % scoring 3.5 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.
<b>% of Students Making Learning Gains</b>	71%	83%			154	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Improve FCAT Levels</li> <li>● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5</li> <li>● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2</li> </ul>
<b>Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?</b>	88% (YES)	81% (YES)			169	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.
Points Earned					694	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
<b>School Grade</b>					<b>A</b>	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

<b>Broward School District BAYVIEW ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2006-2007</b>						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
<b>% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)</b>	98%	99%	100%	92%	389	<b>Writing and Science:</b> Takes into account the % scoring 3.5 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.
<b>% of Students Making Learning Gains</b>	82%	81%			163	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Improve FCAT Levels</li> <li>● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5</li> <li>● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2</li> </ul>
<b>Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?</b>	92% (YES)	91% (YES)			183	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.
Points Earned					735	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
<b>School Grade</b>					<b>A</b>	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested