FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: SANDPIPER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Broward

Principal: Deloris Johnson

SAC Chair: Christian Godoy

Superintendent: Robert Runcie

Date of School Board Approval: December 4, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/24/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Dr. Deloris M. Johnson	BS-Speech Pathology, MS-Diagnostic Teaching of MR, Ed.D- Educational Leadership	13	18	2008-2009 – A – Did Not Meet AYP Reading: AYP:71% Math: AYP:76% 2009-2010 - B - Did Not Meet AYP Reading: AYP:73% Learning Gains:70% Math: AYP:72% Learning Gains: 54% 2010-2011 - A - Did Not Meet AYP Reading: AYP:69% Learning Gains: 64% Math: AYP:80% Learning Gains: 65%
					2008-2009 – A – Did Not Meet AYP Reading: AYP:71% Math: AYP:76% 2009-2010 - B - Did Not Meet AYP

| Assis Principal | John Fossas | BS, MS Elem. Ed. Educational Leadership | 4 | 4 | Reading: AYP: 73%
Learning Gains: 70%
Math: AYP: 72%
Learning Gains: 54%

2010-2011 - A - Did Not Meet AYP
Reading: AYP: 69%
Learning Gains: 64%
Math: AYP: 80%
Learning Gains: 65% |

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Diana Loe	MS Elem. Ed Reading Certification Elem. Ed Certification	13	13	2008-2009 – A – Did Not Meet AYP Reading: AYP: 71% Math: AYP: 76% 2009-2010 - B - Did Not Meet AYP Reading: AYP: 73% Learning Gains: 70% Math: AYP: 72% Learning Gains: 54% 2010-2011 - A - Did Not Meet AYP Reading: AYP: 69% Learning Gains: 64% Math: AYP: 80% Learning Gains: 65%

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	NESS	Kris Shaffer	N/A	Continuous
2	Teacher Buddies	John Fossas	N/A	Continuous
3	Teacher Planning Week Orientation	John Fossas	N/A	Only takes place once a year
4	New Teacher Academy	John Fossas	N/A	Only takes place once a year

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).
*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

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

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
50	0.0%(0)	2.0%(1)	34.0%(17)	44.0%(22)	50.0%(25)	80.0%(40)	12.0%(6)	4.0%(2)	66.0%(33)

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program/plan by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

Mentor Name	Mentee Assigned	Rationale for Pairing	Planned Mentoring Activities
Kris Shaffer	Karen Boyd	New to 1st Grade	Observations and Feedback
Mary Harman	Susan Green	New to 1st Grade	Observations and feedback

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 funds provide two additional teachers to assist students, particularly low performing students.
Staff Development funds are used to develop a comprehensive professional training program to improve delivery of instruction through a variety of workshops designed to move teachers to mastery and improve student achievement.
Parental Involvement Funds are utilized to fund monthly academic parent nights that provide parents with new skills to support student learning at home. Improving the frequency and quality of family participation and increasing family literacy are also goals of our parental involvement component. Monies are used to purchase food, supplies/materials and provide stipends for teacher presenters. Extended learning opportunities are supported with district Title I funds.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

N/A

Title I, Part D

N/A

Title II

Teachers participate in district-developed workshops in differentiated instruction and academic standards training. Summer leadership and curriculum workshops are supported with district Title I funds.

Title III

ELL students receive reading and developmental language arts instruction by a certified ESOL teacher. The Multicultural department provides ESOL instructional materials to be used with ELL students.

Title X- Homeless

Teachers and staff members are responsible for helping to identify homeless students and referring them to the Homeless Education
Program offered by the district. The purpose of the Homeless Education Program is to identify homeless students, remove barriers to their education, including school enrollment, provide them with supplemental academic and counseling case management services as
well as linkages to their school social worker while maintaining school as the students stable environment.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

> The SAI Funds are used for teacher salaries.

Violence Prevention Programs

> Gang Resistance and Drug Education will be integrated into the fifth grade curriculum.

Nutrition Programs

> Commit to be Fit will be integrated into the third and fourth grade curriculum.

Housing Programs

> N/A

Head Start

> N/A

Adult Education

> N/A

Career and Technical Education

> N/A

Job Training

> N/A

Other

> N/A

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

> *ESE Specialist - monitors the IEP services to students, monitors academic progress of inclusion and resource room students, coordinates ESE services.
> *Guidance Counselor - facilitates classroom guidance, small group counseling, 504 Plans, and assists families with outside resources.
> *Reading Coach - provides expertise on the reading process and interventions to promote student achievement, coaches classroom teachers, monitors the implementation of the school-wide reading program.
> *Administration - facilitates the RTI team, conducts weekly meetings, monitors the implementation of the curriculum, approves
>
> necessary resources to achieve positive learning gains for all students, conducts data chats with teachers regarding student progress.
> *School Psychologist - tests students, consults with parents, reviews and suggests interventions to assist students.
> *School Social Worker - facilitates small groups for students with issues related to home situations and works with parents to provide outside resources.

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

> *The RTI/Support Team meets weekly to discuss the overall process of supporting students.
> *Students may be identified based on teacher conversations, student data, behavior referrals, or parent concerns.
> *Each/any member of the RTI Leadership Team may function as a case manager to work with teachers through the process.
> of intervention, documenting the progress, and then moving forward to an RTI meeting.
> *The Team focus is to develop a broad understanding of students in the school who are in need of support, what type of support is needed, documenting the progress, and suggesting additional resources as needed.
> *The ESE Specialist and School Psychologist address concerns and determine the need for possible additional services.
> *The Social Worker and Guidance Counselor work with parents and teachers for outside resources and counseling where the
>
> need is indicated.

*The Reading Coach analyzes data and the indicators related to academic concerns, and administration reviews both the academic and behavioral issues as needed.
*Students who are in the lowest 25%,and Level 1&2 in reading and math are brought to the RTI Team.
*Interventions are recommended from the struggling reading and math charts and implemented by the teacher .
*Data is collected to see if there are improvements(Probes that are aligned with the interventions, Pre/Post assessments, weekly assessments, DAR, and Easy CBM)

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

The school-based leadership team provides data related to student needs, as well as strategies and action steps that could promote student learning gains to the School Advisory Council to be incorporated into the School Improvement Plan related to reading, writing, math and science. Specific strategies are provided by the ESE Specialist in regard to ESE students for each SIP objective.

Each member of the Support Team is responsible to monitor the implementation of the specific action steps in each SIP objective to check for progress. Weekly meetings are held to discuss concerns and develop solutions to the problems related to specific content areas.

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

The RtI analyzes the data from the intervention presented by the classroom teacher at each Tier level. The data includes classroom assessments,standardized test scores and benchmark assessments. Teachers and case workers monitor and track items such as classroom performance, grades, participation charts, and specific behavior plans that have been implemented in the classroom. This information is then gathered and charted for evaluation of goals met or trends that may occur.
The team monitors behavior of students in the RtI process by classroom visits, reviewing frequency charts/graphs created by the classroom teacher and targeting specific behavior needs.
Attendance is monitored by classroom teachers, who in turn makes the first parent contact.
Chronic tardies and continued absences are reported to the RtI team and the guidance counselor and school social worker intervenes.
Academic data for each subject area is monitored at the weekly meetings. The team looks at FCAT scores, benchmark assessments, classroom assessments, work samples and conference forms in order to determine specific interventions that will improve academic performance.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The RTI Leadership team will implement staff training at the beginning of the 2012-13 school year. The training will include a multimedia presentation explaining the RTI process including teacher's role and explanations of interventions and data collection, etc. Teachers will also view county videos. The second part of the training will include break out sessions that the teacher will be involved in cooperative learning groups. The groups will be presented a case study where they will have to develop interventions at Tier 1, Tier 2,and Tier 3. Case studies will include learning difficulties and behavioral concerns. Each team will present their case study to the group with the appropriate interventions at each Tier level.
Additional training sessions will be conducted throughout the year in order to ensure that the teachers have an understanding of the data and is able to disaggregate the data and use it to plan the adequate student interventions to increase student achievement.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

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

Principal – Deloris Johnson Assistant Principal- Mr. John Fossas, School Psychologist- Dr. Julie Franzese, ESE Specialist-Mrs. Allyson Marino, Reading Coach- Mrs. Diana Loe, SLP- Mrs. Vivian Noble Teachers: K-Suzanne Matlin 1-Mary Ann Harman 2-Jessica Steinlauf 3-Holly Walkes 4-Kris Shaffer 5-Christian Godoy ESE-Vivian Noble

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

The Literacy Leadership Team does the following:

• Develops and evaluates curriculum expectations on a monthly basis.
• Provides information on effective teaching methods
• Establishes collegial learning through peer coaching, networking and mentoring, and encourages staff development to assist in the implementation of new programs and practices
• Identifies problems, needs, solutions, and resources and provides continuous evaluation and analysis of practice to meet grade level expectations
• The team is proactive in seeking and providing resources for assistance
• Encourages the practice and implementation of new teaching strategies
• Facilitates communication among team members as they implement new instructional strategies and address any systemic change.

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

• Continuation of the above listed functions as it pertains to new instructional strategies and to monitor growth in grade level standards and expectations
• Monitor grade level transitions via vertical conversations
• Monitor growth of students falling in the lowest 30%

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

During the month of May, a Kindergarten Round-Up is held to allow surrounding preschools to tour the facility and become acquainted with the Kindergarten Program. Families receive invitations via Parent Link for the school's Kindergarten Orientation held prior to the first day of school to allow for a smooth transition into the Kindergarten Program.

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

For schools with Grades 6-12, describe the plan to ensure that teaching reading strategies is the responsibility of every teacher.

N/A

*High Schools Only

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

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

N/A

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

N/A

Postsecondary Transition

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the <u>High School Feedback Report</u>

N/A

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	An area of concern for students in grades 3-5 was performance on informational text passages and text complexity.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
58 % (170) of students scored level 3, 4, or 5	We anticipate that 63% of students will score levels 3, 4, or 5.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students have a limited understanding of non-fiction vocabulary.	Students will read and discuss non-fiction weekly through teacher directed and cooperative group activities to increase depth of knowledge.	Reading Teacher	Tests will be evaluated for proficiency and reviewed with students.	Time for Kids/Scholastic News/Studies Weekly Weekly Tests
2	Lack of proficiency in grade level reading reading comprehension.	Interventions will be used from the struggling reader's chart as needed.	Reading coach, Administration, Classroom Teachers	RTI and data chats.	BAT Testing and FCAT. McMillin and McGraw/Hill core program assessments will be used to determine effectiveness.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	In grades 3-5, 41 % of students will score at a level 4 or 5 on the 2012 Reading FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
38% (124)	41% (133)

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	Maintaining motivation and interest in the curriculum.	Student centered lessons and inquiry based student activities that involves higher order thinking and extension activities.	Classroom Teacher, Administration	Student and teacher observations.	BAT, FCAT

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

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

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	In grades 3-5, 68 % of students will make learning gains in reading on the 2012 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

64% (162)	68% (170)

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	Decreased time spent on reading instruction.	Increase use of reading centers and integrating reading strategies throughout the curriculum.	Classroom Teachers	Monitor student participation in centers, through teacher created checklists.	Teacher observation
2	Organizing and interpreting story elements.	Graphic organizers during small group instruction.	Reading Teacher	Completing graphic organizers in small group.	Student made organizers
3	Students have a limited vocabulary.	Expose students to a variety of fiction and nonfiction literature to build background knowledge.	Reading Teacher	Using Mini-BAT and weekly reading assessments.	Mini-BAT, BAT, FCAT, Weekly 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:

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	In grades 3-5, 60 % of students in the lowest 25th percentile will make learning gains in reading on the 2012-2013 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
54% (34)	60% (38)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
			Person or	Process Used to

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of Differentiated Instruction	Differentiating instruction through the use of materials from the Struggling readers Chart (Rewards, Great Leaps, Phonics for Reading & Wilson as needed) outside of the adopted basal.	Classroom Teachers	Weekly Triumphs Intervention Assessments, Teacher Observation, Weekly FCAT Assessments.	Mini BAT and BAT 1 and 2
2	Lack of parental involvement.	Family Literacy Night	Administration	Sign-In Sheet	BAT 1-2, FCAT
3	Lack of fluency and sustainability.	Using county approved intervention programs such as Quickreads, Phonics for Reading, and Triumphs.	Classroom Teacher, Reading Coach	RTI, Fluency Assessments	BAT 1-2, FCAT, Quarterly Fluency Assessments

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal # 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	On the 2012 FCAT the following subgroups will make AYP: White 77%, Black 69%, Hispanic 69%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White 74%(72), Black 65%(105), Hispanic 65%(63), Asian 92%(12), American Indian 100% (1)	White 77% (75), Black 69%(112), Hispanic 69%(67), Asian Maintain/Improve, American Indian Maintain/Improve

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	Comprehension Skills	Students will be double-dosed in small groups	Reading Teacher	Analysis of Weekly Assessments, Intervention Assessments	BAT and Weekly Reading Tests
2	Students lack strategies to determine the meaning of words. (Context Clues)	Build background knowledge through Treasures reading program vocabulary instruction.	Reading Teacher	Analysis of Weekly Assessments and Intervention Assesmsents.	BAT and Weekly Reading Tests

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making

	satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	In grades 3-5, 63 % of students will make AYP on the 2012 Reading FCAT.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
58% (18)	63% (20)

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Word Recognition</td><td>Students will use language master, high frequency flash cards, and sight word flash cards to build automaticity.</td><td>Reading Teacher</td><td>Quarterly Fluency Assessments</td><td>Treasures Fluency Assessment</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>Computer Skills</td><td>Students will use compass learning odyssey to gain fluency and comprehension skills.</td><td>Reading Teacher</td><td>Compass Odyssey Learning Quizzes</td><td>FCAT, BAT, Weekly Assessments</td></tr>
</table>

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	In grades 3-5, 51 % of students will make AYP on the 2012 Reading FCAT.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
45% (37)	51% (42)

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Lack of fluency and sustainability.</td><td>Using county approved intervention programs such as Quickreads, Phonics for Reading, and Triumphs.</td><td>Administration, Reading Coach, Classroom Teacher</td><td>RTI, Data Chats, Diagnostic Assessments (DAR)</td><td>BAT, Mini BATs, Diagnostic Assessments (DAR), FCAT</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>Lack of parental involvement in after school trainings.</td><td>Provide learning tips, materials, and online sources for parents that can be done at home.</td><td>Assistant Principal</td><td>Parent Surveys</td><td>Weekly Tests, Homework Assignments</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>Lack of Differentiated Instruction</td><td>Differentiating instruction through the use of materials from the Struggling readers Chart (Rewards, Great Leaps, Phonics for Reading & Wilson as needed) outside of the adopted basal.</td><td>Classroom Teachers</td><td>Weekly Basal Tests and Data Chats</td><td>Mini BATs, BAT 1-2</td></tr>
</table>

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

| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.

Reading Goal #5E:	In grades 3-5, 69 % of students will make AYP on the 2012 Reading FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
65% (142)	69% (151)

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of parental involvement in after school trainings.	Provide learning tips, materials, and online sources for parents that can be done at home.	Assistant Principal	Parent Surveys and Sign In Sheets	Weekly Tests, Homework Assignments
2	Students will lack the ability to use various comprehension strategies to understand a variety of nonfiction and fiction texts.	Students will be double-dosed in small groups	Reading Teacher	Analysis of Weekly Assessments	Weekly Treasures Assessments, BAT 1-2, FCAT
3	Grade level Vocabulary skills and knowledge are lacking.	Expose students to a variety of fiction and non fiction text, while exposing them to various strategies for determining new word meanings.	Reading Teacher	Analysis of Weekly Assessments	Weekly Assessments, BAT 1-2, FCAT

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
The PLC focus will be unwrapping the Common Core State Standards.	K-5 Reading, Math, Writing, Science, and Social Studies.	Administration and K-5 team leaders.	PLCs will be done at each grade level.	PLC meetings will be held bimonthly.	Monitoring will be done via meeting sign-in, agenda, and minutes.	Administration

Reading Budget:

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $0.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:	
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	An area of concern for students in grades 3-5 was performance on base ten and fractions.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
61% (180) of students scored levels 3, 4, or 5.	We anticipate 65% of students to score levels 3,4, or 5 on FCAT.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Lack of prerequisite knowledge/skills needed to be successful.</td><td>Utilization of GO Math Intervention and the targeting of specific weaknesses.</td><td>Administration and Teachers</td><td>Analyzing Weekly Assessments and Determining what skills need more intervention.</td><td>Weekly Assessments, BAT 1-2, Mini BATs</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>Lack of parental support.</td><td>Monthly Newsletter that includes tips and strategies for parents to use at home.</td><td>Assistant Principal</td><td>Team Meetings to discuss content.</td><td>Classroom Assessments</td></tr>
</table>

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

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

<table>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="5" align="center">No Data Submitted</td></tr>
</table>

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	In grades 3-5, 48 % of students will score at a level 4 or 5 above on the math 2012 FCAT.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
46% (149)	48% (156)

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	Maintaining motivation and interest in the curriculum.	Student centered lessons and inquiry based student activities that involves higher order thinking and extension activities.	Classroom Teachers, Administration	Student and teacher observations	GO Math Assessments, BAT, FCAT.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	In grades 3-5, 58% of students will make learning gains on the math 2012-2013 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
54 % (172)of students scored levels 3, 4, or 5.	We anticipate 58% (172) of students to score levels 3, 4,or 5.

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Inconsistent implementation of small group instruction during math.	Use Go Math's assessment materials to create flexible groups that are remedial.	Assistant Principal	Classroom Walkthroughs	GO Math Assessments, Mini BATs, Data Chats
2	Students are deficient in previous math standards.	Small Group Remedial Instruction	Assistant Principal	Analyzing improvements in group work.	Mini-BAT Scores

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	In grades 3-5, 48 % of students in the lowest 25th percentile will make learning gains on the math 2012-2013 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
46%(44)of students scored levels 3, 4, or 5 on FCAT.	We anticipate 48% (46)of students will score levels 3, 4, or 5 on FCAT.

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	Inconsistent implementation of small group instruction during math.	Use Go Math's assessment materials to create flexible groups that are remedial.	Administration and Classroom Teacher	Classroom Walkthroughs	GO Math Assessments, BAT 1 and 2, Mini BAT's
2	Computer Skills	Students will use compass learning odyssey to make gains in the math skills they are lacking.	Math Teacher	Pre/Post Compass Assessments	Pre/Post Compass Assessments, FCAT, BAT 1-2
3	Understanding basic math operations	Teachers and students will use manipulatives to solve math problems.	Math Teacher	Teacher Observation	GO Math Assessments, BAT 1 and 2, Mini BAT's

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Elementary School Mathematics Goal # 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	In grades 3-5, 79% of students that are of white descent will make adequately yearly progress on the 2012 Math FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White 76%(74), Black 77%(124), Hispanic 86%(83), Asian 100%(13), American Indian 100%(1)	White 79%(77) Black 80%(130), Hispanic 87%(84), Asian 100%(13), American Indian 100%(1)

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	Inconsistent implementation of small group instruction during math.	Use Go Math's assessment materials to create flexible groups that are remedial.	Classroom Teachers	Classroom Walkthroughs	Go Math Asseessments, BAT 1 and 2, MiniBATs

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
84% (26)	86% (27)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	In grades 3-5, 65% of SWD students will make AYP on the 2012 Reading FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
61% (51)	65% (54)

	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 deficient in previous math standards.	Small Group Remedial Instruction	Math Teacher	Analyzing improvements in group work.	Weekly Assessments, BAT 1-2, Mini BATs
2	Lack of prerequisite knowledge/skills needed to be successful.	Utilization of GO Math Intervention and the targeting of specific weaknesses.	Math Teacher	Analyzing Weekly Assessments and Determining what skills need more intervention.	Weekly Assessments, BAT 1-2, Mini BATs
3	Lack of parental support.	Monthly Newsletter that includes tips and strategies for parents to use at home.	Assistant Principal	Team Meetings to discuss content.	Weekly Assessments, BAT 1-2, Mini BATs

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
78% (170)	81% (177)

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

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
The PLC focus will be unwrapping the Common Core State Standards.	K-5 Reading, Math, Writing, Science, and Social Studies.	Administration and K-5 team leaders.	PLCs will be done at each grade level.	PLCs will be done bimonthly.	Monitoring will be done via meeting sign-in, agenda, and minutes	Administration

Mathematics Budget:

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

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	In grade 5, 43% of students scored at a level 3 or higher on the 2012 Science FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
43% (107)of students scored levels 3,4,or 5.	We anticipate 48% of students will score levels 3, 4, or 5.
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

1	Insufficient knowledge of science vocabulary.	Implementation/Integration of science vocabulary into the daily curriculum through the use of interactive word walls and student notebooks.	Administration	Committee Meetings, Discussion of Student Data	Florida Science Fusion Science Series Assessments and/or BEEP Lesson and IFC Assessments
2	Lack of background Knowledge	Utilization of Discovery Education, FL Science Fusion Digital Lessons, FCAT Explorer, FL Achieves,	Administration	Science Journal	Evaluation of Science Journal using a rubric.

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	In grade 5, 22% of students scored at a level 4 or 5 on the 2012 Science FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
17% (19)	22% (25)

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	Challenging students in the areas of science concepts and processes.	Students will apply concepts and processes in through enrichment activities including: Hands on Inquiry Based Lessons and Investigations.	Administration	Evaluation of Science Notebook	Mini BATs, Science Journal Rubric

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define

areas in need of improvement for the following group:

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

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
The PLC focus will be unwrapping the Common Core State Standards.	K-5 Reading, Math, Writing, Science, and Social Studies.	Administration and K-5 team leaders.	PLCs will be done at each grade level.	PLCs will be done bimonthly.	Monitoring will be done via meeting sign-in, agenda, and minutes.	Administration
Science instructional materials professional development.	Grade 5	Administration	5th grade teachers	September 18	Presentation of training materials and information to the team.	Administration

Science Budget:

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

No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	In grade 4, 74% of students scored a level 3.0 or higher on the 2012 FCAT Writes.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
74% (101) of students scored levels 3,4, or 5.	We anticipate 78% of students will score levels 3,4, or 5.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack of familiarity with all six traits.	Students will be pulled in small groups according to which trait they are struggling with.	Classroom Teachers, Administration	Classroom Walkthroughs on a monthly basis that are focused on the IFC, Data Chats after Walkthrough	Monthly Writing Prompts
2	Lack of background knowledge and exposure to literature.	Teachers will utilize trade books to model the six traits of effective writers.	Classroom Teachers	Classroom Walkthroughs on a monthly basis that are focused on the IFC, Data Chats after Walkthrough	Monthly Writing Prompts

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
The PLC focus will be unwrapping the Common Core State Standards.	K-5 Reading, Math, Writing, Science, and Social Studies.	Administration and K-5 team leaders.	PLCs will be done at each grade level.	PLCs will be done bimonthly.	Monitoring will be done via meeting sign-in, agenda, and minutes.	Administration

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:

1. Attendance	
Attendance Goal #1:	In the 2011-2012 school year average daily attendance will increase to 96%.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
95%	96%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
252	243
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
142	132

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	Parents dropping off their students late.	Students who arrive to school on time will be recognized on morning announcements through a drawing.	Administration	Attendance Reports Monitored Weekly	Data Warehouse

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00

Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00

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

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:	In the 2012 school year the suspension rate will drop by 5%.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
43	41
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
26	25
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
3	2
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
3	2

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	Implementation of school wide discipline plan	Teachers will be assisted with classroom management strategies through a PLC.	Assistant Principal, Classroom Teachers	Review Referrals Quarterly	Discipline Management System

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	By 2013, our overall yearly PTA attendance will increase to 80%.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:

70% (148)	80% (168)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00

Technology

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00

Professional Development

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00

Other

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
				Grand Total: $0.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

jn Priority	jn Focus	jn Prevent	jn NA

Are you a reward school: jn Yes jn No

A reward school is any school that improves their letter grade or any school graded A.

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/14/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

The majority of the SAC members are not employed by the school district. The SAC is composed of the principal and an appropriately balanced number of teachers, education support employees, students (for middle and high school only), parents, and other business and community citizens who are representative of the ethnic, racial, and economic community served by the school. Please verify the statement above by selecting "Yes" or "No" below.

✓ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

SAC will review, discuss, and analyze school data in order to collaborate on strategies for improving areas of weakness.
The committee will review the School Improvement Plan(SIP) to recommend further strategies as well as help monitor the strategies in place.

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Broward School District
SANDPIPER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	76%	86%	92%	47%	301	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	64%	65%			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?	53% (YES)	71% (YES)			124	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					554	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Broward School District
SANDPIPER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	78%	76%	90%	53%	297	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	70%	54%			124	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?	67% (YES)	41% (NO)			108	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					529	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested