FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: HAWKES BLUFF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Broward

Principal: Melinda Cunningham

SAC Chair: Kathleen Wicker

Superintendent: Robert Runcie

Date of School Board Approval: December 4, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/30/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

School Grades Trend Data

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)
Assis Principal	Melinda Cunningham, Principal	Degrees •MS Elementary Ed •BS Elementary Ed Certification •Elementary Ed •Ed Leadership •ESOL Endorsement	12	12	• 92 % Of students met high standards in reading (0%) • 93% Of students met high standards in math (0%) • 96% Of students met high standards in writing (0%) • 70% Of students met high standards in science (-14%) • 67% Of students made learning gains in reading (-1%) • 72% Of students made learning gains in math (+9%) • 57% Of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading (-11%) • 73% Of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math (+10) • 620 Total Points Earned (-7) 2011-2012 School Grade-A 2010-2011 School Grade=A AYP Not Met 2009-2010 School Grade=A AYP Not Met 2008-2009 School Grade= A

					AYP Met 2007-2008 School Grade=A AYP Meet
Assis Principal	Lisa George, Assistant Principal	Degrees •MS Ed Leadership •BA Early Childhood Certifications •Primary Education •Ed Leadership •ESOL Endorsement	1	11	• 59 % Of students met high standards in reading • 59% Of students met high standards in math • 84% Of students met high standards in writing • 15% Of students met high standards in science • 57% Of students made learning gains in reading • 62% Of students made learning gains in math • 51% Of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading • 65% Of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math 2009-2010 School Grade=C AYP Not Met 2008-2009 School Grade= C AYP Met 2007-2008 School Grade=C AYP Meet
Principal					

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	Maria LeBoeuf	•MS Reading •BS Elementary Ed	11	11	• 92 % Of students met high standards in reading (0%) • 93% Of students met high standards in math (0%) • 96% Of students met high standards in writing (0%) • 70% Of students met high standards in science (-14%) • 67% Of students made learning gains in reading (-1%) • 72% Of students made learning gains in math (+9%) • 57% Of the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading (-11%) • 73% Of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math (+10) • 620 Total Points Earned (-7) 2011-2012 School Grade-A 2010-2011 School Grade-A AYP Not Met 2009-2010 School Grade-A AYP Not Met 2009-2010 School Grade-A AYP Met 2008-2009 School Grade-A AYP Met

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	1.Teachers new to the school are assigned to meet with the New Educator Support System(NESS) Coach as well as a grade level team leader. 2.Teachers assigned to new grade level will be assigned a peer mentor at their grade level to assist with the transition	Kathleen Wicker	08/2012	

2	3. All new teachers to Hawkes Bluff Elementary will attend an orientation training prior to the start of the school year. Policies and procedures, school climate and expectations will be reviewed at the orientation. 4.Hold academic and social celebrations	Kathleen Wicker Administration	08/2012 6/2013	
3				

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
N/A	N/A

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
54	0.0%(0)	0.0%(0)	31.5%(17)	68.5%(37)	51.9%(28)	100.0%(54)	9.3%(5)	14.8%(8)	100.0%(54)

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
Erin Sullivan- K Candace Borges- 2nd Grade Bonnie Marks- 4th Grade Maria de la Nuez- 1st Grade Kimberly Milov - 4th Grade Michele LeFevere Katherine Translavina	Caroline Roy Tami Lane Gina Achille Mayra Paneque Virginia Murphy Tara Daub Rebecca Scrima	Teacher new to school and grade level	Observations/ Support Meetings/ Modeling/ Professional Development
Candace Borges - 2nd Grade Bonnie Marks - 4th Grade Andrea Eyl - 1st Grade	Jennifer Sanchez Donna Trucchio Mayte Meizoso	New to grade level	Support Meetings on grade level curriculum

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

- Melinda Cunningham, Principal
- Lisa George, Assistant Principal
- Gina Sandusky-Nelson, ESE Specialist
- Desiree Tanke, School Counselor
- Kathleen Wicker, Curriculum
- Maria LeBoeuf, Reading Specialist
- Raquel Seguinot, School Psychologist

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

Before a student is referred to the RTI team, the teacher must follow Tiers I & II. The teacher is assigned a liaison to help with the process. Interventions are put into place and data is gathered regarding the documented concern. If sufficient progress is not met, the case is referred to the RtI team. The team will review all available data and assist the teacher with Tier III. If acceptable progress is still not made by the student in question, the RtI team will make further recommendations including, but not limited to, a referral to psychological services and/or a consideration of a change in placement.

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?

During monthly committee meetings, the RtI Leadership Team facilitates the monthly review of the SIP.

MTSS Implementation

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

The RtI team meets on a monthly basis to discuss student progress and placement. The RtI team also looks at each student's profile to determine the referred student's area of weakness. The student's progress is tracked based on their needs. Data is also disaggregated to determine appropriate programs, placement, interventions, and accommodations. Data collected may include, Pre/Post Assessments, Mini-BATS, informal or formal observations, Progress Monitoring and Progress Network (PMRN), FCAT, DAR, and FAIR data.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The RtI leadership team will provide continuous training for the staff throughout the school year. The RtI team, in conjunction with the school's psychologist, will utilize the powerpoint available on the SBBC psychological services website in delivering its staff training. The school will also utilize available district personnel in delivering training. Assigned Case Managers will also provide additional personalized support.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The RtI team meets on a monthly basis to discuss student progress and placement. The RtI team also looks at each student's profile to determine the referred student's area of weakness. The student's progress is tracked based on their needs. Data is also disaggregated to determine appropriate programs, placement, interventions, and accommodations. Data collected may include, Pre/Post Assessments, Mini-BATS, informal or formal observations, Progress Monitoring and Progress Network (PMRN), FCAT, DAR, FAIR and data.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Melinda Cunningham, Principal
Lisa George, Assistant Principal
Maria LeBoeuf, Reading Specialist
Kathleen Wicker, Curriculum Specialist
2012-13 Grade Level Team Leaders

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

The LLT will meet monthly to discuss school-wide literacy initiatives as well as to plan ongoing school PLC's. Members will meet weekly with grade levels to share and disseminate information. Additional opportunities will take place at monthly faculty meetings.

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

The major initiatives of the LLT for the 2012-13 school year will be to address the various needs of all students as they relate to six areas of Reading Instruction: fluency, comprehension, phonics, phonemic awareness, vocabulary and oral language. During LLT meetings there will be an emphasis on how to incorporate rigor and relevance in all curriculum areas. In addition the primary teachers that utilize the CCSS will provide support the immediate teachers as they transition into the Common Core State Standards next year

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

*High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	By June 2013, at least 21% of the students in grades 3-5 will score a Level 3 on the FCAT 2.0 Reading
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
84/435 = 19%	87/413 - 21%

	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 supplemental materials.	•Curriculum committee meetings will be used to develop the framework. •Implementation of teacher made for remediation	• Reading Coach • Teacher	•Chapter Tests •Teacher Observation •Pre/Post Tests •Data Chats •Rubrics	Mini-BAT's BAT's Focus Lessons FCAT
2	•Limited training provided by the district	•Utilization of weekly student news magazines	•Reading Coach	•News Magazine Assessment ("No Sweat" Test Prep)	•BAT I •BAT II

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:	By June 2013, at least 57% of the students in grades 3-5 will score at or above Level 4 on the FCAT 2.0 Reading
	2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
	55% (241/435)	57% (235/413)

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	•Access to materials	•Selection of text based on student interest inventory.	•Reading Coach •Classroom Teachers	•CWT's •Data Chats	•Mini-BAT's •BAT I and BAT II •FAIR •FCAT
2	•Limited time to create differentiated lessons	•Use of Differentiated Instruction in delivery of curriculum. •Teachers will utilize early release and teacher planning days to create lesson.	•Reading Coach	•CWT's •Data Chat	•Mini-BAT's •BAT I and BAT II •FAIR •FCAT
3					
4					
5					

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:	By June 2013, 100% of the students will maintain /master the access points at or above Level 7
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (2/2)	100% (2/2)

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	•Limited time to expose students to literature based material	•Supplemental reading instruction will be provided to students in need of additional support, as per the District's Struggling Readers Chart. •Participation in the reading AM/PM	•Reading Coach •ESE Specialist •ESE Teachers	•Beginning, Mid and EOY Assessments •Progress Monitoring •Data Chats •Teacher Observations	•Reading Chapter Tests with modifications based on accommodations •FAA Practice Materials

2					

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:	By June 2013, 80% of the students in grades 3-5 will demonstrate learning gains
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
78% (224.2/286)	80%(219/274)

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	•Limited personnel provide support in implementing programs	Implementation of The following: Implementation of the following: • Accelerated Reader, • SSYRA –Battle of the Books • Family Literacy Nights and Literacy Celebrations • Bi-annual Scholastic Book Fairs • Reading Across Broward Reading Across Broward	• Media Specialist • Classroom Teacher	• AR Reports • Book It • Participation logs for RAB • Sign in sheets from night functions • Participation reports from SSYRA logs	Mini-BAT's BAT's FCAT
2	•Students with limited vocabulary knowledge base.	• Implementation of Vocabulary program (Wordly Wise & Elements of Vocabulary).	•Reading Coach •Classroom Teacher	• Pre/Post Test • End of Unit Assessment	Mini-BAT's FCAT
3	•Student home access to Internet for programs such as FCAT Explorer.	•Provide before school access to the school's computer lab.	• Administration • Classroom Teacher	•Weekly Reading Assessments •Participation reports for Computer Programs	Mini-BAT's BAT's FCAT
4					
5					

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:	By June 2013, 100% of the students will maintain /master the access points to achieve learning gains
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	100% (2/2)

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	•Need for differentiation and remediation	• Grade level intervention reading instruction will be provided to students in need of support.	• Reading Coach • ESE Teacher	• Progress Monitoring • FAA Pre/Post Test	• FAA gains data • FAA Practice

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:	By June 2013, 78% of the students in grades 3-5 who compose the lowest 25% will demonstrate learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
76% (48.7/64)	78% (57/73)

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Additional assistance needed in lower performing classes	Case managers will be assigned to students in the lowest quartile to help teachers with progress monitoring, parent conferences, and RtI.	•Reading Coach • Case Managers •Classroom Teacher •Administration	•Teacher Observation •Data Chats •CWT's	•RTI outcomes •FCAT •Data Chats
2	• Attendance at after school camps	• Provide incentives for attending	•Reading Coach	•Attendance records	•Attendance Records •Data Chats
3	• Coordinating pullouts during the instructional day.	• Pullouts for implementation of supplemental materials will be from 1:45 – 2:15	• Reading Coach • Support Staff	• Teacher Observation • Data Chats	• BAT I and II • FAIR • FCAT

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 # Hawkes Bluff Elementary will reduce the achievement gap by 2-3% each year for the next five(5) years. 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	75%	78%	80%	82%	84%	

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:	By June 2013, there will be at least a 2% decrease of students not making satisfactory progress as per each ethnicity subgroup
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

	White: 18% (41/224), Black: 53% (19/36), Hispanic 32% (39/123), Asian 22% (6/27), American Indian 66% (2/3)	White:16% (33/207), Black:51%,(16/31) Hispanic: 30% (39/130), Asian 19%(6/32), American Indian: 50%(2/4)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	• Monitoring specific students	• A case manager will be assigned to monitor students throughout the year and will be present at parent and teacher student conferences.	•Administration	•Progress monitoring checklists and RtI	•Weekly Assessments, •FCAT data, •Teacher Observation, •RtI graphs

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:	By June 2013, there will be a 60% decrease of ELL students not making satisfactory progress..
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (5/5)	60% (3/5)

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 are having difficulties in the area of comprehension.	• Students will use Destination Reading an online comprehension program, that utilizes research based practices to assist students in the area of comprehension.	•Reading Coach •Classroom Teacher	•Detailed Destination Reading reports tracking student progress •Data Chats	•Pre/Post Test •Weekly comprehension assessments
2	Slow language acquisition.	•Use of Language Master/Pen Pal	•Reading Coach •Administration •Classroom Teacher	•Data Chats •ELL meetings	•Cella Testing •IPT Testing

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:	By June 2013, there will be a 2% decrease of students with disabilities not making satisfactory progress.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
59% (52/88)	57% (48/84)

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	•Scheduling conflicts	• Small groups based on placement tests • Comprehension strategies • QAR Strategies • Repeated Reading for fluency	•ESE Specialist	• Data Chats • Assessments from the Reading Program	FAIR
2	Scheduling	Students will receive intervention strategies to address specific areas of Reading concern.	Teacher	Progress as measured through teacher charting test results	ORF's Weekly Assessments BAT Scores FCAT 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 subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	By June 2013, Economically Disadvantage students not making satisfactory progress will decrease by 2% or more.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (45/90)	48% (45/94)

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	Limited access to technology at home to reinforce concepts learned at school.	• The computer lab will be opened prior to the school day starting for students who do not have access to technology at home. Students will be able to access computer assisted programs such as FCAT Explorer and Destination Reading.	• Administration • Teachers • Reading Coach	•Progress & completion reports from the various programs students are accessing at school. •Quarterly progress monitoring forms. •Teacher/Student Conferences	•Completion of rates of students using in-school technology •FCAT gains •Reading Series Assessments, including Pre/Post Tests.
2	Lack of personnel	Students will be provided additional remediation through small group instruction and specialized reading programs addressing areas of weakness.	•ESE Specialist •Reading Coach •Classroom Teacher	•Quarterly progress monitoring sheets •Data chats	•Post Assessments •FCAT gain reports

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
Center Training	Reading K-5	District Trainers	All Reading Teachers	Tuesdays	Conversations / CWT	Reading Coach / Administration
Common Core	K-5	Administration	School-wide	Early Release and/or Planning Days	CWT	Administration
Reading / Writing Connection	K-5	Lori G	School-wide	Quarterly	Follow Up Assignments	Reading Coach/ 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
Reading / Writing Common Core Connection	School Funded	Inservice Funds	$5,700.00
			Subtotal: $5,700.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $5,700.00

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:	Students will increase at least one level on the CELLA
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
3rd –0% (0/4) 4th 0% (0/1) 5th 100% (2/2)	
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	• Non-English speaking parents	•Recommend Broward County Community School English immersion classes.	•Administration	• Parent Survey • Documentation of Enrollment	•CELLA
2	• Cultural Adjustment	• Peer buddy	• ESOL Contact • Classroom Teacher	• Teacher Observation • ESOL Matrix	•CELLA

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:	Students will increase at least one level on CELLA .

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

3rd –0% (0/4) 4th –0% (0/1) 5th 50% (1/2)

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	• Students unable to decode	• Small group instruction with teacher	•Administration •Teacher	•Reading Assessments	•CELLA
2	•Lack of vocabulary affects comprehension	Language Master	•Administration/ESOL Contact •Teacher	•Reading Assessments	•CELLA

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.

3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	Students will increase at least one level on CELLA

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

3rd –0% (0/4) 4th –0% (0/1) 5th –50% (1/2)

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	• Students unable to apply sounds in writing	• Letter/sound picture cards	• ESOL Contact • Teacher	• Writing Rubric	•CELLA

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:	By June 2013, 26% of the students in grades 3-5 will score level 3 on the FCAT Math Assessment
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
24% (103/437)	26% (107/413)

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	• Large number of level 3 students	Small group instruction	• Math Contact • Administration	•Classroom Walk-Throughs •Chapter/Unit Assessments	•Formal Math Assessements •Mini-BAT's
2	•Differentiated Instruction	•Use of online interventions	•Math Contact •Administration •Team Leaders	•Classroom Walk-throughs •Data Chats	•Formal Math Assessements •Mini-BAT's
3	• Large number of students need additional assistance	• Double dosing of students needing additional help with the assistance of classroom assistants, ESE Teachers and classroom volunteers	• Math Contact • Administration • Classroom Teachers	. •CWT's •Student led conferences •Data Chats	•Reflective Conversations with teachers and administration.
4	• Covering all standards before the FCAT	• Utilization of the District's Instructional Focus Calendar/ for pacing	• Math Contact • Administration • Classroom Teachers	•CWT's •Data Chats	• BAT I and BAT II • FCAT
5					

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:	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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	By June 2013, 57% of the students in grades 3-5 will score at or above level 4 on the FCAT Math Assessment
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
55% (238/437)	57% (235/413)

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	Mastering of all the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards.	• Teachers will teach the Big Ideas, using the Essential questions as a guide.	• Math Contact	•Weekly Assessment •Formal and Informal Assessments •Data Chats	• BAT I and • BAT II • FCAT data • Mini BAT's
2	• Need small group instruction	• Group according to ability within the classroom for leveled activities	• Math Contact	•Weekly Assessment •Formal and Informal Assessments •Data Chats	• BAT I and • BAT II • FCAT data • Mini BAT's
3	• Availability of the supplemental enrichment	•On-line Enrichment, First in Math •Go Math Enrichment activities	• Math Contact	•Monitoring of progress reports •Attendance of usage	• BAT I and • BAT II • FCAT data • Mini BAT's

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:	By June 2013, 100% of the students will maintain /master the access points at or above Level 7
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (2/2)	100% (2/2)

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	•Mastery of multiplication facts and addition and subtraction with	•Small, direct specialized instruction	• ESE Specialist • Math Contact • ESE Teachers	•Weekly Assessments •Formal / Informal Assessments	• FAA Test

	regrouping.				

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:	By June 2013, 81% of the students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains on the FCAT Math Assessment
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
79% (224.7/286)	81% (222/274)

<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>• Mastery of Multiplication</td><td>• Teaching multiplication strategies</td><td>• Math Contact
• Teacher</td><td>• Math Drills</td><td>•Classroom and Formal assessments</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>• Out dated technology</td><td>• Pool resources from within the school</td><td>• Technology Contact
• Administration</td><td>• Technology Inventory</td><td>• Technology inventory</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>• Inability to solve multi-step problems</td><td>• Practice and modeling of multi-step problems</td><td>• Math Contact
• Teacher</td><td>•Assessments</td><td>•Formal 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:

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	By June 2013, 100% of the students on access points will make learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	100% (2/2)

<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>Technology Antiquated</td><td>Computer lab, carts and ipads</td><td>• ESE Specialist
• Math Contact
• ESE Teachers</td><td>• FAA gains
• Progress Monitoring</td><td>• FAA</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:

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	By June 2013, 62% of the students in grades 3-5 who compose the lowest 25% will demonstrate learning gains..
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

	60% (36.3/61)			62% (38.4/62)		

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	• Students unable to retain previous years skills and concepts.	• Students will justify math reasoning by using graphic models and drawings.	• Math Contact • Administration • Classroom Teacher	• Interims Report • RtI • Parent Conference	• BAT IIAssessment • FCAT • EOY Math Test
2	• Inability to break down multistep word problems	Differentiated Instruction	•Math Contact •Classroom Teacher	•RtI	•Rubric •Chapter Tests

---

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 #
	Hawkes Bluff Elementary will reduce the achievement gap by 2-3% each year for the next five(5) years. 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	78%	81%	83%	85%	87%	

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:	By June 2013, there will be a 2% decrease of students not making satisfactory progress as per each ethnicity subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White 92% (209/227),Black 69% (24/35),Hispanic 86% (114/132),Asian 89% (25/28),American Indian 100% (3/3) White: 15%(35/224) Black: 46%(17/37) Hispanic:27% (34?124) Asian:15% (4/27) American Indian:33.3% (1/3)	White (Maintain/Improve),Black 73%,Hispanic (Maintain/Improve),Asian (Maintain/Improve),American Indian (Maintain) White: 12% (24.8/207) Black: 43% (13.3/31) Hispanic: 25%(32.5/130) Asian: 9%(2.8/32) American Indian: 0%

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
	• Students have difficulty understanding basic addition, subtraction and	• Schedule double dosing for students in subgroups to ensure they are	• Math Contact • Administration • Classroom	• RtI, • CWTS	• RtI Results • CWTS • Reflective

	multiplication math facts • Ability to read and analyze multi-step word problems	receiving maximum services, including, but not limited to small group instruction, computer assisted instruction, classroom teacher assistant.programs identified on Struggling Math Chart.	Teacher	• Reflective Conversation	Conversation
1					

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:	By June 2013, there will be a 22% decrease of ELL students not making satisfactory progress.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
80% (4/5)	58% (7/12)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	• Students lack command of the English language	•Schedule for double dosing to receive maximum services. •Peer buddy •ESOL Strategies •Small group instruction, •Computer assisted instruction, classroom teacher assistant.	• ESOL Contact • Math Contact • Administration	• RtI, • CWTS • Reflective Conversation	• RtI, • CWTS • Reflective Conversation

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:	By June 2013, there will be a 3% decrease of students with disabilities not making satisfactory progress.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
51% (46/90)	48% (44/84)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	• Student lacking prerequisite skills	• Touch Math • Soar to Success • Intensive Intervention with GO Math series • Double dose of math	• ESE Specialist • ESE Teacher • Classroom Teacher	•Weekly Assessment •Beginning of the Year Assessment	•End of the Year GO Math Assessment • BAT I and II • FCAT
1	Students with limited access to technology at	Students will utilize the math computer lab to	Teachers	•Usage and progress reports from math	FCAT AYP Report

2	home that will help reinforce concepts taught at school.	reinforce the Math Big Ideas		programs students are using in lab. •Chapter/Big Idea 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 subgroup:	
E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:	By June 2013, Economically Disadvantage students not making satisfactory progress will decrease by 2% or more.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41% (37/91)	38% (36/94)

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	•Limited access to technology at home that will help reinforce concepts taught at school.	•Students will utilize the math computer lab to reinforce the Math Big Ideas	• Math Contact • Teachers	•Chapter Tests/ Big Idea Assessments •Soar to Success	Mini BATS
2	•Students have not had enough exposure to the remedial components of the GO Math series	•Double dosing of the remedial components: Soar to Success Reteach Intensive Intervention	• Math Contact • Classroom Teacher	•Record, collect, analyze and discuss test data •CWT •Teacher Observation	• GO Math Chapter test • Mini BATS • BAT I and II • FCAT

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
No Data Submitted						

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:	.By June 2013, 33% of the 5th grade students will score a Level 3 on the FCAT 2.0 Science
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
31% (48/156)	33% (46/138)

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 reading components included in the classroom sets. Including Flip charts, leveled readers, etc.	• Collaboration with the Science Special teacher to Implement the Instructional Focus Calendar.	• Curriculum Contact • Administration • Science Teacher	• Weekly • Assessments • Data Chats • CWT's • Science Journals	•Science Mini-BATS •BAT I and BAT II
2	• How to effectively address grade-level standards that need additional support	Science Specials Teacher to instruct certain standards and double dose in weak areas.	•Science Special Teacher •Classroom Teacher	• Data Chat's • CWT's • Science Journals	• Science Mini-BAT's • BAT I and • BAT II • Unit Assessments
3	Parental Involvement	Students will be provided the opportunity to participate in Family Science.	Science Specials Teacher	Bi-weekly projects	•EOY Science Assessment
4	Covering all experiments	Science specials teacher will work with the classroom teacher to present hands-on investigations of science concepts learned in the classroom.	•Science Specials Teacher •Classroom teacher	Monthly lateral conversations between science specials teacher and classroom teacher	Reflective Conversations between teachers

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b:	By June 2013, all HBE students participating in the FAA will score at a level 4 or higher
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	100% (2/2)

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	• Lack of reading components included in the classroom sets. Including Flip charts, leveled readers, etc.	• Collaboration with the Science Special teacher to Implement the Instructional Focus Calendar.	SE Specialist • Classroom Teacher • ESE Teacher	• Weekly Assessments • Unit Assessments • Science Journals	•FAA

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:	By June 2013, 40% of the 5th grade students will score a Level 4 or 5 on the FCAT 2.0 Science
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
36.5% (57/156)	40% (55/138)

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 reading components included in the classroom sets, and Science based novels. Including Flip charts, leveled readers, etc.	Collaboration with the Science Special teacher to Implement the Instructional Focus Calendar.	• Curriculum Contact • Administration • Science Teacher	• Weekly • Assessments • Data Chats • CWT's • Science Journals	• Science Mini-BATS • BAT I and BAT II

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:	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				

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						

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:	By June 2013, 90% of the students will score at proficiency
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
88% (124/141)	90% (122/136)

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	• Deficiency in conventions	•Mini – Lessons in Daily Oral Language •Double Dose	• Writing Contact	•Writing Samples	•State Rubrics
2	• Deficiencies in the specific areas of the 6 Traits	Daily Language Oral	•Writing Contact	•Writing Samples	•State Rubrics
3	• Schedules and school events	• Bi-Weekly 4th Grade Writers Workshop	• Writing Contact • 4th Grade Teachers	• BAT Writing • Monthly Demand Writing	•FCAT Writes •State 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 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	N/A There are no FAA students in this grade level.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (2/2)	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				

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
Core Connection Training	Pre-K - 5	Kathleen Wicker Lori Gandolfo	School-wide	Preplanning 2012-February 2013	Sharing of Best Practices/ Peer Observations	Kathleen Wicker

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:	By June 2013, Hawkes Bluff Elementary will achieve to maintain an average daily attendance of 96% or above.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
96.1% (151179/157317) .	96.5%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
24	19
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
106	85

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	Parental Support	•Reminders in the school newsletter •Weekly reminders through Parentlink •Letter sent to parents when 3 absences have occurred •Phone call to parent when student has occurred 5 absences •Perfect attendance certificates for classes per grade level	, Assistant Principal	• Monthly attendance reports to include a decrease in tardies • Chart and monitor tardies with a graph to encourage attendance	•Monthly reports of tardies. •Individual attendance records of students

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

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:	By June 2013, there will be a 42 % decrease of students for Out of School Suspensions and a 50% decrease for Suspend Out of School.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
1	1
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
1	1
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
7	3
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
4	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	•Although the suspension rate has been low in the past, the students represent repeat offenders.	•Students will participate in social skills and decision making groups.	•Guidance Counselor	•Progress Monitoring	Quarterly analysis of suspensions.
2	•Lack of parental support	•Sharing helpful strategies with teachers on how to handle challenging students.	•Guidance Counselor	Weekly behavior charts as required.	•Teacher observation •Weekly behavior charts
3	•Student Motivation	•Positive Behavior Assembly •Kids of Character •Catch You Being Good Tickets/Bucket Fillers •Student of the Week •Kids of Kompassion (Compassion)	•Guidance Counselor •Administration •Support Staff	•Progress Monitoring	•Number of Kids of Kompassion forms submitted •End of year suspension data •Graph depicting suspension rate as compared to the previous year

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 June 2013, HBE would like to increase the percentage of parental involvement at after school activities by 2%
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
85% (357/420)	87% (348/400)

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	• Hours that parents work	• Varying times of events	• Admin. • Support Staff	• Sign In Sheets • Participation Logs	• Sign In Sheets • Participation Logs
2	•Communication with parents and other stakeholders	• Marquee • Parentlink • Website • Telephone App	•Administration •Technology Contact	• Sign In Sheets • Participation Logs	• Sign In Sheets • Participation Logs

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)

N/A Goal:

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						

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 N/A Goal(s)

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
Reading	Reading / Writing Common Core Connection	School Funded	Inservice Funds	$5,700.00
				Subtotal: $5,700.00

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: $5,700.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

○ Priority	○ Focus	○ Prevent	○ NA

Are you a reward school: ○ Yes ○ No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/26/2012)

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.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
Salary for teachers tutoring AFter School Camp- $3600.00 Snacks for students 200.00 Substitutes for teachers attending district curriculum training- 1400.00 Supplies and Materials 2000.00	$7,200.00

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

After school tutoring camps for remediation, District Curriculum Training,

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Broward School District
HAWKES BLUFF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	92%	93%	96%	70%	351	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	67%	72%			139	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?	57% (YES)	73% (YES)			130	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					620	
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
HAWKES BLUFF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	92%	93%	96%	84%	365	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	68%	63%			131	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?	68% (YES)	63% (YES)			131	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					627	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested