

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

School Name: PARK TRAILS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Broward

Principal: Thomas Redshaw

SAC Chair: Kimberly McCarthy

Superintendent: Robert Runcie

Date of School Board Approval: December 4, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/22/2012

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	Thomas Redshaw	Masters in Educational Leadership	1	11	The school has earned an A for 10 consecutive years. A grade was not given for the 2001-2002 school year as that was the year the school opened. We have made AYP continuously until the 2010 school year. Our SWD subgroup did not meet required high standards. Results of the 2012 FCAT indicate that students making High Standards are: Reading 80%, Math 82%, Writing 84%, Science 77%. Students made the following Learning Gains: Reading 80%, Math 77%. Of the Lowest 25%, 75% made gains in Reading and 62% made gains in Math.
Principal	Lisa Rodriguez		1	1	Mrs. Rodriguez has been the Assistant Principal at Park Trails Elementary for one month. She was a third grade teacher before being promoted to the Assistant Principal position. Please see data above on high standards, learning gains, and lowest 25%.

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	Karen Fletcher	Masters in Elementary Education Endorsements in Reading, Gifted and ESOL	11	7	For the seven years that Karen Fletcher has been the reading coach at Park Trails, the school has earned the grade of A. Please refer to data listed under Highly Qualified Administrators for high standards, learning gains, and lowest 25%.

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	New Educator Support System-New teachers will receive a coach and will participate in a monthly learning community to network with experienced teachers. Content of these sessions will include curriculum, school and district procedures, classroom management etc. New teachers are sent to training activities throughout the year as well as attending staff development at the school level.	Karen Fletcher	June 2013	
2	Induction Process-New teachers will be assigned a mentor to assist in learning and understanding the school culture and process. Staff development will be provided to all staff to ensure an understanding of the importance of the induction process and encourage interaction among staff.	Karen Fletcher	June 2013	

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
62	1.6%(1)	4.8%(3)	48.4%(30)	45.2%(28)	45.2%(28)	100.0%(62)	6.5%(4)	1.6%(1)	59.7%(37)

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
Joan Verdaguer	Josh Brodsky	Mr. Brodsky is teaching 5th Grade at Park Trails Elementary for the first time. Ms. Verdaguer is an experienced 5th Grade Teacher.	Monthly meetings(or more frequently as needed) to review curriculum, grade level processes and procedures.
Terri Romance	Mary Beckwith	Ms. Beckwith is teaching 2nd grade at Park Trails Elementary for the first time. Ms. Romance is an experienced 2nd Grade Teacher.	Monthly meetings(or more frequently as needed) to review curriculum, grade level processes and procedures.
Corinne Church	Debra Malara	Ms. Malara is teaching 3rd grade Gifted for the first time at Park Trails Elementary. Ms. Church is an experienced 3rd Grade Gifted Teacher.	Monthly meetings(or more frequently as needed) to review curriculum, grade level processes and procedures.
Beth Bickler	Sherri Pagan	Ms. Pagan is teaching 5th grade for the first time. Ms. Bickler is an experienced 5th Grade Teacher.	Monthly meetings(or more frequently as needed) to review curriculum, grade level processes and procedures.

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)

FCAT Math Camp for the students in the lowest 30%.

Violence Prevention Programs

Gang Resistance Education and Training (GREAT), with our fourth grade, addresses making good decisions to maintain personal safety. Student Taking Action and Responsibility(STAR), with our fifth grade, addresses making good decisions to maintain personal safety. NET Smart addresses internet safety for kindergarten through third grade. Anti-Bullying Policy will continue to be implemented at all grade levels. Hands Are For Helping Program which supports our anti-bullying policy will address students in grades Kindergarten through Second. Get Real About Violence which supports our anti-bullying policy will address students in grades Third through Fifth. CHAMPs is a school-wide classroom management expectation program.

Nutrition Programs

Pack Assorted Colors for Kids(PACK) Week focuses on teaching children to eat healthy foods through the exploration of colors.

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.

Principal-Thomas Redshaw, Assistant Principal-Lisa Rodriguez, Reading Coach-Karen Fletcher, Guidance Counselor-Christine Sicilia, ESE Specialist-Merrill Levine, Behavior Specialist/Autism Coach-Kellie Moore, School Psychologist-***, School Social Worker-Liliana Pardo-Posse. The classroom teacher will be included when a student from his/her classroom is being discussed.

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?

Meetings are held bi-weekly and facilitated by our Reading Coach, Karen Fletcher. Ms. Fletcher prepares the agenda and updates the database after each meeting. The members of the RtI team act as case managers, meet with teachers, observe students, recommend interventions, and report back to the committee for further recommendations. The case manager works closely with classroom teacher monitoring the progress of each student at each intervention level. The teacher keeps a record of all progress monitoring in order for data to be graphed and analyzed with the case manager. That information is shared with the RtI Leadership team to determine next steps.

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?

Once the School Leadership team disaggregates testing data, they alert the RtI team about academically weak areas. The

RtI team recommends activities, training, and interventions etc. that need to be included in the SIP. When more intensive intervention is needed, case managers are assigned to work with teachers to determine and monitor appropriate interventions needed by the students. The team then discusses individual cases, assesses success of the interventions or recommends additional interventions for implementation.

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.

- Data is generated from FCAT, DRA, FAIR, District reading/math tests, reading /math minis, classroom assessment and observations.
- Through progress monitoring and Virtual Counselor, data is managed and available on students for staff and the RtI team.
- Tier I- Data is analyzed and student trends are noted. Through discussions with teams, global interventions are suggested to staff and implemented.
- Tier II-Case manager and teacher determine specific deficit area based on the students' data and classroom performance. Skill specific interventions are implemented with on going progress monitoring assessment tool that aligns with the skill being taught.
- Tier III-After reviewing results of interventions from Tier II, if expected growth is not shown, students will receive more intensive interventions. Once the graph of progress is analyzed by the CPST, they may refer the students for psychological assessment.
- Examples of evidence based interventions are Read Naturally, Triumphs, Road to the Code, Phonics for Reading, Rewards, Foundations, VV(Visualize and Verbalize), and Go Math Interventions.
- To assess academics,Data Points are taken from Mini-BATs, Big Idea, End of Chapter, DRA, and built in program intervention assessments.
- To assess behavior and attendance, Data Points are taken from the Discipline Management System and Pinnacle/Terms.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The reading coach and the school psychologist will train staff during faculty meetings on the RtI process and necessary steps to ensure that students receive appropriate interventions. It is important for teachers to understand that their targeted instruction and monitoring is crucial to the success of the RtI process.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Principal-Thomas Redshaw, Assistant Principal-Lisa Rodriguez, Reading Coach-Karen Fletcher, Christine Sicilia-ELL Representative, Catherine Kager-4th grade teacher, Beth Bickler-5th grade teacher, and Kim McCarthy-Media Specialist

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

The Literacy Leadership Team meets monthly to discuss staff development, implementation of reading and language arts curriculum, materials needed, and modeling. The Principal and Assistant Principal have the responsibility to oversee that all teachers implement the IFCs, provide appropriate differentiated instruction, and strive to ensure a years growth for each student. The Reading Coach, teacher representatives and Media Specialist use feedback from the administrators to plan modeling, staff development, and PLC to ensure that teachers are current with strategies and classroom instruction. The ELL Representative ensures that all teachers know their ELL students and implement appropriate strategies. She also guides teachers needing training for endorsement to available coursework.

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

- Staff development focused on higher order thinking literacy skills
- Reinforce the 90 minute, uninterrupted reading block
- Appropriate differentiated instruction in each classroom.

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:	Based on results of 2012 FCAT scores, 21% (99) of our students achieved proficiency at Level 3 in Reading. Our goal is to move 10%(6) of our students from Level 1 or 2 to Level 3.
---	---

2012 Current Level of Performance: 21% (99) of our students achieved proficiency at Level 3 in Reading.	2013 Expected Level of Performance: 24% (105) of our students will achieve proficiency at Level 3 by improving 15% (4) of our students from Level 1 or 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	The language challenges of our ESE and ESOL students impact reading proficiency.	1. Teachers will analyze data to determine reasons for gap in learning gains per student and plan appropriate interventions and instruction. 2. Students will increase their independent reading time through use of Accelerated Reader to strengthen their reading skills. 3. Students will use Thinking Maps to improve background knowledge through informational text. 4. Students will use magazines to increase their independent reading of informational text.	* Administrators * Reading Coach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor IFCs Progress Monitoring Through weekly CWT grade level teams will receive feedback on the integration of Thinking Maps as a tool to improve critical thinking. Monthly Data Chats with LLT and teachers to discuss results of BAT I and II, and Mini BAT Assessments in order to project percentage of students who will score at Level 3 in Reading. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Observation Classroom Snapshots BAT I and II Mini Bat Assessments FCAT Results CWT Reports (Responding to different learning needs)

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:	
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 reading. Reading Goal #2a:	Based on the results of 2012 FCAT scores, 59% (279) of our students achieved above proficiency in Reading. Our goal is to move 6% (6) from Level 3 to Level 4 or 5.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
59% (279) of our students achieved above proficiency in Reading.	63% (285) of our students will achieve above proficiency, Level 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	Teachers focus on their underachieving students and lack rigor of instruction for the students achieving above proficiency.	1. Teachers will use higher order questions techniques. 2. Teachers will utilize advanced reading materials beyond the basal. 3. Instruction will incorporate varied genres including nonfiction magazines. 4. Teachers will use e-books to promote reading in the classroom. 5. Students will read e-books from the school library. 6. Teachers will use more complex text for read alouds and instruction.	*Administration *Reading Coach -Media Specialist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress Monitoring Through weekly CWT grade level teams will receive feedback on trends using higher order questioning. Monthly Data Chats with LLT and teachers to discuss results of BAT I and II, and Mini BAT Assessments in order to project percentage of students who will score at Level 4 or 5 in Reading. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BAT I and II Mini BAT Assessments FCAT Results CWT Reports (Responding to different learning needs)

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:	Based on results of 2012 FCAT, 80% (255) of our students made learning gains in reading. Our goal is to increase the number of students with learning gains by 3% (9).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
80% (255) of our students made learning gains in reading.	Of the currently enrolled 4th and 5th grade students (312), 83% (264) will make learning gains 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
1	A large portion of the students struggling to make learning gains tend to be ESE and ESOL students who are impacted by language challenges that impact comprehension.	1. Teachers will utilize RAZ KIDS and Destination Reading to improve comprehension. 2. Teachers will implement intervention programs from the Struggling Readers Chart to develop fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension in order to help students make learning gains.	Administrators •Reading Coach •CPST members	•RAZKIDS and Destination Reading reports will be discussed at Data chats to monitor and increase in reading comprehension. •Progress Monitoring through weekly CWT grade level teams will receive feedback on trends from intervention programs to increase reading proficiency. •Monthly Data Chats with LLT and teachers to discuss results of BAT I and II, and Mini BAT Assessments in order to project percentage of students who will make learning gains in reading.	*IObservation *Classroom Snapshots •End of Year Assessment •BAT I and II • Mini BATS •FCAT Results •CWT Reports (Responding to different learning needs)

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:	Based on results of 2012 FCAT, 75% (53) of students in the lowest 25% (71) made learning gains in reading. Our goal is to increase the number of students in our lowest 25% making learning gains by 3% (2) students increasing our overall learning gains to 78%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
75% (53) of students in the lowest 25% (71) made learning gains in reading.	Our goal is to increase the number of students in our lowest 25% making learning gains by 3% (2) students increasing our overall learning gains to 78%.

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	Many of the students in the lowest 25% are ESE or ESOL with language deficits that impact comprehension.	1. Identify students and appropriate targeted interventions through the RTI process. 2. Teachers will implement double-dose of reading in classroom based on targeted intervention. 3. Implement reading tutorial groups to improve reading comprehension and increase proficiency.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrators CPST members Reading Coach 	Administrators <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CPST members Reading Coach •Progress Monitoring through weekly CWT grade level teams will receive feedback on trends from intervention programs to increase reading proficiency. •Monthly Data Chats with LLT and teachers to discuss results of BAT I and II, and Mini BAT Assessments in order to project students in lower 25% who will make learning gains in reading.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BAT I and II Mini BATS FCAT Results CWT Reports (Responding to different learning needs)

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 :		<input type="text"/>				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>

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:	White, Hispanic, and Asian subgroups made satisfactory progress in Reading 2011-2012. For 2012-2013 we anticipate any subgroup with less than 80% proficiency to increase by 3 percentage points as listed below.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White - 80%, Black 61%, Hispanic 80%, Asian 84%, American Indian na, ELL 50%, SWD 45% and FRL 58%.	Black 64%, ELL 53%, SWD 48% and FRL 61%.

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	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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:	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
1	Establishing time for increased communication between general education and resource teachers regarding effective strategies for the SWD.	1. Identify specific deficit area and implement appropriate intervention programs from the struggling readers chart. 2. To build stamina for reading endurance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Administrators •Reading Coach •ESE Specialist 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Progress Monitoring through weekly CWT grade level teams will receive feedback on trends from intervention programs to increase reading proficiency. •Monthly Data Chats with LLT and teachers to discuss results of BAT I and II, and Mini BAT Assessments in order to project percentage of SWD students who will make AYP in reading. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •FCAT •BAT Results •Mini Bats •CWT Reports (Responding to different learning needs)
2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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:	Based on the results of the 2012 FCAT 55% (30) of our 55 students with disabilities did not meet satisfactory progress. Our goal is for 58% of our SWD to make satisfactory progress.
--	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
55% (30) of our SWD students did not make satisfactory progress.	58% (32) of our SWD will make satisfactory progress.

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	Establishing time for increased communication between general education and resource teachers regarding effective strategies for the SWD.	1. Identify specific deficit area and implement appropriate intervention programs from the struggling readers chart. 2. To build stamina for reading endurance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrators Reading Coach ESE Specialist 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress Monitoring through weekly CWT grade level teams will receive feedback on trends from intervention programs to increase reading proficiency. Monthly Data Chats with LLT and teachers to discuss results of BAT I and II, and Mini BAT Assessments in order to project percentage of SWD students who will make AYP in reading. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FCAT BAT Results Mini Bats CWT Reports (Responding to different learning needs)

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:	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
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

Common Core Reading Strategies	K-5	Leadership Team	Classroom Teachers	August 2012	Monthly	Karen Fletcher
--------------------------------	-----	-----------------	--------------------	-------------	---------	----------------

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
Focus on Informational Text to build background knowledge	Classroom Magazines	SAC	\$3,000.00
			Subtotal: \$3,000.00
			Grand Total: \$3,000.00

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:	Based on 2012 FCAT scores 26%(121) of our students achieved proficiency at Level 3 in Math. Our goal is to move 3% (4) students to Levels 4 or 5.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
26%(121) of our students scored Level 3.	26%(125)of our students will score a Level 3 on FCAT Math.

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	Added Rigor with the NGSS and CCST requires more complex thinking for Problem Solving.	<p>1. Kindergarten through 2nd grade will implement the new Common Core State standards with ongoing training.</p> <p>2. Grades 3 through 5 will begin transitioning to Common Core State Standards while maintaing the New Generation State Standards with ongoing training.</p> <p>3. Teachers will analyze data to determine reasons for gap in learning and plan appropriate interventions for instruction with input from teammates.</p> <p>4. Teachers will incorporate the elements of 8-Step Problem Solving in their instruction.</p>	<p>*Administrators</p> <p>*CPST Members</p>	<p>•Monitor use of IFC</p> <p>•Progress Monitoring through weekly CWT grade level teams will receive feedback on evidence of implementation of the new NGSS standards.</p> <p>•Monthly Data Chats with Administrators and teachers to discuss results of BAT I and II, and Mini BAT Assessments in order to project percentage of students who will score at Level 3 in Math.</p>	<p>*IObservation</p> <p>*Classroom Snapshots</p> <p>•BAT I and II</p> <p>•Mini Assessments</p> <p>•GO Math Assessments</p> <p>•FCAT Results</p> <p>• CWT Reports (Determining Levels of Student Work)</p>
2	Teachers will continue to use the Florida Science Fusion to be integrated with Broward County Hands-On Science Kits.	<p>1. Teachers will use the District IFCs to pace instruction.</p> <p>2. Teachers will implement the use of a science journal.</p> <p>3. Teachers will utilize science kits for hands-on exploration.</p>	<p>*Administrators</p> <p>*Leadership Team</p>	<p>•Monitor use of IFC to pace instruction.</p> <p>•Progress Monitoring through weekly CWT grade level teams will receive feedback on evidence of implementation of a science journal.</p> <p>•Monthly Data Chats with Administrators and teachers to discuss results of BAT I and II, in 5th grade and evaluation of science journals K-5.</p>	<p>*Iobservation</p> <p>*Classroom Snapshots</p> <p>BAT I and II</p> <p>•FCAT Results</p> <p>•Rubric for Science Journal</p> <p>•Assessments noted in IFC</p>

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:

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:	Based on 2012 FCAT scores 57%(268) of our students achieved above proficiency in Math. Our goal is to move 3% (5) of our students who scored Level 3 into Level 4 or 5.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
57%(268) of our students scored Level 4 or 5.	60%(273)of our students will score Level 4 or 5 in Math.

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	Teacher focus on their underachieving students and lack rigor of instruction for the students achieving above proficiency.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers will differentiate instruction through PEP(projects, acceleration, enrichment), Hands-On-Equations, and supplemental materials. Teacher will utilize higher order questioning techniques. Teachers will show evidence of "Standards of Mathematical Practice". Students will be able to explain and justify their reasoning of their understanding of the math skills. Teachers will model how to explain and justify the understanding of the math skill. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Administration *Leadership Team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Monitor use of IFC •Progress Monitoring through weekly CWT grade level teams will receive feedback on evidence of implementation acceleration and enrichment. •Monthly Data Chats with Administrators and teachers to discuss results of BAT I and II, and Mini BAT Assessments in order to project percentage of students who will score at Level 4 or 5 in Math. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •BAT I and II •Mini Assessments •GO Math Assessments •FCAT Results • CWT Reports (Determining Levels of Student Work)

2	Implementation of Florida Science Fusion to be integrated with Broward County Hands-On Science Kits.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers will enrich students with real-world applications. Teachers will challenge students with inquiry-based investigations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrators Leadership team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor use of IFC to pace instruction. Progress Monitoring through weekly CWT grade level teams will receive feedback on evidence of implementation of real-world applications and inquiry-based investigations. Monthly Data Chats with Administrators and teachers to discuss results of BAT I and II, in 5th grade and evaluation of inquiry-based investigations through science journal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BAT I and II FCAT Results Rubric for Science Journal Assessments noted in IFC
---	--	--	---	--	--

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:	Based on results of 2012 FCAT, 77%(246) of our students made learning gains in math. Our goal is to increase the number of students making learning gains by 3%(7).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
77%(246) of our students made learning gains in math.	Of our currently enrolled 4th and 5th grade students (318),80%(256) will make learning gains in math.

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
	Implementation of new standards may impact	1. Teachers will be trained how to unwrap	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrators Leadership team. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitor use of IFC Progress Monitoring 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BAT I and II Mini Assessments

1	the effectiveness of math instruction.	the benchmarks for clearer understanding. 2. At bi-monthly team meetings teachers will share best practices, model, and co-plan lessons.	through weekly CWT grade level teams will receive feedback on evidence of implementation of the new NGSS standards. •Monthly Data Chats with Administrators and teachers to discuss results of BAT I and II, and Mini BAT Assessments in order to project percentage of students who will make learning gains in Math.	•Go Math Assessments • FCAT Results •CWT Reports (Determining Levels of Student Work)
---	--	---	---	---

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:	Based on FCAT results for 2012, 62%(35) of our students in the lowest 25%(57) made learning gains. Our goal is to increase this by 3%(2).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
62%(35) of our students in the lowest 25% (57) made learning gains in math.	Of the currently enrolled 4th and 5th grade students in the lowest 25%(57),85%(48) will make learning gains in math.

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
The pacing of the IFC calendar is rigorous for the students in the lowest 25%.	1. Teachers will analyze data to determine deficit areas for the lowest 25%. 2. Teachers will differentiate instruction	• Adminstrators • CPST members	•Monitor appropriate pacing with the IFCs. •Progress Monitoring through weekly CWT grade level teams will receive feedback on	•BAT I and II •Mini Assessments •GO Math assessments •FCAT Results •CWT Reports

1		to include reteach and intervention in small groups 3. Teachers will model how to explain and justify the understanding of a mathematical skill. 4. Students will explain and justify the understanding of a mathematical skill.	evidence of implementation of differentiation of instruction. •Monthly Data Chats with Administrators and teachers to discuss results of BAT I and II, and Mini BAT Assessments in order to project percentage of students at the lowest 25% who will make learning gains in Math.	(Determining Levels of Student Work)
---	--	--	---	--------------------------------------

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:	The Black,ELL,SWD, and FRL subgroup did not make satisfactory progress in Math 2011-2012. For 2012-2013 we anticipate any subgroup with less than 80% proficiency to increase by 3 percentage points as listed below.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White - 84%, Black 46%, Hispanic 79%, Asian 100%, American Indian na, ELL 20%, SWD 45% and FRL 52%.	Black 49%, Hispanic 82% or higher,Ell 23%, SWD 48% and FRL 55%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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:	Based on FCAT results for 2012, 80%(10) of our ELL students did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics. Our goal is to decrease this by 3%(3).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
80%(10) of our ELL student did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics	We will decrease our ELL students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics by 3% (3).

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	Establishing sufficient time for collaboration between classroom and resource teachers to effectively meet students' needs.	1. Review data and identify specific deficit concepts and skills. 2. Provide appropriate interventions from the struggling math chart.	Classroom teachers Resource teachers Reading Coach	BAT Go Math Assessments Data Chats Progress Monitoring	FCAT
2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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:	2Based on the results of the 2011 FCAT 45% (25) of our SWD met proficiency in math. Our goal for 2013 is for 48% (26) of our students with disabilities to meet Satisfactory Progress.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
45% (25) of our SWD met satisfactory progress.	48% (26) of our SWD will make AYP/Safe Harbor.

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	Establishing sufficient time for collaboration between classroom and resource teachers to effectively meet students' needs.	1. Review data and identify specific deficit concepts and skills. 2. Provide appropriate interventions from the struggling math chart.	Classroom teachers Resource teachers Reading Coach	BAT Go Math Assessments Data Chats Progress Monitoring	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 subgroup:

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:	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
1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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:	Based on results of 2012 FCAT,36%(57) students scored level 3. Our goal is for 39%(65) of the currently enrolled 5th graders(166)to score a Level 3.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
36%(57) of students scored Level 3 in science.	Of our currently enrolled 5th graders (166), 39%(65) will achieve a Level 3.

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:

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:	Based on 2012 FCAT results, 41%(65) of students achieved above proficiency in science. Our goal is for 44%(73) of our currently enrolled 5th graders (166) to achieve Level 4 or 5 in science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41%(65) of our students scored above proficiency in science.	Of our currently enrolled 5th graders (166), 44%(73) will achieve Level 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
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:

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
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

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:	Based on FCAT results for 2012, 83% (144) of our students achieved a Level 3 or above on writing. Our goal is for 86%(126) of our currently enrolled 4th graders (146) to score Level 3 in writing on the 2012 Writing FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
83%(144) of our students scored Level 3 or higher.	Of our currently enrolled 4th graders (146), 83%(144) will score Level 3 and higher on the 2013 Writing 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	Some ESE and ESOL students have limited language capabilities.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Teachers will instruct in the various genres of writing in alignment with IFC. Teachers will incorporate the Six Traits of Writing and the FCAT Rubric in instruction. Teachers will encourage high yield strategies of Cooperative Learning to peer edit and revise writing. Students in K-5 will use Thinking Maps with the writing process. Students will utilize the Common Core State Standards to learn how to write a 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Administrators Leadership Team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Progress Monitoring Through weekly CWT 4th grade teams will receive feedback on the integration of Thinking Maps as a tool to improve the writing process. Monthly Data Chats with LLT and teachers to discuss results of Writing BAT I and II in order to project percentage of students who will score at Level 4 or higher in Writing. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing teacher collaboration of students writing samples Writing BAT I and BAT II Writing Prompts FCAT Results

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
Common Core Standards in Writing	Prek-5	Leadership Team	Schoolwide	Bi Monthly	Observation	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	Current data indicates that our attendance rate is 96%

Attendance Goal #1:	(166362). Our goal is to increase attendance by 2%(33).
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
Our attendance rate for the 2012 school year was 96% (166362).	Our anticipated attendance rate for 2013 would be 98% (166395).
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
During the 2012 school year 24 students had excessive absences.	During the 2013 school year we would expect to reduce the number of excessive absences to 20 showing a reduction of 2% (4).
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
During the 2012 school year 75 students (0.075%) had excessive tardies.	During the 2013 school year we would expect to reduce the number of excessive absences to 73 students (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	Parents, students, and guardians understanding the connection between school achievement and attendance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Share information with parents about attendance and school achievement in our parent groups, school newsletter, conferences, meet-n-greet and open house. •Continue use of BTIP as required. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Classroom Teacher •Registrar •Administration •Social Worker 	Monitoring attendance patterns.	Daily attendance Quarterly Attendance 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
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:	Our goal is to maintain our low number of Suspensions.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
1 Internal Suspensions	We do not anticipate an increase in the number of In-School Suspensions during the 2012 school year.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
1 students	We do not anticipate an increase in the number of students suspended during the 2012 school year.
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
3 Out of School Suspension	We do not anticipate an increase in the number of Out of School Suspensions during the 2012 school year.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
2 student	We do not anticipate an increase in the number of students receiving an Out of School Suspension during the 2012 school year.

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	Unexpected inappropriate behavior	Implementation of CHAMPs in all classrooms, and rewards for expected	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Behavior Coach •Administrators 	Classroom Observation	Reports run from the DMS.

behavior.

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:

<p>1. Parent Involvement</p> <p>Parent Involvement Goal #1:</p> <p><i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i></p>	<p>Based on attendance results of parent participation of 25% (217) parents attending at least one curriculum night, our goal is to increase that attendance to 28% (277) parent for the 2011 school year.</p>
---	--

2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
25% (217) of our parents participated in at least one of our Curriculum Nights.	28%(277) of our parents will participate in at least one of our curriculum nights.

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	Coordinating schedules of stakeholders.	1. Schedule activities across the calendar to meet varied schedules of parents allowing them to participate in at least one event. 2. Advertise events well in advance to allow stakeholders to fit it into their schedules.	Committee Chairs	Provide sign in sheets at each event.	Tally of signatures for each event and compare with school population for %.

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
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
Reading	Focus on Informational Text to build background knowledge	Classroom Magazines	SAC	\$3,000.00
				Subtotal: \$3,000.00
				Grand Total: \$3,000.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent	<input type="checkbox"/> 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 9/10/2012)

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.

If NO, describe the measures being taken to Comply with SAC Requirement

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

AYP DATA

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2011-2012
 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2010-2011
 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) Trend Data 2009-2010

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Broward School District PARK TRAILS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	93%	96%	96%	83%	368	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	72%	72%			144	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?	69% (YES)	83% (YES)			152	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					664	
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 PARK TRAILS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	93%	97%	93%	71%	354	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	73%	76%			149	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?	58% (YES)	82% (YES)			140	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					643	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested