

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: GATOR RUN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Broward

Principal: Susan F. Sasse

SAC Chair: Susy Suarez

Superintendent: Robert Runcie

Date of School Board Approval: December 4, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/19/2012

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)
Principal	Susan F. Sasse	B.S. - Elementary M.S. - Educational Leadership Certified in Elementary Ed and School Principal	12	16	2007-2008 A, AYP met 2008-2009 A, AYP met 2009-2010 A, AYP met 2010-2011 A, AYP met 2011-2012 A, AYP met
Assis Principal	Cynthia Felton	B.A. - Elementary Education M.S. -Educational Leadership Certified in Elem. Education and School Principal NBCT and ESOL endorsed	7	.5	2011-2012 A, AYP met

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	Lori Knapik	Elementary Education, Reading Endorsed, NBCT	14	10	2007-2008 A, AYP met 2008-2009 A, AYP met 2009-2010 A, AYP met 2010-2011 A, AYP met 2011-2012 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	NESS - New Educator Support System to include new teachers, teachers new to a grade level or subject area.	Shari Heyman	May 2013	
2	Orientation for new teachers, staff new to a grade level and/or departmentalizing for the first time.	Susan Sasse Team Leaders Curriculum Coach	August 2012	
3	Professional Learning Communities focusing on best practices and targetted questions.	Cyndi Felton	May 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
1	Coursework being completed in gifted/highly talented to attain certification

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
72	0.0%(0)	4.2%(3)	51.4%(37)	44.4%(32)	36.1%(26)	98.6%(71)	12.5%(9)	19.4%(14)	90.3%(65)

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

Corrine Genovese	Stacey Mahoney	New to school	Monthly Learning Communities Weekly Lesson Plan development Modeling
Arlene Izquierdo	Allison Atlas	New to school	Monthly Learning Communities Weekly Lesson Plan development Modeling
Terry Looky	Ashley Fritzius	New to school	Monthly Learning Communities Weekly Lesson Plan development Modeling
Stacey Morse	Rosalynnda Webster	New to school	Monthly Learning Communities Weekly Lesson Plan development Modeling
Lorrie Willard	Carmen Velasco	First year	Monthly Learning Communities Weekly Lesson Plan development Modeling
Pamela Sherwood	Cheri Edler	Returning to school	Monthly Learning Communities Weekly Lesson Plan development Modeling
Angela Davis	Shari Heyman	First Year	Monthly Learning Communities Weekly Lesson Plan development Modeling
Tristan Ferrer	Denise Boehm	New to school	Monthly Learning community Weekly Lesson Plan development Modeling

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

N/A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

N/A

Title I, Part D

N/A

Title II

N/A

Title III

N/A

Title X- Homeless

N/A

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

N/A

Violence Prevention Programs

N/A

Nutrition Programs

N/A

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

Other

N/A

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Susan Sasse, Principal
Cyndi Felton, Assistant Principal
Lori Knapik, Reading Coach
Rose Powers, Guidance
Anita Tio, Social Worker
Barbara Diaz, School Psychologist
Select General Education Teachers

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

The MTSS leadership team meets twice monthly, using the Collaborative Problem-Solving Model. When meeting, the team reviews individual student history and data to determine appropriate interventions to meet the students' needs. RtI team members meet with individual teachers to provide support as needed with the process. Include social worker on the team. Tier 1 data are routinely inspected in the areas of reading, math, writing, science and behavior. Data are used to make decisions about modifications needed to the core curriculum and behavior management strategies for all students. These same data are also used to screen for at-risk students who may be in need of Tier 2 or 3 interventions; all such students are referred to the CPS team for consideration of how best to proceed.

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

The school-based MTSS/RtI Leadership Team meets to discuss each section of the School Improvement Plan to ensure it follows the problem solving process. After disaggregating students in all sub groups and analyzing individual student test data, the team decides on specific action plans to meet the needs of all students.

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.

Baseline Data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), FAIR, Benchmark Assessment Tests (BAT 1 reading, math and science), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)
Progress Monitoring: FAIR, Benchmark
Midyear: Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Mid Year Primary Reading/Math, Benchmark Assessment Tests (BAT 2 reading, math and science)
End of Year: FAIR, FCAT, EOY Primary Reading/ Math
Frequency of Data Days: Quarterly for Data Analysis
All data sources are routinely inspected at Tier 1 for: Reading, Math, Writing, Science, and Behavior. For Tiers 2 & 3, the data sources are the Intervention Records and progress monitoring graphs generated for individual students.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional development will be provided during teacher's common planning time and Early Release Days throughout the year. The initial training will be provided by the Reading Coach and ESE Specialist in October for all K-5 teachers on graphing interventions.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The MTSS/RtI team will also evaluate additional staff PD needs during MTSS/RtI Leadership Team and meetings.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Susan Sasse, Cyndi Felton, Caitlin Clabby, Ann House, Denise Boehm, Sara Crowther, Lynn Mitchel, Francesca Fazio, Jill Dillard, Lori Knapik, Rose Powers and Jean Bailey

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

The LLT meets monthly to discuss student data, interventions and strategies to increase student achievement and to discuss revisions on school processes and procedures (if needed). RtI progress monitoring.

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

Based on 2012 FCAT data, AYP was met. The LLT will be focusing on disaggregating data and re-training teachers on the RtI process.

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.

N/A

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

N/A

*High Schools Only

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

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

N/A

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

N/A

Postsecondary Transition

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](#)

N/A

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	Our percentage of students scoring Level 3 and above in reading fluctuates between 3-7% points each year. Our Level 3 performance in reading exceed state and district levels. Our school has met AYP criteria each year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
According to 2012 FCAT scores, 24% (147) of students are proficient (Level 3) in Reading .	According to the 2013 FCAT, 27% (162) of students will be proficient (Level 3) 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	Mastery of all prerequisite benchmarks in reading from previous grade level not achieved.	Students will be pulled for small group instruction and will receive research-based interventions found on the Struggling Readers Chart. Teachers will use the core reading selection and graphic organizers to help students improve their comprehension skills. Using the core reading series will be emphasized. Students will be instructed utilizing research based strategies including sorting important from unimportant using summarizing, graphic organizers, visuals, compare/contrast activities, fiction reading organizer/sorter skills and how to plan and label. The District Instructional Focus Calendar (IFC) will be utilized to drive instruction. Based on school data assessment, secondary benchmarks will be added to the IFC. The District K-12 Reading plan will be followed to ensure fidelity of the Reading program.	Administration Reading Coach Classroom Teachers	Assessments will be administered according to District reading IFC. Assessments will include: Weekly reading comprehension selections and Mini BATS will be administered according to District reading IFC and monitored for improvement. Quarterly Data Chats will be conducted with Support Staff and classroom teachers. Progress monitoring will be analyzed by the Leadership Team. Those who remained the same (showed no progress) will be monitored; those who went down will receive remediation in small group instruction ; those who go up will receive enrichment activities. Regrouping will occur according to the results of assessment analyzation. Classroom visits will be utilized and a reflective conversation with the identified instructional staff will be conducted.	Treasures weekly assessments, Classroom visits, Lesson plan review, Data notebooks Mini Benchmarks

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:	Even though historically more than 70% of our students achieve above proficiency in FCAT Reading, our school results show that these same students may fall in the lowest 25%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on 2011 FCAT data, 57% (348) students achieved proficiency at a Level 4 or 5 in Reading.	Based on 2013 FCAT data, 60% (365) students will achieve proficiency at Level 4 or 5 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	Maintaining above proficiency for those students who scored a Level 4 or 5 in Reading.	PLC - best practices for for enriching students.	Team Leader Literacy Leadership Team Administration	Classroom Visits data analysis meetings conferences with parents and students	classroom visits data notebooks conference forms
2	Students lack critical and creative thinking and problem solving skills in reading.	Students will be pulled for small group reading instruction. Students will receive instruction using higher level questioning and enrichment activities for reading. Students will receive instruction in research and reference that coincides with the weekly story. Additionally, Marzano's Research based strategies for increasing student achievement will be used in classroom instruction.	Classroom Teachers Literacy Leadership team Reading Coach	Assessments will be administered according to District reading IFC. Assessments will include: Weekly reading comprehension selections and Mini BATS will be administered according to District reading IFC and monitored for improvement. Quarterly Data Chats will be conducted with Support Staff and classroom teachers. Progress monitoring will be analyzed by the Leadership Team. Classroom visits will be utilized and a reflective conversation with the identified instructional staff will be conducted.	Classroom visits Mini benchmarks Weekly Treasures assessments

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

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:

Results of the 2012-2013 FCAT Reading show that our percentage of students making learning gains increased 3% from the previous year.

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

In grades 3-5, 81% (351) students achieved learning gains on the 2012 FCAT in Reading.

In grades 3-5, 83% (359) students will achieve learning gains on the 2013 FCAT 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	Mastery of all pre-requisite benchmarks in reading from previous grade level not achieved.	Students will be pulled for small group instruction. Teachers will use the core reading selection and will use graphic organizers to help students improve their comprehension skills. Students will be instructed utilizing research based strategies including sorting important from unimportant using summarizing, cartooning, graphic organizers, visuals, compare/contrast activities, fiction reading organizer/sorter skills and how to plan and label. The District IFC will be utilized to drive	Administration classroom teachers reading coach	Classroom Observations Lesson Plans review Data collection Data Analysis Meetings	Grade level assessments on reading benchmarks given weekly, mini benchmarks and data chats with administration.

	instruction. Based on school data assessment, secondary benchmarks will be added to the 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:

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:	Results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Reading showed that our percentage of lowest 25% students making learning gains increased by 2% from the previous year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on 2012 FCAT data, 80% (89) of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in Reading.	Based on 2013 FCAT data, 82% (91) of students in the lowest 25% 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	Staff's understanding of RtI process and data collection	Tier 1: Determine core instructional needs by reviewing common assessment data for all students in each grade level who are not making adequate yearly progress. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence-based instruction/ interventions within the reading block.	classroom teachers reading coach administration	Classroom Observations, Lesson Plans, Data collection, Data analysis meetings	Grade level assessments on reading benchmarks given weekly
	Staff's understanding of RtI process and data collection	Tier 2: Plan supplemental instruction/ interventions for students not responding to core instruction. Focus on	RtI team administration	Review Graphs, Progress monitoring data, and consultations	Grade level assessments on reading benchmarks given weekly

2		instruction is determined by review of common assessment data and will include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent instruction.			
3	Staff's understanding of RtI process and data collection	Tier 3: Plan targeted intervention for students not responding to core plus supplemental instruction using problem solving process. Interventions will be matched to individual student needs, be evidence-based, and provided in addition to core instruction.	RtI Team	RtI team will review results of common assessment data which has been plotted on a data chart/graph to determine progress towards benchmark.	Assessments from the intervention that have been utilized with the student.

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 # In 2012-2013, 83% of students will be at or above a level 3 based on FCAT Reading data in 2013..				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	81%	83%	85%	87%	89%	

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:		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

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
No Data Submitted				

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	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

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 Implementation	Grades 1-5	District Personnel	Teachers 1st - 5th	As scheduled by district	Classroom visits Collaborative team planning Weekly reports	Susan Sasse, Cyndi Felton and Lori Knapik
Common Core	K-5	Lori Knapik	school-wide	Early release days	Collaborative team planning weekly reports and observation	Susan Sasse, Cyndi Felton and Lori Knapik
Instructional Rounds	K-5	Susan Sasse Cyndi felton	school-wide	Faculty meetings	Instructional Rounds in practice and feedback	Susan Sasse and Cyndi Felton

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
Common Core Training through district	Substitute teachers for TDAs 48 substitutes x \$80	SAC Funds	\$3,840.00
			Subtotal: \$3,840.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Teachers participating in Instructional Rounds	Substitute Teachers for class coverage 36 x \$80	SAC Funds	\$2,880.00
			Subtotal: \$2,880.00
			Grand Total: \$6,720.00

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:	73% (176 students) will be proficient in Listening /Speaking on the 2013 CELLA.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	

Based on 2012 CELLA results, 67% (161 students) of students were 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
1	Additional instructional time is needed to support ELL students	Provide ELL (A1, A2 and select students) students time in the ESOL Lab for additional instruction and support	Susy Suarez , ESOL Specialist Susan Sasse, Principal Cyndi Felton, Asst. Principal	Progress Monitoring	Benchmark Assessments BAT 1 and BAT 2

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:

46% (110 students) will be proficient in Reading on the 2013 CELLA.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

Based on 2012 CELLA results, 41% (100 students) of students were 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
1	ELL students need additional vocabulary support.	Teacher will implement the ELL portion of the Treasures reading series, focusing weekly on vocabulary	Classroom Teachers Lori Knapik, Reading Coach Susy Suarez, ESOL Specialist Susan Sasse, Principal	Progress Monitoring	Benchmark Assessments BAT 1 and BAT 2 Treasures weekly assessment

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

45% (108 students) will be proficient in Reading on the 2013 CELLA.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

Based on 2012 CELLA results, 40% (98 students) of students were 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
1	Conventions and grammar are very difficult for ESOL	A1 and A2 students will receive pullout in the ESOL lab, providing	Susy Suarez, ESOL Specialist Administration	Progress monitoring Data from monthly samples	Monthly writing samples

students.	additional support in Writing		Data chats	
-----------	-------------------------------	--	------------	--

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

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:	Our percentage of students scoring Level 3 and above in math fluctuates between 1-3% points over the last three years. Our Level 3 performance in math exceeds state and district levels. Our school has met AYP criteria each year.
--	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
------------------------------------	-------------------------------------

Based on 2012 data, 27% (169) students achieved proficiency (FCAT level 3) in Math.	Based on 2013 data, 30% (182) students will achieve proficiency (FCAT level 3) 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	Staff's understanding of RtI process and data collection	Tier 1: Determine core instructional needs by reviewing common assessment data for all students in each grade level who are not making adequate yearly progress.	Teachers	Classroom Observations, Lesson Plans, Data collection, Data analysis meetings	GO Math weekly assessments Big Idea assessments
2	Staff's understanding of RtI process and data collection	Tier 2: Plan supplemental instruction/ interventions for students not responding to core instruction. Focus on instruction is determined by review of common assessment data and will include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent instruction.	Classroom Teacher, Case Manager, RtI team	Review Graphs, Progress monitoring data, and consultations	PMS database, data notebooks
3	Staff's understanding of RtI process and data collection	Tier 3: Plan targeted intervention for students not responding to core plus supplemental instruction using problem-solving process. Interventions will be matched to individual student needs, be evidence-based, and provided in addition to core instruction.	RtI team	RtI team will review results of common assessment data which has been plotted on a data chart/graph to determine progress towards benchmark.	Assessments from the intervention that have been utilized with the student.
4	Mastery of all prerequisite skills in math from previous grade level not achieved.	Struggling Math students will be pulled for small group instruction in the classroom. Struggling students will use the GO Math Intervention component online. All students will use FCAT Explorer, Florida Achieves for individualized practice.	Classroom Teacher Administration	Quarterly Data Chats Lesson plan review Classroom Visitation	Prerequisite assessment Chapter Assessments Big Idea Assessments Benchmark assessments BAT 1 & BAT 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:

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:	Even though historically more than 70% of our students achieve above proficiency in FCAT Math, our school results show that these same students fall in the lowest 25%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on 2012 FCAT data, 54% (329) students achieved above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 or 5) in Math.	Based on 2013 FCAT data, 57% (347) students will achieve above proficiency (FCAT Levels 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	Maintaining and/or increasing the number of students who achieved above proficiency.	Students will be placed in gifted/high achievers classes or advanced/high achiever groups to provide enrichment.	Team Leaders Administration	Classroom Walkthroughs Team Meetings Data Meetings	Chapter Assessments Big Idea Assessments Benchmark assessments BAT 1 & BAT 2
2	Effective use of instructional time for differentiated grouping.	Training and implementation of small groups and differentiation in math. Utilize GO Math Enrichment component	Team Leaders Administration	Classroom Visitation Team Meetings Data Meetings	Chapter Assessments Big Idea Assessments Benchmark assessments BAT 1 & BAT 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:

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:	Results of the 2011-2012 FCAT Math show that our percentage of students making learning gains increased 5% from the previous year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on 2012 FCAT data, 76% (329) students made Learning Gains in Math.	Based on 2013 FCAT data, 79% (340) students 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
1	Staff's understanding of RtI process and data collection	Tier 3: Plan targeted intervention for students not responding to core plus supplemental instruction using problem-solving process. Interventions will be matched to individual student needs, be evidence-based, and provided in addition to core instruction	RtI team	RtI team will review results of common assessment data which has been plotted on a data chart/graph to determine progress towards benchmark.	Assessments from the intervention that have been utilized with the student.
2	Staff's understanding of RtI process and data collection	Tier 1: Determine core instructional needs by reviewing common assessment data for all students in each grade level who are not making adequate progress. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence-based instruction/ interventions within the reading block.	Classroom Teachers	Classroom observations, Lesson Plans, Data Collections, Data Analysis Meetings	Classroom assessments including chapter tests, Big Idea assessments and mini Benchmark assessments.
	Staff's understanding of RtI process and data collection.	Tier 2: Plan supplemental instruction/ interventions for students not responding to core instruction. Focus of	RtI team	Graph reviews, Progress Monitoring Data, Consultations	Classroom assessments including chapter tests, Big Idea assessments and

3	instruction is determined by review of common assessment data and will include explicit, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice. Supplemental instruction is provided in addition to core instruction.		mini Benchmark assessments.
---	---	--	-----------------------------

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in 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:	Each year a portion our students performing in the lowest 25% include students achieving at level 4.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on 2012 FCAT data, 73% (65) students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in Math.	Based on 2013 FCAT data, 76% (68) students in the lowest 25% 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
1	Staff's understanding of RtI process and data collection	Tier 1: Determine core instructional needs by reviewing common assessment data for all students in each grade level who are not making adequate progress. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence-based instruction/ interventions within the reading block..	classroom teachers	classroom walkthroughs data meetings conferences with parents and students	Classroom assessments including chapter tests, Big Idea assessments and mini Benchmark assessments.

2	Staff's understanding of RtI process and data collection	Tier 2: Plan supplemental instruction/ interventions for students not responding to core instruction. Focus of instruction is determined by review of common assessment data and will include explicit, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice. Supplemental instruction is provided in addition to core instruction.	RtI Team	RtI Meetings data meetings conferences with parents and students	Classroom assessments including chapter tests, Big Idea assessments and mini Benchmark assessments.
3	Staff's understanding of RtI process and data collection	Tier 3: Plan targeted intervention for students not responding to core plus supplemental instruction using problem-solving process. Interventions will be matched to individual student needs, be evidence-based, and provided in addition to core instruction	RtI team	Classroom walkthroughs progress monitoring data analysis meetings RtI meetings	Assessments from the intervention that has been utilized with the student.

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 # Based on FCAT Math, 84% of our students will be at or above a level 3 in 2013. 5A :				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	82	84	86	88	90	

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:		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

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.		N/A			
Mathematics Goal #5C:					
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

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.		N/A			
Mathematics Goal #5D:					
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

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.		N/A			
Mathematics Goal #5E:					
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

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:	Our students achieving proficiency in Science exceeds state and district levels. Our school has met AYP criteria each year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on 2012 FCAT data, 38% (83) students achieved	Based on 2013 FCAT data, 40% (86) students will

proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in Science.			achieve proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in Science		
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 vocabulary and background knowledge in basic science concepts	Science lessons and centers that incorporate vocabulary development and hands on activities and experiments	Classroom teacher	Team meetings to discuss data taken from student assessments and teacher observation.	Science Mini Assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
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:	The number of students achieving above proficiency in Science is significantly less than those achieving proficiency in other FCAT subject tests.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on 2012 FCAT data, 29% (64) students achieved above proficiency in Science.	Based on 2013 FCAT data, 32% (68) students will achieve above proficiency in Science.

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 vocabulary and hands-on experiences.	Science lessons that incorporate vocabulary and hands-on experiments. Enrichment activities will provide challenge for high achieving and	Classroom teachers	Team meetings to discuss strategies and suggestions for change, if needed	Classroom assessments including chapter tests, teacher observations and mini Benchmark assessments.

gifted students.

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
			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:	Our percentage of students scoring Level 3 and above in Writing fluctuates between 2-3% points each year. Our Level 3 performance in Writing exceeds state and district levels. Our school has met AYP criteria each year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on 2012 FCAT data, 93% (219) students scored level 3.0 or higher in Writing.	Based on 2013 FCAT data, 96% (225) students will score level 3.0 or higher 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
1	Maintaining and/or increasing the number of students who achieved proficiency in Writing	Students in grades in K-5 will receive daily writing instruction including teacher modeling using Lucy Calkins and the Six Traits through BEEP.	Administration Reading Coach	Classroom walkthroughs lesson plans	CWT Lesson Plans Monthly writing samples
2	New teachers in 4th grade	Partner new teachers with veteran 4th grade teachers for support and allow release time for teachers to observe other 4th grade teachers	administration 4th grade team leader Reading Coach	Data collection from prompts Data Chats	Prompts
3	New emphasis on FCAT writing on grammar and conventions	School wide emphasis on grammar, vocabulary, conventions and spelling. Mystery Word of the Week activities Increased Language Arts instructions through Treasures Reading	Classroom teachers Reading Coach Administration	Classroom visitation Progress monitoring Data collections & Data chats	Prompts Monthly Writing samples Reading response Weekly Treasures assessment

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
No Data Submitted						

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

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:		Due to a change in enrollments, there is a large percentage of ELL students who have language barriers. Also, there is an increase of NCLB students attending who travel a long distance to school.			
2012 Current Attendance Rate:		2013 Expected Attendance Rate:			
Based on 2012 data, the attendance rate was 96%.		In 2012 the attendance rate will be 97%.			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)			
Based on 2012 data, 35 (3%) students had Excessive Absences.		In 2013 the number of students with Excessive Absences will decrease to 30.			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)			
Based on 2012 data, 110 (10%) students had Excessive Tardies.		In 2013 the number of students with Excessive Tardies will decrease to 100.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of communication between parents and school regarding attendance and tardies.	Teachers will notify parents of tardies. Parent link will be utilized to notify parents of absences.	classroom teachers administration	conferences with teachers by administration	quarterly reports
2	Lack of communication between parents and school regarding attendance and tardies.	Notices will go home with parents regarding BTIP information and will be placed on the school's website.	administration Micro Tech	monitor attendance quarterly	File Maker Database

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal # 1:	In 2011-12, we had only 1% of our students receive receive any type of suspension. Our large mentoring program run by our guidance counselors continues to assist students with additional needs.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
13 (1%)	10
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
11	9
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
2	1
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School

2		1			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Current school-wide behavior plan was not being implemented with fidelity.	All classroom teachers will utilize the "Clip Chart" Behavior Management System to reinforce positive behavior.	classroom teachers, team leaders, and administration	classroom walkthroughs referrals	referrals
2	Current school-wide behavior plan was not being implemented with fidelity.	A new behavior plan will be implemented. "Gator Goals" will focus of the District's Character Traits and other positive reinforcements.	classroom teachers, team leaders, and administration	classroom walkthroughs referrals	referrals

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

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: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	Traditionally Gator Run has always had excellent parent involvement. In recent years, we have had an increase in working parents. However, we continue to encourage parents to attend grade level events throughout the year. Our goals is to continually increase our percentage of parent involvement.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
Based on 2012 data, 78% (943) parents attended grade level parent events.	Based on 2013 data, 80% (968) parents will attend grade level parent events.

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 being notified of events in a timely manner.	Parent Link will be utilized and events will be posted on the school's website. In addition, we will use Twitter to announce happenings at Gator Run.	Administration micro tech	review parent sign in sheets check website for parent events posted	parent sign in sheets website

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:			100% of K-5 students will participate in STEM activities during the 2012-2013 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	Students lack experience with STEM activities and presentations.	Science resource teacher will assist the staff with STEM-based instruction, including problem-based learning utilizing technology.	Administration Science Resource Teacher Technology Resource Teacher	Through data chats (teacher/team) classroom observations and lesson plans, STEM-based instruction will be identified.	Lesson plans STEM-related rubric

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)

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	Common Core Training through district	Substitute teachers for TDAs 48 substitutes x \$80	SAC Funds	\$3,840.00
				Subtotal: \$3,840.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Teachers participating in Instructional Rounds	Substitute Teachers for class coverage 36 x \$80	SAC Funds	\$2,880.00
				Subtotal: \$2,880.00
				Grand Total: \$6,720.00

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

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
Substitute teachers for coverage as Instructional staff engages in Common Core Professional development and Instructional Rounds.	\$6,720.00

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

Monitor SIP plan and work within committees to develop new instructional programs for 2013-2014 school 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 GATOR RUN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	93%	96%	94%	81%	364	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	78%	71%			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?	78% (YES)	77% (YES)			155	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					668	
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 GATOR RUN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	96%	97%	97%	85%	375	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	81%	75%			156	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?	80% (YES)	79% (YES)			159	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					690	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested