

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: CRESTHAVEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Broward

Principal: Joshua Kisten

SAC Chair: Jan Heavner/Sandra Wilches

Superintendent: Robert Runcie

Date of School Board Approval: December 4, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/18/2012

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) |
|----------|------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| | | | | | 2011-12: Grade A Reading Mastery 56% Math Mastery 66% Writing Mastery 84% Science Mastery 61% 2010 -11: Grade A Reading Mastery: 73% Math Mastery: 85% Writing Mastery: 92% Science Mastery: 54% AYP: White, Hispanic, ELL, and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in Reading; All Subgroups met AYP in Mathematics 2009 -10: Grade A Reading Mastery: 70% Math Mastery: 74% Writing Mastery: 94% Science Mastery: 51% |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|---|----|----|---|
| Principal | Joshua Kisten | <p>B.A. – Exceptional Student Education and Grades K-12, Brooklyn College;</p> <p>M.A. – Neuropsychological Learning Disabilities, Brooklyn College;</p> <p>M.A. School Supervision, Educational Leadership, Brooklyn College</p> | 14 | 14 | <p>AYP: Black, Hispanic, and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in Reading; Black, Economically Disadvantaged and ELL did not make AYP in Math</p> <p>2008-2009: Grade A Reading Mastery: 72% Math Mastery: 92% Writing Mastery: 92% Science Mastery 51% AYP: Black, ELL, SWD did not make AYP in Math; ELL and SWD did not make AYP in Reading</p> <p>2007-2008: Grade A: Reading Mastery: 74% Math Mastery: 84% Writing Mastery: 83% Science Mastery: 51% AYP: All subgroups met criteria</p> <p>2006-2007: Grade A Reading Mastery: 74% Math Mastery: 80% Writing Mastery: 82% Science Mastery: 59% AYP: ELL did not make AYP in reading</p> <p>2005-2006: Grade: A Reading Mastery: 70% Math Mastery: 77% Writing Mastery: 83% Science Mastery: n/a AYP: All subgroups met criteria</p> <p>2004-2005: Grade: A Reading Mastery: 74% Math Mastery: 76% Writing Mastery: 83% Science Mastery: n/a AYP: Provisional – SWD did not meet proficiency in reading</p> <p>2003-2004: Grade: A Reading Mastery: 68% Math Mastery: 72% Writing Mastery: 82% Science Mastery: n/a AYP: All subgroups met criteria</p> |
| Assis Principal | Stephanie Saban | <p>B.A Elementary Education, University of Florida</p> <p>Med Elementary Education, University of Florida</p> <p>Certificate in Ed Leadership, Florida Atlantic University</p> | 3 | 3 | <p>2011-12: Grade A Reading Mastery 56% Math Mastery 66% Writing Mastery 84% Science Mastery 61%</p> <p>2010 -11: Grade A Reading Mastery: 73% Math Mastery: 85% Writing Mastery: 92% Science Mastery: 54% AYP: White, Hispanic, ELL, and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in Reading; All Subgroups met AYP in Mathematics</p> <p>2009-2010 Grade C Reading Mastery 61%, Math Mastery 66%, Writing Mastery 76%, Science Mastery 28%. AYP: Hispanic Subgroup made AYP in Math</p> <p>2008-2009 Grade: A Reading Mastery 91%, Math Mastery 94%, Writing Mastery 91%, Science Mastery 72%. AYP: All subgroups made AYP</p> <p>2007-2008 Grade: A Reading Mastery 89%, Math Mastery 93%, Writing Mastery 87%, Science Mastery 72%. AYP: All subgroups made AYP</p> <p>2006-2007 Grade: A Reading Mastery 91%, Math Mastery 93%, Writing Mastery 94%, Science Mastery 68%. AYP: All subgroups made AYP</p> |

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 | Jan Heavner | <p>B.S. – Elementary Education, Indiana University</p> <p>M.A. – Reading, FAU</p> <p>Certifications: Elementary Education Grades 1-6; ESOL Endorsement, Primary Education (Grades K-3), and Reading (Grades K-12)</p> | 21 | 11 | <p>2011-12 Grade A Reading Mastery 56% Math Mastery 66% Writing Mastery 84% Science Mastery 61%</p> <p>2010 -11: Grade A Reading Mastery: 73% Math Mastery: 85% Writing Mastery: 92% Science Mastery: 54% AYP: White, Hispanic, ELL, and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in Reading; All Subgroups met AYP in Mathematics</p> <p>2009 -10: Grade A Reading Mastery: 70% Math Mastery: 74% Writing Mastery: 94% Science Mastery: 51% AYP: Black, Hispanic, and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in Reading; Black, Economically Disadvantaged and ELL did not make AYP in Math</p> <p>2008-2009: Grade A Reading Mastery: 72% Math Mastery: 92% Writing Mastery: 92% Science Mastery 51% AYP: Black, ELL, SWD did not make AYP in Math; ELL and SWD did not make AYP in Reading</p> <p>2007-2008: Grade A: Reading Mastery: 74% Math Mastery: 84% Writing Mastery: 83% Science Mastery: 51% AYP: All subgroups met criteria</p> <p>2006-2007: Grade A Reading Mastery: 74% Math Mastery: 80% Writing Mastery: 82% Science Mastery: 59% AYP: ELL did not make AYP in reading</p> <p>2005-2006: Grade: A Reading Mastery: 70% Math Mastery: 77% Writing Mastery: 83% Science Mastery: n/a AYP: All subgroups met criteria</p> <p>2004-2005: Grade: A Reading Mastery: 74% Math Mastery: 76% Writing Mastery: 83% Science Mastery: n/a AYP: Provisional – SWD did not meet proficiency in reading</p> <p>2003-2004: Grade: A Reading Mastery: 68%</p> |

Math Mastery: 72%
 Writing Mastery: 82%
 Science Mastery: n/a
 AYP: All subgroups met criteria

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

| | Description of Strategy | Person Responsible | Projected Completion Date | Not Applicable (If not, please explain why) |
|---|---|------------------------------|---------------------------|---|
| 1 | 1. Regular Meetings of new teachers with Assistant Principal | Stephanie Saban | Ongoing | |
| 2 | 2. Partnering new teachers or teacher with less than 3 years experience with veteran staff | Jan Heavner | Ongoing | |
| 3 | 3. Staff Development – All instructional staff is trained in areas identified as a need by student achievement data | Joshua Kisten/Stephaie Saban | Ongoing | |
| 4 | 4. Team Planning-Teachers work collaboratively to strengthen instructional strategies | Team Leaders | Ongoing | |

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 |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 38 | 2.6%(1) | 21.1%(8) | 47.4%(18) | 28.9%(11) | 7.9%(3) | 100.0%(38) | 7.9%(3) | 10.5%(4) | 84.2%(32) |

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 |
|---------------|-----------------|---|--|
| Diane Manusky | Denise Camuto | Mrs. Camuto is a new teacher to Broward County and is a NESS participant. Mrs. Manusky is a veteran kindergarten teacher. She has had clinical educator | Weekly team meetings, mentoring activities, individual support as needed |

| | | | |
|----------------|-------------------|---|--|
| | | training and is also the grade level leader. | |
| Sabrina Edler | Elizabeth Bowland | Mrs. Bowland is new to 2nd grade. Mrs. Edler is the second grade team leader. | Weekly team meetings, mentoring activities, individual support as needed |
| Sandra Wilches | Nekeia Foster | Ms. Foster is a new teacher to SBBC. Ms. Wilches is the third grade team leader as has provided coaching to several mentees. | Weekly team meetings, mentoring activities, individual support as needed |
| Jan Heavner | Sandra Michel | Ms. Michel is new to SBBC coming from another county. She is the ESE Specialist with several years of previous experience. Mrs. Heavner is the Reading Resource Specialist with coaching experience. They are both part of the Support Staff. | Weekly team meetings, mentoring activities, individual support as needed |

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

Services are provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through after-school programs. Funds are used for teacher's salaries, PI, and PD activities. The district coordinates with Title II and Title III in ensuring staff development needs are provided and students are being instructed by highly qualified teachers..

Title I, Part C- Migrant

n/a

Title I, Part D

N/A

Title II

District receives supplemental funds for improving basic education programs through the purchase of small equipment to supplement education programs. New technology in classrooms will increase the instructional strategies provided to students and new instructional software will enhance literacy and math skills of struggling students. Funds at Cresthaven Elementary School are used to purchase technology resources to best prepare our students for the 21st century.

Title III

Services are provided through the District for education materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners.

Title X- Homeless

District Homeless Social Worker provides resources (clothing, school supplies, social services referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI funds are used to provide additional tutoring before and after school and for additional support during the school day.

Violence Prevention Programs

The school offers a non-violence and anti-drug program, to students, which incorporate field trips, community service, drug tests and counseling.

Nutrition Programs

FAU provides monthly nutrition lessons to our first and second grade students. We are also participating in the FFVP grant. Students are receiving fresh fruits and vegetables three times per week, to introduce them to healthy alternative they may not have access to in their daily lives.

Housing Programs

n/A

Head Start

Cresthaven Elem. currently has two Head Start classes. The purpose of the Head Start classes is to prepare preschool students for entrance into Kindergarten. The school works with the Headstart program to transition students from pre-school to elementary school by working with students and their families on readiness skills.

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.

Identify the school-based RtI Leadership Team.

Principal:

Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing RTI, conducts assessment of RTI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RTI implementation, and communicated with parents regarding school-based RTI plans and activities.

Select General Education Teachers (Primary and Intermediate):

Provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2 and 3 activities.

Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teachers: Participates in students data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching.

Instructional Coach (es) Reading/Math/Science:

Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student

need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at-risk"; assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.

Reading Instructional Specialist:

Provides guidance on K-12 reading plan, facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning; supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans.

School Psychologist:

Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation, facilitates data-based decision making activities.

Speech Language Pathologist:

Educates the team in the role language plays in curriculum, assessment, and instruction, as a basis for appropriate program design; assists in the selection of screening measures; and helps identify systemic patterns of student need with respect to language skills.

Student Services Personnel:

Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students. In addition to providing interventions, schools social workers continue to link child-servicing and community agencies to the schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.

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 team meets bi-monthly to engage in the following activities:

The ESE specialist coordinates and facilitates bi monthly meetings. Depending on the student's area of need, the school psychologist, school social worker, ESE specialist, Guidance Counselor, Reading Resource Specialist, and Assistant Principal share case worker duties.

Review universal screening data and link to instructional decisions; review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development and resources. The team will also collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skills. The team will also facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation.

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 RtI Leadership Team meets with the School Advisory Council (SAC) and principal to help develop the School Improvement Plan. The team provides data on Tier 1, 2, and 3 targets, academic and social/emotional areas that need to be addressed; helps set clear expectations for instruction; facilitates the development of a system approach to teaching; and aligns processes and procedures.

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.

Progress Monitoring: PMRN, Mini-Assessments, FCAT Simulation

Mid-Year: Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR) and Diagnostic Assessment for Reading (DAR)

End of the Year: FAIR, FCAT. Programs, used for reading intervention as outlined in the struggling reader's chart, are as follows: Quick Reads, Phonics for Reading, Wilson Foundations, Soar to Success, and Super QAR. Math intervention is addressed through the use of Harcourt interventions and Soar to Success.

Frequency of Data Days: Twice a month for data analysis

For students on tiers 2 and 3 the data sources that will be utilized are as follows: intervention records and progress monitoring graphs generated for individual students. Data is collected and tracked using cool tools, fluency, comprehension, phonics probes are administered bi-weekly and charted using ChartDog software.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional Development will be provided (Sept. 2012) by the Guidance Counselor, Reading Resource Specialist, and ESE specialist. The teachers will review the process and its purpose. Teachers new to the school will be oriented to the process and purpose by role playing and working in small groups. Teachers will have follow up in small sessions throughout the year. Support Staff will visit team meetings as assigned once monthly to discuss students in RtI process and progress monitor interventions. The RTI team will also evaluate additional staff professional development needs during the bi-weekly RTI Leadership Team meetings.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The Literacy Leadership Team will be comprised of the team leaders from each grade level, the reading coach, assistant principal, guidance counselor, ESE specialist, and the principal.

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

During monthly leadership meetings, literacy will be addressed. During the monthly LLT meetings the team will work collaboratively to review data and address the literacy needs of students. After the data is disaggregated, secondary instructional focus calendars will be put in place. After remediating benchmarks students will be assessed for mastery. The LLT will reconvene with data results to determine next steps. Students who have achieved mastery will be

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

The LLT will work with identified teachers to develop model classrooms. These classrooms will be used for demonstration of research based strategies for teachers who are struggling with reading instruction. Based on our data, the strategies will include but not be limited to the use of literacy centers, small group instruction, close reading, and reading think alouds.

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.

Kindergarten Round Up is held every year during the month of May to assist Head Start parents and new to kindergarten parents with the transition into kindergarten. Parents are able to tour the school, visit kindergarten classrooms, and find out about expectations and procedures for the next school year.

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

All students are assessed prior to or upon entering within the areas of Basic skills/School Readiness, Oral Language /Syntax, Print/Letter Knowledge, and Phonological Awareness/Processing.

Screening data will be collected and aggregated prior to September 10th, 2009. Data will be used to plan daily academic and social/emotional instruction for all students and for groups of students or individual students who may need intervention beyond core instruction. Core Kindergarten academic and behavioral instruction will include daily explicit instruction, modeling, guided practice and independent practice of all academic and/or social emotional skills identified by screening data. Social skills instruction will occur daily for 20 minutes using language, re-teaching, and positive reinforcement of pro-social behavior.

Screening tools will be re-administered mid-year and at the end of the year in order to determine student learning gains in

order to determine the need for changes to the instructional/intervention programs.

To ensure school readiness, the Head Start (HS) Program has implemented a new literacy, math, and science curricula in the 119 HS classrooms. The program has aligned the literacy and math standards with the K-3 national standards to improve educational outcomes. This transparent connection between curricula and child expectations has contributed to better prepare students to succeed in kindergarten. An end of the year Creative Curriculum Continuum report, detailing students' ongoing assessment, is placed in the students' cumulative folder to familiarize kindergarten teachers with the HS students' progress in the program.

Regarding the logistics of registering students at the elementary schools, the Head Start Program ensures a smooth transition to kindergarten by clearly specifying the necessary enrollment processes and timelines to all families participating in the program. The HS family services support team and the HS teachers provide ongoing guidance to the HS families by indicating the students' corresponding home school, immunization requirements, and dates scheduled for kindergarten roundup at those schools.

*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: | 30% of students will achieve proficiency (Level 3) on the FCAT Reading Test. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 27% (68) | 30% (75) |

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 not receiving differentiated reading skills instruction in comprehension. | Establish at least three reading groups, including one intervention group, within the classroom for small group differentiated instruction. | Principal, Assistant Principal, and Reading Coach | Administration will monitor implementation through Classroom Walk Through. Review student data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the Curriculum Framework/Instructional Focus Calendars | Effectiveness will be determined through mini-Benchmark and school-wide Assessments, and Treasures assessments. |
| 2 | Students not receiving enough instruction on the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards prior to the FCAT reading test. | Follow the District's Instructional Focus Calendar for Reading | Reading Coach | Administration will be aware of the IFCS upcoming focus and monitor implementation through Classroom Walk Through. | Authentic assessments and products |
| 3 | Students lack a strong reading vocabulary | Teacher will use Elements of Vocabulary program to enhance core curriculum. Teachers will be trained on research based strategies to help students learn and apply vocabulary. | Reading Coach | Administration and Reading Coach will monitor student progress through review of assessments. Administration will monitor through iObservation data. | Effectiveness determined by reviewing school wide data such as mini-benchmark tests in vocabulary. |

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: | 32% of students will achieve above proficiency (Levels 4 and 5) on the FCAT Reading Test. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 29%(72) | 32%(80) |

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 not having enough enrichment in reading instruction | Establish at least three reading groups, including one enrichment group, within the classroom for small group differentiated instruction. | Principal, Assistant Principal, and Reading Coach | Administration will monitor implementation through Marzano's iObservation. Review student data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the IFC. | Effectiveness will be determined through mini-Benchmark and school-wide Assessments. |
| 2 | Students not using higher order thinking in reading comprehension | Teacher will model think alouds and close readings for students. Students will work towards generating their own higher order thinking questions. | Reading Coach, administration | Authentic assessment and products in reading comprehension. Classroom iObservations. | iObservation generated data BAT, mini BAT, and Treasures Assessments |
| 3 | Students not engaged in enough practice with cognitive complexity. | Students will participate in project based learning to supplement core curriculum. Increase rigor by providing practice with higher order questioning and inquiry based projects with support from media specialist and teacher collaboration. | Reading Coach, Principal | Student produced products displayed in the classroom. | BAT and mini BAT Results, 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: | 82% of students will make Learning Gains in reading on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 79%(140) | 82%(145) |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Students are unaware of what they need to achieve in order to make learning gains. | Student achievement data chats will be conducted with all students following school-wide assessments | Principal and Reading Coach | Administration will review logs for student achievement data chats | BAT, mini BAT and Treasures assessments |
| 2 | Teachers are unaware of students' specific areas of weakness. | Teachers will explicitly infuse secondary reading benchmarks in lesson plans and instructional delivery. Data analysis of individual students | Principal, Reading Coach | Administration will focus their attention on explicit teaching of the reading benchmarks in other subject areas (Social Studies, Science, etc.) during classroom observations. | Mini-Benchmark Assessment Test and iObservation data |
| 3 | Teachers not instructing all of the necessary benchmarks before the FCAT reading test | Instructional Focus Calendars and Curriculum Frameworks will be utilized, which incorporate the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards in Reading and Common Core ELA. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach | Using data from school wide assessments, ongoing Mini-BATs, the BAT administered in December, and the FAIR will be analyzed to guide instruction. | Effectiveness will be determined through school wide and district assessments. |
| 4 | Students lack the stamina needed when reading for long periods of time as expected on the FCAT 2.0. | Establish a collection of high complexity texts in a variety of genres and provide students with independent reading choices and time for sustained silent reading. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach | Administration will monitor student assessment data. | Mini benchmark assessments, iObservation data, and 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:

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| 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: | 87% of students in the Lowest 25% will make learning gains in reading. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 84% (39) | 87% (40) |

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 below the 25th percentile not receiving enough intensive reading instruction. | Establish at least three reading groups, including one intervention Triumphs group, within the classroom for small group differentiated instruction. Teachers will utilize alternative programs outlined in the Struggling Readers Chart | Principal, Assistant Principal, and Reading Coach | Administration will monitor implementation through iObservations. Review student data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students according to the IFC and Curriculum Frameworks. | Effectiveness will be determined through mini-Benchmark Treasures and Triumphs Assessments |
| 2 | Students below the 25th percentile not receiving enough instruction on the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards prior to the FCAT reading test. | Follow the District's Instructional Focus Calendar for Reading and Curriculum Frameworks | Reading Coach | Administration will be aware of the IFCs upcoming focus and monitor implementation through iObservations | Effectiveness will be determined through mini-Benchmark and school-wide Assessments |
| 3 | Students below the 25th percentile lack background knowledge and specific vocabulary. | Expose students to a wide variety of genre by providing them with independent reading choices and time for silent sustained reading. | Principal and Assistant Principal. | Administration will monitor implementation through iObservation, Reader Response logs and Sustained Silent Reading graphs. | iObservation data, BAT, Mini BAT and Treasures/Triumphs assessment data Sustained Silent |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---------------|--|--|
| | | | | | Reading Charts indicating increased stamina. |
| 4 | Students below the 25th percentile lack grade level comprehension and fluency skills. | Opportunities for extended learning (ELO) in specific reading strategies will be offered as afterschool and Saturday FCAT Camps. | Reading Coach | Collaborative Problem Solving Team, Administration, and reading coach will review student data reports including RtI progress monitoring data. | Treasures, Triumphs, BAT and Mini-benchmark assessment data. |

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, based on the FCAT 2.0 data the following subgroups scored proficient (Levels 3 and above) as indicated below: American Indian - N/A Asian - N/A | | | | |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | 56% | 61% | 65% | 69% | 73% | |

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: | 75% White, 50% Black, 54% Hispanic, and 78% Asian students will make satisfactory progress in reading. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 28%(19)White, 53%(44) Black, 49%(43) Hispanic, 25%(1) Asian | 75%(51) White, 50%(42) Black, 54%(47) Hispanic, and 78% (3) Asian |

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 | Black and Hispanic students not having enough intensive reading instruction | Establish at least three reading groups, including one intervention group, within the classroom for small group differentiated instruction | Principal, Assistant Principal, and Reading Coach | Administration will monitor implementation through Marzano's iObservations. | Effectiveness will be determined through mini-Benchmark and school-wide Assessments |
| 2 | Students in the black, white, Asian, and Hispanic sub-groups not receiving enough instruction on the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards prior to the FCAT reading test. | Follow the District's Instructional Focus Calendar for Reading and curriculum frameworks. | Reading Coach | Administration will be aware of the IFCs upcoming focus and monitor implementation through iObservations. | Effectiveness will be determined through mini-Benchmark and school-wide Assessments. |

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

| | |
|---|--|
| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C: | 28% of English Language Learners will make satisfactory progress in reading. |
|---|--|

| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| 75%(35) | | | 28%(13) | | |
| 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 are unable to determine ELL students' specific areas of weakness due to language proficiency. | <p>*Determine core instructional needs by reviewing assessment data such as IPT, CELLA, DAR results, Mini-BATs, BAT 1 and 2 for all ELLs.</p> <p>*Plan differentiated instruction using evidence based instruction /interventions within 90 min. reading block.</p> <p>*Weekly data chats with grade level team; meet with the ELL committee-</p> <p>*Invite parents to join the meeting and provide feedback. Translation to be provided as necessary.</p> | Classroom Teacher, Principal, Assistant Principal and Reading Coach, ESOL coordinator | Review student data reports to ensure teachers are assessing students accordingly to the IFC and Curriculum Frameworks. Conduct data chats with teachers and students to monitor progress | Student Data Forms phonics, fluency and comprehension probes. Printouts of Mini-BATs |
| 2 | Students are not responding to core instruction. | Teachers will plan supplemental instruction/intervention including but not limited to explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice. Utilize supplemental materials including but not limited to Content Essentials, Radius bundle, and Sundance | Classroom Teacher, ESOL coordinator, and Assistant Principal | Student progress is assessed using results from BAT 2. Percent of students making adequate progress toward benchmarks are calculated. | Benchmark Assessment 2, mini-BATs, and FAIR results |
| 3 | Students are not responding to core plus supplemental instruction | Teachers will plan targeted intervention using the problem-solving process. Interventions will be matched to individual student needs, be evidence-based, and provided in addition to core. Including, but not limited to, peer observations and identifying master ESOL teachers and pairing them with teachers struggling with accommodations. | Collaborative Problem solving Team, ESE Specialist, Assistant Principal, ESOL Coordinator, Reading Coach | Grade-level teams will review results of the mini-assessments to determine progress toward benchmark (at least 75% of mastery on common assessment). Classroom observations at least once bi-weekly. | Mini-BAT assessments and BAT 2, Teacher/Administrator Data Chat meetings quarterly, Target *During monthly team leader meeting, areas will be targeted once quarterly. |
| 4 | Students do not demonstrate grade level appropriate vocabulary. Many lack background knowledge and strong vocabulary. | Students will use graphic organizers, nonlinguistic representations, context clues, and personal clues to learn essential vocabulary. Teachers will refer to | Collaborative Problem solving Team, ESE Specialist, Assistant Principal, ESOL Coordinator, Reading Coach | Monitor progress on school wide assessments that test vocabulary. | Treasures, Triumphs, BAT2, and mini benchmark assessments in vocabulary. |

the ESOL strategy matrix and CAV resources.

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: | 24% of students with disabilities will make satisfactory progress in reading. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 79% (23) | 24% (7) |

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 not receiving appropriate intensive reading instruction. | Students will receive differentiated instruction and teachers will utilize alternative programs outlined in the Struggling Readers Chart. | Principal, Assistant Principal, ESE Specialist, and Reading coach | Student assessment data will be closely monitored by Reading coach and ESE Specialist to determine satisfactory progress in targeted deficiencies. Frequent data chats between ESE teacher and general education teacher. | BAT 2, mini benchmark tests, Treasures and Triumphs assessment data. |

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: | 55% of Economically Disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in reading. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 48%(102) | 55%(116) |

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 | Economically disadvantaged students below not receiving appropriate intensive reading instruction | Establish at least three reading groups, including one intervention group, within the classroom for small group differentiated instruction. Teachers will utilize alternative programs outlined in the Struggling Readers Chart. | Principal, Assistant Principal, and Reading Coach | Administration will monitor implementation through iObservations. | Effectiveness will be determined through mini-Benchmark and school-wide Assessments |
| | Economically disadvantaged students not receiving enough | Follow the District's Instructional Focus Calendar for Reading | Reading Coach | Administration will be aware of the IFCs upcoming focus and | Effectiveness will be determined through mini- |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|---|
| 2 | instruction on the Sunshine State Standards prior to the FCAT reading test. | | | monitor implementation through iObservation | Benchmark and school-wide Assessments |
| 3 | Students lack the stamina needed when reading for long periods of time as expected on the FCAT 2.0. | Establish a collection of high complexity texts in a variety of genres and provide students with independent reading choices and time for sustained silent reading. | Principal, Assistant Principal, and Reading coach | Administration will monitor student assessment data. | BAT 2, mini benchmark assessments, and Core Reading curriculum assessments. |

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 |
|--|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| Professional Learning Community (Daily Cafe) with focus on Strategies for Building Reading Stamina and Independence. | K-5 | Classroom teacher leaders | Teachers K-5 | Once monthly for 2 hours. | Participant reflection journals, collaborative goal setting, and classroom iObservations. | Administration, PLC facilitators, and Reading Coach |
| Teacher training sessions on Instructional Implications of FAIR | K-5 | Reading Coach | Teachers K-5 | After school meetings following results of FAIR AP1, AP2, AP3. | Appropriate instruction and grouping based on results of FAIR data. | Administration and Reading Coach. |
| Teacher information seminars that focus on Explicit Teaching of Text Structure, Vocabulary and Theme identification. | 2-5 | Reading Coach | Teachers in grades 2-5 | 1.5 hours on Early Release Days. | Analyze student data on school wide reading assessments and classroom observations by peers and administration. | Administration and Reading Coach |
| PLC with focus of Marzano's Framework in relation to the ten Common Core anchor standards in reading. | K-5 | PLC facilitators/ teachers | Teachers in grades K-5 | Two hours each month. | Participants will keep reflection journals and conduct peer observations of effective use of reading strategies. | Administration and reading coach |

Reading Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s) /Material(s) | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------|------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Students who are not responding to reading core instruction will be provided with intervention | Research-based materials | SAC/Accountability | \$500.00 |

| | | | |
|---|------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------|
| materials. | | | Subtotal: \$500.00 |
| 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 |
| District Training | Substitute teachers/stipends | Title I | \$9,000.00 |
| Reading professional Development | Books, materials, supplies | Title I | \$6,100.00 |
| FAIR overview and implications for instruction | Reading Coach | | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$15,100.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Substitute teachers to provide temporary coverage for student assessments | Substitute teachers | Title I | \$3,000.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$3,000.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$18,600.00 |

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: | | 47% of students will score proficient in listening and speaking on the CELLA. | | | |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking: | | | | | |
| 44% (75) | | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | Students are not authentically engaged in listening and speaking activities in the classroom. | Teachers will utilize the ESOL Strategy matrix to provide opportunities for cooperative learning. | Administration, Reading coach, and ESOL Contact | Classroom iObservations will be conducted to monitor teacher use of effective cooperative learning strategies. | Student presentations and cooperative group projects. |

| | |
|---|--|
| 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: | 26% of students will score proficient in reading on the CELLA. |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading: | |
| | |

23% (39)

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 are unable to determine ELL students' specific areas of weakness in reading comprehension due to language proficiency. | Plan differentiated instruction that targets the intervention needed to help the student reach proficiency. ESOL paraprofessional will provide instruction with CAVs. | Administration, Reading Coach, and ESOL contact | Conduct data chats with teachers to monitor progress. Review data reports to inform instruction. | Progress monitoring assessments listed on Struggling Reader chart. |

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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|----------------------------------|
| 1 | Students have a limited vocabulary due to language proficiency. | Teachers will utilize more realia, pictures, and videos to provide connections to English language. | Administration and Reading Coach | Teachers will review student writing notebooks to monitor use of richer vocabulary. | Writing prompts and assignments. |

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: | 35% of students will achieve proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in mathematics. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 32% (82) | 35%(87) |

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 | Determining students' specific areas of weakness. | Utilize FCIM to identify students in the core curriculum needing intervention and enrichment | . Principal, Classroom Teacher and Leadership Team | Review student grouping charts frequently and ensure groups are redesigned to target the need of students based on assessment | Progress of all students on GO MATH! Big Idea assessment. |
| 2 | Students not having adequate intensive mathematics instruction | Establish at least three math groups, including one intervention group, within the classroom for small group differentiated instruction. | Principal Classroom Teacher and Leadership Team | Review student grouping charts frequently and ensure groups are redesigned to target the need of students based on assessment | Ongoing Progress Monitoring of all students utilizing GO MATH! Big Ideas assessments, observations, and chapter tests. |
| 3 | Students lack prerequisite skills necessary for grade level concepts. | Use GO Math Getting Ready for Math test on that grade level. Diagnose the areas of weakness from the problems missed and then use the online interventions for at -risk students. | Principal, Assistant Principal, and classroom teacher | Analyze student data to inform instruction. | School wide math assessments (Go Math), BAT 1 and 2, and mini-benchmark tests. |

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following 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: | 36% of students will achieve above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in mathematics. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 33% (82) | 36%(90) |

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 | Determining students' specific areas of weakness | Utilize FCIM to identify students in the core curriculum needing intervention and enrichment | Principal, Classroom Teacher and Leadership Team | Review student grouping charts frequently and ensure groups are redesigned to target the need of students based on assessment | Progress of all students on assessment. |
| 2 | Students not having enough enrichment in mathematics instruction | Establish at least three math groups within the classroom for small group differentiated instruction and mathematics centers. | Principal Classroom Teacher and Leadership Team | Review student grouping charts frequently and ensure groups are redesigned to target the need of students based on assessment | Ongoing Progress Monitoring of all students utilizing mini-BAT assessments, observations, and chapter tests. |
| 3 | Students not making transition from concrete to abstract. | Provide enrichment using Go Math Enrichment book activities. | Administration and classroom teachers | Analyze student data to inform instruction | Go Math chapter tests, BAT 1 and 2, and mini benchmark. |

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: | 80% of students will make Learning Gains in mathematics |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 77% (136) | 80% (140) |

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 | Determining students' specific areas of weakness | Utilize FCIM to identify students in the core curriculum needing intervention and enrichment. | Principal, Classroom Teacher and Leadership Team | Review student grouping charts frequently and ensure groups are redesigned to target the need of students based on assessment | Progress of all students on assessment. |
| 2 | Students not having enough intensive/enrichment mathematics instruction | Establish at least three math groups, including one intervention group, within the classroom for small group differentiated instruction. | Principal Classroom Teacher and Leadership Team | Review student grouping charts frequently and ensure groups are redesigned to target the need of students based on assessment | Ongoing Progress Monitoring of all students utilizing mini-BAT assessments, observations, and chapter tests. |
| 3 | Provide time to analyze individual student data. | Grade level teachers analyze data together. | Administration and Team Leaders | Review student data frequently to inform instruction and remediation | School wide assessment data: BAT 1 and 2 and chapter tests |

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following 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: | 75 % of students in the Lowest 25% will make learning gains in mathematics. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 72%(33) | 75%(35) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|--|---|--|---|
| 1 | Students are not exposed to visual representation of concrete concepts. | Teachers will reinforce instruction through the use of GO MATH! iTools. | Principal, Assistant Principal | Classroom Walk Through | *During monthly team leader meeting, areas will be targeted once quarterly.. |
| 2 | Students are not exposed to real world, hands-on experiences. | Students will be provided with real world, hands-on experiences through the use of manipulatives in small group center activities. | Principal and Assistant Principal | Classroom Walkthrough | *During monthly team leader meeting, areas will be targeted once quarterly. |
| 3 | Students not making the transition from concrete to abstract math concepts. | Increase the use of mathematical processes to reinforce mathematics concepts. | Principal, Team Leaders and the Leadership Team | Team Leaders will assist teachers in the creation of centers and stations, and administration will ensure activities are implemented | Observations, mini-BAT assessments and school-wide assessments. |
| 4 | Students in the lowest 25th percentile groups not being identified | Identify and closely monitor the progress of the lowest 25 percentile consistently; revise instruction and intervention groups as indicated by student progress. | Principal and Leadership Team | Maintain a record of strategies and interventions utilized with the lowest 25 percentile | Increased achievement between BAT 1 & 2 assessments. Increased achievement between school-wide assessments. |
| 5 | Administrators not closely monitoring the implementation of mathematics. | Classroom iObservations will be conducted for each teacher to monitor the implementation and effectiveness of the mathematics strategies being taught. | Principal and Assistant Principal | Analyze data obtained from iObservation data | Increased achievement between BAT 1 & 2 assessments, mini-BATs and school-wide assessments. |

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

Elementary School Mathematics Goal #

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

5A : In 2012, based on the FCAT 2.0 data the following subgroups scored proficient (Levels 3 and above) as indicated below:
 American Indian - N/A
 Asian - N/A

| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
|-------------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | 66% | 72% | 75% | 77% | 80% | |

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: | 87% White, 49% Black, 45% Hispanic students will make satisfactory progress in mathematics. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 16%(11) White, 46%(38) Black, 42%(36) Hispanic | 87%(59) White, 49%(41) Black, 45%(39) Hispanic |

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 not making the transition from concrete to abstract math concepts | Increase the use of mathematical processes to reinforce mathematics concepts. | Principal, Team Leaders and the Leadership Team | Team Leaders will assist teachers in the creation of centers and stations, and administration will ensure activities are implemented | Observations, mini-BAT assessments and school-wide assessments. |
| 2 | Students in the black and Hispanic sub- groups not being identified | Identify and closely monitor the progress of the effected ethnic sub-groups consistently; revise instruction and intervention groups as indicated by student progress. | Principal and Leadership Team | Maintain a record of strategies and interventions utilized with the lowest 25 percentile. | Increased achievement between BAT 1 & 2 assessments. Increased achievement between school-wide assessments |
| 3 | Teachers not using the appropriate level of cognitive complexity to instruct students in the NGSSS for math. | Teachers will be provided training through the district and co plan lessons to address students' specific needs to incorporate more rigor. | Principal and Assistant Principal | Analyze data obtained from Classroom Observations | Increased achievement between BAT 1 & 2 assessments, mini-BATs and school-wide assessments. |

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

| | |
|---|--|
| 5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C: | 43% of English Language Learners (ELL) will make satisfactory progress in mathematics. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 60%(28) | 43%(20) |

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 not making the transition from concrete to abstract math concepts | Utilize CAVS math and other supplemental material in small groups | Principal and Leadership Team | Team Leader will assist teachers in the creation of centers and stations, and administration will ensure activities are implemented | Progress of students on BAT 1 & 2 and mini-assessments *During monthly team leader meeting, areas will be targeted once quarterly. |
| 2 | Lack of parental support due to language barrier | Provide parent night training in native language to explain GO Math, IFC....etc Educate parents on use of BEEP and online textbooks. | Administration and Leadership Team | Attendance (parental involvement) will be monitored. | Go Math chapter tests and homework assessments. |

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

| | |
|--|---|
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D: | 34% of students with disabilities will make satisfactory progress in mathematics. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 69% (20) | 34% (10) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|
| 1 | Students are instructed on one level and tested on another level. | Expose to grade level curriculum while concentrating on IEP goals. Provide students with practice on both levels. Use Touch Math program with an ESE teacher to address those areas. | Administration, classroom teachers, and ESE Specialist. | Assess with KEY MATH, find areas of weakness. | Key Math assessments, Go Math chapter tests, BAT 1 and 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 subgroup:

| | |
|---|--|
| 5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E: | 64% of the Economically Disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in mathematics. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 39%(82) | 64%(134) |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|---|---|--|--|
| 1 | Students are not able to make the concrete concepts to visual representations | Teachers will reinforce instruction through the use of GO MATH! iTools. | Classroom Teacher, Principal, and Assistant Principal | Classroom iObservations | *During monthly team leader meeting, areas will be targeted once quarterly. |
| 2 | Economically disadvantaged students not making the transition from concrete to abstract math concepts. | Increase the use of mathematical processes and hands-on activities to reinforce mathematics concepts. | Principal and Team Leaders | Team Leaders will assist teachers in the creation of centers and stations, and administration will ensure activities are implemented | Progress of students on BAT 1 & 2 assessments, mini-BATs and school-wide assessments. |
| 3 | Economically disadvantaged students not being identified. | *Identify and closely monitor the progress economically disadvantaged students consistently; revise instruction and intervention groups as indicated by student progress. | Principal and Team Leadership | Principal and Team Leadership | Increased achievement between BAT 1 & 2 assessments, mini-BAT assessments and school-wide assessments. |
| 4 | Do not have background knowledge or exposure that non at risk students do. | Provide more real world exposure, i.e. Field trips, community education nights etc. Go Math real world connections videos and the Future channel videos. | Classroom teacher and Administration | Analyze data from assessments to inform instruction or remediation. | BAT 1 and @, Go Math chapter tests, and mini-BATS. |

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

Mathematics Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|--|--------------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Provide practice for basic math concepts utilizing software. | Touch Math software | Title I | \$1,000.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$1,000.00 |
| 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: \$1,000.00 |

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: | | 45% of students will achieve proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in science. | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| 42% (39) | | 45% (42) | | | |
| 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 not providing enough hands on science learning experiences. | Utilize hands-on laboratory experiments and provide real-world science experiences and engaging activities as prescribed in the district instructional focus calendar and ELA curriculum frameworks. | Principal, Assistant Principal | Students will use a journal/notebook and Florida Science Fusion Assessments. | Student journal/notebook rubric Targeted *During monthly team leader meeting, areas will be targeted once quarterly. |
| 2 | Students not receiving enough instruction on the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards for science prior to the FCAT Science test | Teachers will follow the District's Instructional Focus Calendar and primary teachers will prepare students through curriculum frameworks for CCSS. | Principal, Assistant Principal, Classroom Teachers | Monitor IFC and the pacing of the correlation chart of science kits with fidelity (will be monitored by the Principal). Evidence of student work displayed and students science journals with current entries | Improvement on the Science mini assessments and district's BAT 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: | 15% of students will achieve above proficiency (FCAT Level 4 or 5) in science. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 12% (7) | 15%(9) |

| 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 not using the resources from the the state to enrich science instruction | Teachers will register students in FCAT explorer science, CPALMS, and Florida Achieves. | Classroom Teachers, Assistant principal | Students complete the FCAT Explorer science with 80% accuracy. | CWT and FCAT Explorer reports pulled weekly. *During monthly team leader meeting, areas will be targeted once quarterly. |
| 2 | Students are not provided with real world critical thinking opportunities. | Students will be provided with real world, hands on critical thinking opportunities through the use of BCHS kits, Science Fusion hands on science activities, virtual labs, science journals, and student created projects to enrich student knowledge of the scientific process through out the school year. | Classroom Teachers, Administration | Teacher observation, documentation through the use of science journals and Science Fusion Assessments. | Science journals/notebook rubric |
| 3 | Teachers not providing additional hands on science learning experiences. | Utilize hands-on laboratory experiments and provide real-world science experiences and engaging activities as prescribed in the district instructional focus calendar. | Classroom teachers and Administration | Teacher observation and classroom iObservation by administration. | Science journals, BAT 1 and 2, and miniBAT 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 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: | 87% of students will score level 3.0 and higher in writing. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| 84% (68) | 87%(70) |

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 not providing ample opportunities for students to write daily. | Students will use the writing process daily across the curriculum; all writing will be dated, and recorded in a journal, notebook, or work folder for monitoring of growth across time. | Principal and Reading Coach | A school wide consistent method of saving student work will be established. Teachers will be required to have a designated writing block. | Progress between the Pretest Prompt and Mid-Year Prompt. |
| 2 | Students not receiving explicit instruction on the revision and editing process | The revision and editing process will be explicitly taught and seen in student writing drafts through BEEP lessons. | Reading Coach, Classroom Teachers and Principal | Classroom teachers, the reading coach and administration will monitor revision and editing process by reviewing student drafts. | Progress between the Pretest Prompt and Mid-Year Prompt. |
| 3 | Students not being identified as scoring a 4.0 or higher. | Students will simulate the FCAT Writing Assessment once a month. Students scoring below 4.0 will be assigned a writing tutor. Students scoring a 4.0 or higher will receive enrichment through small group instruction. | Principal and Reading Coach | Classroom Walk Throughs conducted by administration and student scores. | *The school scoring team will score each students writing sample using the six-traits and compare progress between prompts. *During monthly team leader meeting, areas will be targeted once quarterly. |
| 4 | Students have a limited vocabulary and lack of life experiences. | Teachers will use more pictures, videos, and provide them more exposure to a wide variety of activities. They will also have more exposure to great | Classroom Teachers, Media Specialist, Reading Coach | Teachers will keep writing portfolios or writer's notebooks. | The students' work samples/finished pieces. |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|---|----------------------------------|--|---|
| | | writing and books. | | | |
| 5 | Students have limited grammar and spelling skills. | Students will be taught grammar lessons before and during writing block. Grammar will explicitly be taught beginning in grade K-5. Writing will be monitored for conventions on a daily basis. Provide classrooms with English/Grammar Materials. | Administration and Reading Coach | Teachers and Support Staff will analyze student writing samples for evidence of adequate spelling and mechanics. | Student writing samples in form of writing prompts will be scored by support staff. |

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 | | | |

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|--------------------|
| Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement: | | | | | |
| 1. Attendance Attendance Goal # 1: | | By June 2013, the number of excessive absences and tardies will decrease by 10%. | | | |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: | | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: | | | |
| 95%(522) | | 98%(539) | | | |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | | | |
| 40 | | 36 | | | |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | | | |
| 130 | | 117 | | | |
| 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 motivation to attend school regularly | Cresthaven Elementary will provide incentives quarterly to students with less than 3 absences in a quarter | Assistant Principal | Weekly attendance reports Interim Reports | Attendance records |
| 2 | Lack of motivation to attend school regularly. | Students that have 3 unexcused absences/tardies will receive a social worker | BTIP coordinator Social Worker | Monthly attendance reports Rtl Interim Reports | Attendance records |

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: | By June 2013, the number of suspensions will decrease by 10%. |
| 2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions |
| | |

| | |
|---|--|
| 29 | 26 |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School |
| 18 | 16 |
| 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions |
| 10 | 7 |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School |
| 6 | 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 | Not all teachers have a classroom management plan | Teachers will develop concrete classroom management plans with leveled consequences | Principal and Assistant principal | iObservations | iObservation documentation |
| 2 | Teachers are not following school wide behavior intervention plan | Assistant principal will work with the discipline committee to ensure implementation of plan with fidelity. | Assistant Principal | Monitor number of referrals written | Referral data |

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

| | |
|--|--|
| 1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i> | Increase teacher communication with parents to 40% of their students' parents at least once per quarter. |
| 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement: | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: |
| 10%(60) | 40%(240) |

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 not feeling comfortable attending school-wide activities for families | Evaluate our school's "Family Friendly" rating. | Principal, Parent Liaison | Collect feedback surveys from parents and teachers. Plan activities and strategies to increase positive interaction with all family groups | Parent and Teacher Surveys |
| 2 | Family activities not being clearly communicated to all stakeholders. | Publicize event using multiple methods (newsletters, parent link, and fliers | Principal/Assistant Principal | Collect attendance rosters from each event. | Maintain attendance rosters in each classroom. |

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 |
| Family Math Night | food, salaries, materials, and supplies | Title I | \$300.00 |
| Increase parent/teacher communication | School Agenda books | Title I | \$1,000.00 |
| Reading Under the Stars (family reading night) | Food and supplies | Title I | \$550.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$1,850.00 |
| 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: \$1,850.00 |

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 |
| Reading | Students who are not responding to reading core instruction will be provided with intervention materials. | Research-based materials | SAC/Accountability | \$500.00 |
| Parent Involvement | Family Math Night | food, salaries, materials, and supplies | Title I | \$300.00 |
| Parent Involvement | Increase parent/teacher communication | School Agenda books | Title I | \$1,000.00 |
| Parent Involvement | Reading Under the Stars (family reading night) | Food and supplies | Title I | \$550.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$2,350.00 |
| Technology | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Mathematics | Provide practice for basic math concepts utilizing software. | Touch Math software | Title I | \$1,000.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$1,000.00 |
| Professional Development | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | District Training | Substitute teachers/stipends | Title I | \$9,000.00 |
| Reading | Reading professional Development | Books, materials, supplies | Title I | \$6,100.00 |
| Reading | FAIR overview and implications for instruction | Reading Coach | | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$15,100.00 |
| Other | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Substitute teachers to provide temporary coverage for student assessments | Substitute teachers | Title I | \$3,000.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$3,000.00 |
| | | | | Grand Total: \$21,450.00 |

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 9/4/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

The majority of the SAC members are not employed by the school district. The SAC is composed of the principal and an appropriately

balanced number of teachers, education support employees, students (for middle and high school only), parents, and other business and community citizens who are representative of the ethnic, racial, and economic community served by the school. Please verify the statement above by selecting "Yes" or "No" below.

✓ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

| Projected use of SAC Funds | Amount |
|--|----------|
| Research Based Reading materials aligned with the struggling reader's chart. | \$500.00 |

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

The will conduct monthly meetings addressing SIP goals, parental involvement, and identified student needs.

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 CRESTHAVEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011 | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------|---|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 73% | 85% | 92% | 54% | 304 | 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% | 86% | | | 158 | 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? | 65% (YES) | 78% (YES) | | | 143 | 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 | | | | | 605 | |
| 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 CRESTHAVEN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010 | | | | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------|---|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 70% | 74% | 94% | 51% | 289 | Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component. |
| % of Students Making Learning Gains | 68% | 75% | | | 143 | 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? | 61% (YES) | 67% (YES) | | | 128 | 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 | | | | | 560 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | A | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |