FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: TRADEWINDS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Broward

Principal: Mr. Michael A. Breslaw

SAC Chair: Tara Hessberger/Raiko Knight

Superintendent: Robert W. Runcie

Date of School Board Approval: December 4, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/25/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
					2011-2012: School Grade: A, Reading: 66% at or above grade level, 74% Learning Gains, 71% Lowest 25th Percentile Math: 74% at or above grade level, 78% Learning Gains, 71 % Lowest 25th Percentile Science: 59% at or above grade level, Writing: 85% meeting state standards. Reading: Total - 66%, Asian - 80%, White - 71%, Black - 48%, Hispanic - 62%, Economically Disadvantaged - 55%, English Language Learners - 47%, Students With Disabilities - 41%. Mathematics: Total - 74%, Asian - 96%, White - 82%, Black - 52%, Hispanic - 66%, Economically Disadvantaged - 60%, English Language Learners - 55%, Students With Disabilities - 50%. Writing: Total - 85% 2010-2011: School Grade: A,

Principal	Michael A. Breslaw	Masters in Educational Leadership (K-12), Bachelor of Science in English Literature and Broadcast Journalism, Certification in School Principal (All Levels) and Elementary Education (Grades 1-6) with endorsements for ESOL (K-12).	2	11	Reading: 71% at or above grade level, 71% Learning Gains, 73% Lowest 25th Percentile Math: 75% at or above grade level, 66% Learning Gains, 59% Lowest 25th Percentile Science: 49% at or above grade level, Writing: 78% meeting state standards. AYP Reading: Total - 65%, White - 81%, Black - 47%, Hispanic - 54%, Economically Disadvantaged - 56%, English Language Learners - 42%, Students With Disabilities - 42%. Reading proficiency was met with White Students Reading proficiency was not met with Total, Black, Economically Disadvantaged, Hispanic, English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities AYP Mathematics: Total - 70%, White - 79%, Black - 53%, Hispanic - 69%, Economically Disadvantaged - 61%, English Language Learners - 54%, Students With Disabilities - 48%. Math proficiency was not met with Total, White, Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, English Language Learners and Students With Disabilities AYP Writing: White - 93%, Black - 95% and Economically Disadvantaged - 95% Writing proficiency was met with all subgroups. 2009-2010: School Grade: C, Reading: 68% at or above grade level, 57% Learning Gains, 44% Lowest 25th Percentile Math: 77% at or above grade level, 59% Learning Gains, 66% Lowest 25th Percentile Science: 39% at or above grade level, Writing: 72% meeting state standards. AYP Reading: Total - 63%, White - 74%, Black - 44%, Hispanic - 58%, Economically Disadvantaged - 54%, English Language Learners - 37%. Reading proficiency was met with White and Hispanic subgroups. Reading proficiency was not met with Total, Black, Economically Disadvantaged and English Language Learners. AYP Mathematics: Total - 72%, White - 80%, Black - 58%, Hispanic - 71%, Economically Disadvantaged - 66%, English Language Learners - 54%. Math proficiency was met with the White subgroup. Math proficiency was not met with Total, Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged and English Language Learners. AYP Writing: Total - 86%, White - 89%, Black - 83% and Economically Disadvantaged - 85% Writing proficiency was not met with Total, White, Black or Economically Disadvantaged.
					2011-2012: School Grade: A, Reading: 66% at or above grade level, 74% Learning Gains, 71% Lowest 25th Percentile Math: 74% at or above grade level, 78% Learning Gains, 71 % Lowest 25th Percentile Science: 59% at or above grade level, Writing: 85% meeting state standards. Reading: Total - 66%, Asian - 80%, White - 71%, Black - 48%, Hispanic - 62%, Economically Disadvantaged - 55%, English Language Learners - 47%, Students With Disabilities - 41%. Mathematics: Total - 74%, Asian - 96%, White - 82%, Black - 52%, Hispanic - 66%, Economically Disadvantaged - 60%, English Language Learners - 55%, Students With Disabilities - 50%. Writing: Total - 85% 2010-2011: School Grade: A, Reading: 85% at or above grade level, 66% Learning Gains, 56% Lowest 25th Percentile Math: 89% at or above grade level, 71% Learning Gains, 66% Lowest 25th

					Percentile Science: 57% at or above grade level, Writing: 97% meeting state standards. AYP Reading: Total - 79%, White – NA, Black - 72%, Hispanic - 64%, Economically Disadvantaged - 57%, English Language Learners - 51%, Students With Disabilities - 42%. Reading proficiency was met with White Students Reading proficiency was not met with Total, Economically Disadvantaged, Hispanic, English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities AYP Mathematics: Total - 87%, White – NA, Black - 77%, Hispanic - 71%, Economically Disadvantaged - 70%, English Language Learners - 54%, Students With Disabilities - 62%. Math proficiency was not met with Total, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, English Language Learners and Students With Disabilities AYP Writing: White - 100%, Black - 100% and Economically Disadvantaged - 94%, Hispanic- 96% Writing proficiency was met with all subgroups. 2009-2010: School Grade: A, Reading: 87% at or above grade level, 66% Learning Gains, 51% Lowest 25th Percentile. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED, ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS, STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES students in this school need improvement in Reading. Math: 87% at or above grade level, 71% Learning Gains, 60% Lowest 25th Percentile. ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS, STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES students in this school need improvement in Math. Science: 63% at or above grade level, Writing: 85% meeting state standards.
Assis Principal	Tracy Gruendel	Masters in Educational Leadership/Certification in Educational Leadership and Elementary Education ESOL endorsement	7	7	

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)
		Masters Degree in Educational Leadership, Bachelor of Arts in			2011-2012: School Grade: A, Reading: 66% at or above grade level, 74% Learning Gains, 71% Lowest 25th Percentile Math: 74% at or above grade level, 78% Learning Gains, 71 % Lowest 25th Percentile Science: 59% at or above grade level, Writing: 85% meeting state standards. Reading: Total - 66%, Asian - 80%, White - 71%, Black - 48%, Hispanic - 62%, Economically Disadvantaged - 55%, English Language Learners - 47%, Students With Disabilities - 41%. Mathematics: Total - 74%, Asian - 96%, White - 82%, Black - 52%, Hispanic - 66%, Economically Disadvantaged - 60%, English Language Learners - 55%, Students With Disabilities - 50%. Writing: Total - 85% 2010-2011: School Grade: A, Reading: 71% at or above grade level, 71% Learning Gains, 73% Lowest 25th Percentile Math: 75% at or above grade level, 66% Learning Gains, 59% Lowest 25th Percentile Science: 49% at or above grade level, Writing: 78% meeting state standards.

Reading	Denise Acevedo	Elementary Education. ESOL Endorsed. Certified by National Board of Professional Teaching Practices Nationally Board Certified	12	6.5	AYP Reading: Total - 65%, White - 81%, Black - 47%, Hispanic - 54%, Economically Disadvantaged - 56%, English Language Learners - 42%, Students With Disabilities - 42%. Reading proficiency was met with White Students Reading proficiency was not met with Total, Black, Economically Disadvantaged, Hispanic, English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities AYP Mathematics: Total - 70%, White - 79%, Black - 53%, Hispanic - 69%, Economically Disadvantaged - 61%, English Language Learners - 54%, Students With Disabilities - 48%. Math proficiency was not met with Total, White, Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, English Language Learners and Students With Disabilities AYP Writing: White - 93%, Black - 95% and Economically Disadvantaged - 95% Writing proficiency was met with all subgroups. 2009-2010: School Grade: A, Reading: 87% at or above grade level, 66% Learning Gains, 51% Lowest 25th Percentile. ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED, ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS, STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES students in this school need improvement in Reading. Math: 87% at or above grade level, 71% Learning Gains, 60% Lowest 25th Percentile. ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS, STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES students in this school need improvement in Math. Science: 63% at or above grade level, Writing: 85% meeting state standards.

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	Teachers participate in staff development sessions to master effective teaching practices: Implementation of the Common Core State Standards, Robert J. Marzano's Effective Supervision, The Art and Science of Teaching and Classroom Instruction that Works, Gail Boushey and Joan Moser's The Cafe Book and The Daily 5.	Principal with staff development committee	Ongoing	
2	Participation in workshops is differentiated for all instructional staff. The 2012-2013 school year will include core trainings in reading, math, science and social studies for new and newer staff. STEM, Common Core State Standard and Marzano's Effective Supervision and The Art and Science of Teaching will be ongoing staff development for all instructional staff.	Administrators with staff development committee and individual teachers	Ongoing	
3	All new staff members receive mentors and/or NESS Coaches (experienced or inexperienced).	Principal	June 2013	
4	All instructional members participate in professional learning communities to increase knowledge, share best practices and collaborate with colleagues.	Principal and Field Experience Contact	June 2013	
5	Beginning teachers participate in a bi-weekly New to Tradewinds Professional Learning Community and are provided with mentors and NESS coaches to enable them to make a positive professional transition.	Principal and NESS Liaison	June 2013	
6	Staff achievements are recognized and celebrated throughout the year in a variety of formats.	Administrators	June 2013	
7	The current school administrative team mentors aspiring administrators from the school and other sites.	Administrators	June 2013	
8	School leaders are involved in the selection and interviewing of prospective staff members.	Principals	Ongoing	Staff selection is done as needed.
9	The administrators attend recruitment fairs and other professional events to highlight the school as a positive worksite.	Administrators	Ongoing	Public relations are an ongoing process.
10	Instructional staff members will learn Daily 5 and CAFE strategies along with the 7 Keys to Comprehension through professional learning community opportunities.	Administrators	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
74	1.4%(1)	9.5%(7)	45.9%(34)	43.2%(32)	41.9%(31)	100.0%(74)	1.4%(1)	23.0%(17)	97.3%(72)

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
Denise Acevedo	Paula Canady	Ms. Acevedo is our Reading Coach and has been assigned to mentor, plan and model instruction. Mrs. Canady is new from Human Resource Development and has been assigned outside of a classroom position for 15+ years.	Weekly planning, modeling instruction and implementation of The Common Core State Standards.
Elizabeth Fraschetti	Alison Levine	Mrs. Fraschetti has been assigned to collaborate with Mrs. Levine as she is new to Tradewinds Elementary from a middle school.	Operational and overall functioning of the school.
Karen Adams	Elisha Agami	Mrs. Adams has been assigned to collaborate with Mrs. Levine as she is new to Tradewinds Elementary.	Weekly planning, modeling instruction and implementation of The Common Core State Standards. Operational and overall functioning of the school.
		Mrs. Miscio is	

Renee Miscio	Lisa Widelitz	an experienced ESE Program Specialist in the county. She provides collaborative assistance and support.	On-going peer collaboration
Samantha Gac	Wendy Friedman	Ms. Gac has been assigned to collaborate with Mrs. Friedman as she is new to Tradewinds Elementary.	Weekly planning, modeling instruction and implementation of The Common Core State Standards. Operational and overall functioning of the school.
Rachel Sterling	Andrea Gelman	Mrs. Sterling has been assigned to collaborate with Mrs. Gelman as she is new to Tradewinds Elementary.	Weekly planning, modeling instruction and implementation of The Common Core State Standards. Operational and overall functioning of the school.
Cathy Bean	Anicee Lawrie	Mrs. Bavaro has been assigned to collaborate with Mrs. Lawrie as she is a first year teacher.	Weekly planning, modeling instruction and implementation of The Common Core State Standards. Operational and overall functioning of the school.

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

NA

Title I, Part C- Migrant

NA

Title I, Part D

NA

Title II

NA

Title III

NA

Title X- Homeless

NA

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

YES

Violence Prevention Programs

NA

Nutrition Programs

NA

Housing Programs

NA

Head Start

NA

Adult Education

NA

Career and Technical Education

NA

Job Training

NA

Other

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Tradewinds Elementary's RtI Leadership team is comprised of the Principal (Michael Breslaw), Assistant Principal (Tracy Gruendel), Reading Resource Specialist (Denise Acevedo), Autism Coach (Erika Valbuena), ESE Specialist (Lisa Widelitz), School Psychologist (Anne Rosen), Social Worker (Kimberly Marr) and Guidance Counselor (Raiko Knight). All members of the RtI team serve as liaisons to the other members of the staff. The RtI Leadership team collaboratively solves comprehensive problems at bi-weekly meetings to address the needs and progress of individual students. The CPST tracks individual qualitative and quantitative data on students from the time they are first discussed with the team.

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

The RtI Leadership Team meets bi-weekly with the Principal (Michael Breslaw), Assistant Principal (Tracy Gruendel), Reading Resource Specialist (Denise Acevedo), Autism Coach (Erika Valbuena), ESE Specialist (Lisa Widelitz), School Psychologist (Anne Rosen), Social Worker (Kimberly Marr) and Guidance Counselor (Raiko Knight) to discuss school wide goals and initiatives and make plans to implement the necessary action steps to meet the needs of individual students. Hard copy records are managed by the school's guidance counselor/ESE teacher Raiko Knight and brought to each meeting. Working documents are kept on file by the school's principal. Members of the team share the information with the school's leadership team, which consists of all the members of the RtI team, SAC Chair, and team leaders. As a part of their meetings, they analyze school data, identify areas for improvement and develop action plans. They discuss and plan school wide activities, conduct classroom walkthroughs and share and model good teaching practices. In addition, the team works on curriculum standards, discusses school and county policies, and reviews current literature. They examine intervention programs available and evaluate the programs that are in place. The school's leadership team receives training to increase their ability to identify interventions for students not success in Tier 1, and to mentor others so that more teachers will successfully use interventions. All data is stored in File Maker Pro databases.

RTI data is routinely inspected in the areas of reading, writing, mathematics and social behavior in all subgroups. Data is used to make decisions about differentiation and modifications in core curriculum and behavior management strategies for all students. The same data is used to screen for at-risk students who may be in need of Tier 2 or 3 interventions. All students are referred to the CPST team for intervention and strategies for improvement. Progress monitoring is routinely inspected at Tier 1, 2 and 3. For Tiers 2 and 3, intervention records and progress monitoring graphs are generated for individual students.A ll data is stored in the school data base system for easy retrieval.

The RtI Team collaboratively works with the leadership and staff development teams: Amy Towne, Kelly Weingart, Susan Didway, Keelyn Stein, Erin Bell and Laura Lee to identify professional development needs. Selected staff members have been trained in a variety of academic strategies and programs (ie.. Just Words, Daily 5/CAFE Strategies, CHAMPS, BASSS other programs for behavioral needs).

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?

Representatives from the leadership team participate in the development and implementation of the school improvement plan. Members of the leadership team analyze the assessment data in all grade levels to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the students, teachers, grade levels and the school. This information is then used to develop professional development sessions for teachers and goals for the school improvement plan. All teams are represented at School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings. The team representatives serve as a liaison, sharing information from the grade level to the community (and vice-versa). They advise the School Advisory Council when additional training or resources are needed to meet goals. Teams report and share their classroom data to determine progress on school goals.

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.

Test data is summarized for each tier in reading, mathematics, science and writing at all grade levels and used to place students in appropriate academic programs to best meet their needs. Classroom teachers closely monitor the progress of students. Assessments include, but are not limited to, Informal Reading Inventories, standardized tests, Diagnostic Assessment of Reading, DRA, Rigby, TEMA, TOMA and FAIR. Data from mini-benchmarks and other assessments are discussed weekly at team meetings and best practices are shared. This information is shared with administrators through weekly team reports. The RtI Team and ESE teachers examine all data on ESE students and consult with district personnel to provide students with appropriate services and programs. Schedules are constructed to accommodate the selected instructional models.

RTI data is routinely inspected in the areas of reading, writing, mathematics and social behavior in all subgroups. Data is used to make decisions about differentiation and modifications in core curriculum and behavior management strategies for all students. The same data is used to screen for at-risk students who may be in need of Tier 2 or 3 interventions. Following implementation of interventions selected through team meetings, all struggling students are referred to the RtI team for consideration of how best to proceed. The school uses the expertise of District and Area ESE staff to identify the most effective intervention programs and to match students with programs where they will be successful.

Classroom grades and progress from classroom teachers and district mandated tests are routinely inspected at Tier 1,2 and 3. For Tiers 2 and 3 students, the Intervention Records and progress monitoring graphs are generated for individual students.

All students participate in quarterly school-wide reading fluency checks and students noted as not making sufficient progress are reviewed by the RtI Team. When necessary, interventions are adjusted or strengthened. When interventions prove unsuccessful or progress is minimal, a referral may be made for psychological testing in order to give the team additional information.

Administrators conduct data chats with teachers and with students in order to have them reflect upon their current and past performance and to set future goals. In Reading and Mathematics, students are grouped based on multiple sources of data based on assessments completed at the beginning of the school year. Their progress is then monitored to ensure learning gains are being made. If students are not making progress, placement is modified to meet the needs of the students. Groups change throughout the year to meet the students academic needs.

Whole group writing lessons provide teachers the opportunity to model skills and techniques for writings, then students are pulled in small groups in order to target specific skills in writing. A school-wide writing plan assists with continuity across grade levels.

All data is stored in the school based data system for easy retrieval.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

The school provides on-going staff development for Rti assessment and the utilizes of a wide variety of interventions. Additional training is planned to further staff understanding of purposeful targeted strategies for their specific students. Personalization of the training will foster greater awareness and implementation. Data analysis, classroom observations and use of Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching will foster differentiated instructional strategies and highlight teacher, grade and school goals. Professional development courses that supplement the staff's ability to diagnose student needs and deliver more targeted instruction are provided throughout the school year. Follow-up activities are created to extend learning beyond the workshop session. Individual conferences are held by classroom teachers with students, and individual goals are set.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The RtI Leadership Team meets bi-weekly with the Principal (Michael Breslaw), Assistant Principal (Tracy Gruendel), Reading Resource Specialist (Denise Acevedo), Autism Coach (Erika Valbuena), ESE Specialist (Lisa Widelitz), School Psychologist (Anne Rosen), Social Worker (Kimberly Marr) and Guidance Counselor (Raiko Knight) to discuss school wide goals and initiatives and make plans to implement the necessary action steps to meet the needs of individual students. Hard copy records are managed by the school's guidance counselor/ESE teacher Raiko Knight and brought to each meeting. Working documents are kept on file by the school's principal. Members of the team share the information with the school's leadership team, which consists of all the members of the RtI team, SAC Chair, and team leaders. As a part of their meetings, they analyze school data, identify areas for improvement and develop action plans. They discuss and plan school wide activities, conduct classroom walkthroughs and share and model good teaching practices. In addition, the team works on curriculum standards, discusses school and county policies, and reviews current literature. They examine intervention programs available and evaluate the programs that are in place. The school's leadership team receives training to increase their ability to identify interventions for students not success in Tier 1, and to mentor others so that more teachers will successfully use interventions. All data is stored in File Maker Pro databases.

RTI data is routinely inspected in the areas of reading, writing, mathematics and social behavior in all subgroups. Data is used to make decisions about differentiation and modifications in core curriculum and behavior management strategies for all students. The same data is used to screen for at-risk students who may be in need of Tier 2 or 3 interventions. All students are referred to the CPST team for intervention and strategies for improvement. Progress monitoring is routinely inspected at Tier 1, 2 and 3. For Tiers 2 and 3, intervention records and progress monitoring graphs are generated for individual students.A ll data is stored in the school data base system for easy retrieval.

The RtI Team collaboratively works with the leadership and staff development teams: Amy Towne, Kelly Weingart, Susan Didway, Keelyn Stein, Erin Bell and Laura Lee to identify professional development needs. Selected staff members have been trained in a variety of academic strategies and programs (ie.. Just Words, Daily 5/CAFE Strategies, CHAMPS, BASSS other programs for behavioral needs).

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The school based literacy team consists of the Collaborative Problem-Solving Team (CPST) and School Leadership team. The School Leadership Team is comprised of a team leader from each grade level: Amy Towne (Kindergarten), Kelly Weingart (Grade 1), Susan Didway (Grade 2), Keelyn Stein (Grade 3), Erin Bell (Grade 4) and Laura Lee (Grade 5), Tara Hessberger and Raiko Knight (SAC Chairpersons), Lisa Widelitz (ESE Specialist), Erika Valbuena (Autism Coach), Raiko Knight (Guidance Counselor) and Denise Acevedo (Reading Coach). Michael Breslaw (Principal) and Tracy Gruendel (Assistant Principal) are leaders of the Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).

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

Michael Breslaw (Principal) and Denise Acevedo (Reading Coach) guide the Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). The function of the school-based LLT is to look at individual student data from multiple sources including IRI, DAR, FAIR, Fluency probes, BAT, Mini-benchmarks, STAR, DRA and Rigby scores and then identify students who are struggling in the areas of reading and writing. Interventions are first provided by the classroom teachers. If interventions are not working, teachers meet with team members to develop a 25-minute plan in which teams of teachers meet together to identify areas of concerns, the interventions already tried and brainstorm interventions that would meet the need of the student. The classroom teacher selects from the options discussed and implements one of the interventions suggested. If the interventions do not work the child is then brought up before the school's Collaborative Problem-Solving Team (CPST).

Each member of the team is assigned students to follow with the classroom teacher. Together data is reviewed, recommendations made and if necessary arrangements are made for further testing to determine any learning problems. Students are also assesses and enrolled in a multitude of Phonics, Fluency, Vocabulary and Comprehension programs as an additional/tiered instructional intervention. These interventions occur within the classroom and amongst the grade level team. Phonics for Reading, Words Their Way, Rewards, Wilson Reading, Quick Reads, Super QAR, Reading Master, Elements of Vocabulary and Fast Track are some of the intervention programs utilized throughout the classrooms. The istation computer program is also used to teach new skills while providing additional practice in reading.

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

The major initiatives of the LLT this year will be to identify all students, their current academic levels along with their strengths and weaknesses. Once identified, students will be assessed and placed into programs that will help them reach their greatest potential, ultimately making learning gains. Phonics for Reading, Words Their Way, Rewards, Wilson Reading, Quick Reads, Super QAR, Reading Master, Elements of Vocabulary and Fast Track are some of the intervention programs

utilized throughout the classrooms as additional interventions. The LLT will also identify sub groups of students that are not meeting adequate progress, analyze progress monitoring of students and staff. The team will use data to analyze the effectiveness of instruction and seek resources to meet student learning and intervention needs. The team will monitor and support the implementation of the Comprehensive Intervention Reading Programs in addition to researched based reading instruction and strategies. The LLT will ensure the programs are being implemented with fidelity. The LLT will provide support to teachers and information to PLC's and study groups to promote literacy.

Reading in the content areas will be addressed during the planning of weekly team meetings and monthly PLC's. Teachers are encouraged to build background knowledge and use pre-reading strategies in order to increase comprehension in the content areas. The goal of all PLC's is to promote effective reading instruction, through the use of increasing strategy talk among teachers and students. Teachers are encouraged to attend trainings and workshops in order to obtain their Reading endorsement. Teachers are encouraged to share information about the trainings attended with their teams.

All instructional staff will be involved with on-going training in the The Common Core State Standards (CCSS). Kindergarten through second grade teachers will fully implement Common Core and assist with implementation in third, fourth and fifth grades.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

na

*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?

na

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?

na

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	By June 2013, students scoring Achievement Level 3 on the Reading FCAT 2.0 will increase by at least 3% (15) and By June 2013, students scoring Achievement Level 3 and above on the Reading FCAT 2.0 will meet the AMO Target of 70%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27%(130) of students scored at Achievement Level 3 on the 2011-2012 Reading FCAT 2.0.	30% (145) of students will score at Achievement Level 3 on the Reading FCAT 2.0. By June 2013, students scoring Achievement Level 3 and above on the Reading FCAT 2.0 will meet the AMO Target of 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 will need to be trained in the Common Core Standards.	Teachers in all grades will be trained during pre-planning week to infuse the Common Core Standards into the curriculum. Appropriate grade levels will attend district workshops on Common Core Standards for each academic area. Teachers shall meet with teams weekly and discuss which core standards are being used in which curriculum areas. Teachers will use IFCs provided on BEEP for their grade level.	Administration/Leadership Team	CWT(Classroom Walkthroughs) will be done on a weekly basis to determine if Common Core Standards are being used.	Data chats with administration, Chapter tests, Mini Benchmark tests
2	Students need comprehension strategies to increase comprehension.	Teachers will be trained during pre-planning week and participate in PLC's to learn to increase Daily 5 strategies. Teachers will use Struggling Readers Chart, Classroom teacher/Administration, observations and data chats between administration and classroom teacher, integration of high yield strategies into lesson presentation,review of student work samples. Reading Coach will model lessons in	Team Leaders/Administration/ Reading Coach	CWT (Classroom Walk Throughs) by Administration and Team Leaders weekly to focus on standards being taught. Feedback will be given to teachers during data chats to determine effectiveness of teaching strategies. Mini- benchmark tests and chapter tests will be used to determine student levels and progress throughout the year.	Mini- Benchmark Assessment test, and informal classroom assessments to determine effectiveness of strategy, DRA,DAR, IRI, BAT and FAIR

		classrooms.		
3	Lack of engagement of students when reading independently	Using CAFE strategies students will increase the amount of time spent reading and discussing what they are reading in school each day . Teachers will use BEEP IFC's in order to plan effective lessons for rigorus instruction, collaborative learning and confidence building.	Team Leaders, Administration/ Reading Coach	Lesson study, weekly informal assessment by classroom teachers and data chats with students and administrators	Mini- Benchmark Assessment test,classroom assessment, and daily observations by the teacher

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:	By June 2013, 50% (3) students will score at Levels 4, 5 and 6 on the Florida Alternate Assessment in Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (3) students scored at Levels 4, 5 and 6 on the Florida Alternate Assessment in Reading.	50% (3) students will score at Levels 4, 5 and 6 on the Florida Alternate Assessment in Reading.
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Alignment of Access Points to The Common Core State Standards ("Connecting to Core")	Continued utilization of the Prerequisites to The Common Core State Standards and current access points, Supplementing programs with addition resources (e.g. Basic Math from Struggler's Math Chart)	Classroom teachers, Autism Coach and Administration	Use Brigance Diagnostic Inventory Assessment and IEP Data Collection Forms.	Florida Alternate Assessment
2	Behavior Management	Utilization of TEACCH Strategies and Skills (reinforcement and assessment), Daily Picture Behavior Charts	Classroom teachers, Autism Coach and Administration	Use Brigance Diagnostic Inventory Assessment, IEP Data Collection Forms, Behavior Charts and Daily Home Notes	Florida Alternate Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	By June 2013, students scoring Achievement Level 4 or above on the Reading FCAT 2.0 will increase by at least 3% (14) and By June 2013, students scoring Achievement Level 3 and above on the Reading FCAT 2.0 will meet the AMO Target of 70%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
39%,(191) students scored at Achievement Level 4 or above on the 2011-2012 Reading FCAT 2.0.	42% (205) students will score at Achievement Level 4 or above on Reading FCAT 2.0 and By June 2013, students scoring Achievement Level 3 and above on the Reading FCAT 2.0 will meet the AMO Target of 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 will need to be trained in the Common Core Standards.	Teachers in all grades will be trained during pre-planning week to infuse the Common Core Standards into the curriculum.	Administration, team leaders	Teachers shall meet with teams weekly and discuss which core standards are being used in which curriculum areas.	Data chats with administration, Chapter tests, Mini Benchmark tests
2	Students need more opportunities for higher order thinking in comprehension.	Teachers were be trained during pre-planning week and participate in PLC's to learn to increase knowledge Daily 5 strategies.	Leadership Team/Administration	Classroom walk-throughs, and weekly assessment by classroom teachers to determine student levels and progress through out the year.	Mini- Benchmark Assessment test, and classroom assessments.
3	Students need to be challenged in reading using project based learning.	Students will participate in Sunshine Readers Award program and participate in classroom discussions,thinking maps and Project BAsed LEarning.	Administration/Leadership TEam	Discussions, summaries, Data Chats	charts and graphs, reports, rubrics for projects
4	Teachers will differentiate instruction based on the needs of students	Teachers will participate in trainings on ways to enrich reading activities for students	Leadership Team, Administration	CWTs in order to see if teachers are differentiating instruction.Data Chats	Mini-benchmarks, BAT scores, mini-benchmark assessments,Work samples, Weekly assessments by classroom teachers

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	By June 2013, 50% (3) students will score at or above Level 7 on the Florida Alternate Assessment in Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (3) students scored at or above Level 7 on the Florida Alternate Assessment in Reading.	50% (3) students will score at or above Level 7 on the Florida Alternate Assessment in Reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Alignment of Access Points to The Common Core State Standards ("Connecting to Core")	Continued utilization of the Prerequisites to The Common Core State Standards and current access points, Supplementing programs with addition resources (e.g. Basic Math from Struggler's Math Chart)	Classroom Teachers, Autism Coach, Principal	Use Brigance Diagnostic Inventory Assessment and IEP Data Collection Forms.	Florida Alternate Assessment
2	Behavior Management	Utilization of TEACCH Strategies and Skills (reinforcement and assessment), Daily Picture Behavior Chart.	Classroom Teachers, Autism Coach, Principal	Use Brigance Diagnostic Inventory Assessment, IEP Data Collection Forms, Behavior Charts and Daily Home Notes.	Florida Alternate Assessment

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	By June 2013, students making learning gains on Reading FCAT 2.0 will increase by 3% (9).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
74.3% (248.3) of students made learning gains on the Reading FCAT 2.0.	77% (257) of students will make learning gains on the Reading FCAT 2.0.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teachers need to be trained in the use of programs on the Struggling Readers and math charts.	Teachers will use programs as defined in the Struggling Readers Chart for students who are demonstrating difficulty.	Reading Coach, Administration	Targeted students will be assessed quarterly to determine if they are progressing in the alternative programs.Data Chats with teachers.	Program specific evaluations
2	Students will require additional time and targeted instruction in reading.	Students will participate in Reading Assistance Program that uses an alternative program that fits their needs.	Support Staff, Reading Resource Specialist, Administrator	Progress monitoring, Data chats	IRI, Fluency Probes Weekly assessments
3	Technology accessibility for newly implemented on-line differentiated and leveled reading program (Raz-Kids).	Teachers will increase opportunities to utilize the Raz-Kids program during the regular school day including computer lab time.	Reading Coach, ESE Specialist and Administration	Progress monitoring (fluency, vocabulary, comprehension)	Raz-Kids quizzes

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	By June 2013, students making learning gains on the Florida Alternate Assessment will increase by 16% (1)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67% (4) students made learning gains on the Florida Alternate Assessment.	83% (5) students will make earning gains on the Florida Alternate Assessment.

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	Alignment of Access Points to The Common Core State Standards ("connecting to the core")	Continued utilization of the Prerequisites to The Common Core State Standards and current access points, Supplementing programs with addition resources (e.g. Basic Math from Struggler's Math Chart)	Classroom Teachers, Autism Coach, Principal	Use Brigance Diagnostic Inventory Assessment and IEP Data Collection Forms.	Florida Alternate Assessment

| 2 | Behavior Management | Utilization of TEACCH Strategies and Skills (reinforcement and assessment), Daily Picture Behavior Chart. | Classroom Teachers, Autism Coach, Principal | Use Brigance Diagnostic Inventory Assessment, IEP Data Collection Forms, Behavior Charts and Daily Home Notes. | Florida Alternate Assessment |

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	By June 2013, the percentage of students in the lowest 25th making learning gains will increase by at least 3% (3).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71% (61.1) of students in the lowest 25th percentile made learning gains on the Reading FCAT 2.0.	74% (64) of students in the lowest 25 percentile will make learning gains on the Reading FCAT 2.0 in 2013.

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	Time for students to receive more intensive instruction in reading.	Special area teachers will be using programs as defined in the Struggling Readers Chart for students who are not demonstrating proficiency.They will use push-in program one hour every morning.	Reading Coach, Administrator	Targeted students will be assessed quarterly to determine if they are progressing in the alternative program(s).	IRI, DAR, Fluency Probes, BAT, mini benchmarks, STAR, DRA,Rigby,Program Specific Evaluations.
2	Students need additional skills and strategy practice in the area of reading.	Struggling students will receive additional reading instruction through the Reading Assistance Program, (RAP).	Support Staff, Reading Resource Specialist and Administration	Targeted students will be assessed quarterly to determine if they are progressing in the selected program(s).	IRI, DAR, Fluency Probes, BAT, mini benchmarks, STAR, DRA, Rigby.
3	Students will increase reading fluency and stamina	Students will be assigned reading mentors	Classroom Teacher, Reading Resource Specialist	Fluency scores, progress monitoring	School-wide fluency assessment

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 #
	By June 2013, students scoring Achievement Level 3 and above on the Reading FCAT 2.0 will meet the AMO Target of 70%.
	5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	66%	70%				

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	By June 2013, the percentage of White students (6), Black students (2), Hispanic students (5) and Asian students (1) not making satisfactory progress will decrease by 3% on the Reading FCAT 2.0
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

	27% (63) of White students will not make satisfactory progress on the Reading FCAT 2.0 and achieve the AMO target of 73%.
29.5% (69) of White students did not make satisfactory progress on the Reading FCAT 2.0. 52.4% (33) of Black students did not make satisfactory progress on the Reading FCAT 2.0. 38.3% (54) of Hispanic students did not make satisfactory progress on the Reading FCAT 2.0. 20% (5) of Asian students did not make satisfactory progress on the Reading FCAT 2.0.	27% (63) of White students will not make satisfactory progress on the Reading FCAT 2.0 and achieve the AMO target of 73%. 49% (31) of Black students will not make satisfactory progress on the Reading FCAT 2.0 and achieve the AMO target of 53%. 35% (49) of Hispanic students will not make satisfactory progress on the Reading FCAT 2.0 and achieve the AMO target of 66%. 17% (4) of Asian students will not make satisfactory progress on the Reading FCAT 2.0 and achieve the AMO target of 86%.

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	Larger class size due to budget cuts will reduce the amount of time teachers can spend with an individual student.	Teachers will incorporate reading throughout the curriculum and intertwine subject areas to increase reading time on task.	Administrator, Reading Coach	Progress monitoring, weekly assessments, computer generated reports.	IRI, Mini Benchmark,FCAT Benchmark tests
2	Students require frequent repetition of material with audio and visuals.	Students will participate in Reading Assistance Program daily for 30 minutes, a pullout reading intervention program using the Rewards Program and Phonics for Reading Program. Students also use the iStation Computer Program daily for 30 minutes.	Classroom teacher, Administration,Reading Teachers	Progress monitoring,Data Chats,CWTs	Computer based assessments, weekly assessments by classroom teachers,computer generated reports, and by Reading Support Teachers

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	By June 2013, the percentage of ELL students not making satisfactory progress on the Reading FCAT 2.0. will decrease by 5% (3). By June 2013, 49% of ELL students will achieve proficiency and meet the AMO target as evidenced on the Reading FCAT 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71.4% (35) of ELL students did not make satisfactory progress on the Reading FCAT 2.0.	66% (32) of ELL students will not make satisfactory progress on the Reading FCAT 2.0 and By June 2013, 49% of ELL students will achieve proficiency and meet the AMO target as evidenced on the Reading FCAT 2.0.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Larger class size due to budget cuts will reduce the amount of time teachers can spend with an individual student and pull out programs.	Teachers will incorporate reading throughout the curriculum to increase reading time on task.Students will use FCAT Explorer at school and home to increase reading on task.	Administration, Reading Coach	Progress monitoring, weekly assessments, computer generated reports	IRI,MiniBenchmark,FCAT Benchmark tests, CELLA, IPT
	Students require frequent repetition of material with audio and	A1-B2 students will participate in Reading Assistance Computer	Support Staff, Reading Resource Specialist,	Progress monitoring, weekly assessments, computer generated	Computer based assessments, weekly assessments by

2	visuals.	Program (istation)on a daily basis during RAP, classroom time and/or Computer Reading Assistance program to promote academic achievement.	Administration	reports.	classroom teachers.
3	Students lack stamina while reading independently.	Teachers will participate in Daily 5 and The Daily CAFE Literacy trainings to increase knowledge of reading strategies in Learning Communities and Thursday morning weekly discussion groups.	Learning Community Coaches Rosemary Manners and Linda Steward, Administration	Charts, graphs of strategies, students progress, data chats with students	Progress monitoring charts, weekly classroom assessments.
4	ELL students have difficulty with reading comprehension	ELL teacher will identify strengths and weaknesses and work with small groups throughout the day to address deficiencies and CAVS learning system. ESOL Instructional Matrix will be used.	Reading Resource Specialist, Administration	Frequent review of student achievement data	Pre/Post Test, istation reports, BAT results, CELLA,IPT
5	Teachers will be trained in the use of ESOL Supplemental Materials to be used to differentiate instruction based on the needs of students.	Students will be pulled for small group instruction and iStation weekly.Classroom teachers will use supplemental materials purchased through Title III Funds and the ESOL MAtrix.	Maria Guiliani,Claudia Barros, Reading Coach, Administration	Frequent review of student achievement data and iStation reports, CWTs	Computer based assesments and reports,weekly observation and assessments by classroom teachers, CELLA, IPT

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	By June 2013, the percentage of SWD students that will not make satisfactory progress on the Reading FCAT 2.0 will decrease by 5% (5) and By June 2013, 52% of SWD students will achieve proficiency and meet the AMO target as evidenced on the Reading FCAT 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
63.6% (68) of SWD students did not make satisfactory progress on the Reading FCAT 2.0.	59% (63) of SWD students will not make satisfactory progress on the Reading FCAT 2.0 and By June 2013, 52% of SWD students will achieve proficiency and meet the AMO target as evidenced on the Reading FCAT 2.0.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
---	---	---	---	---	---
1	41% of Students with Disabilities were proficent in reading on the 2012 FCAT. With larger class sizes students may not receive as much individual assistance.	Teachers will incorporate reading throughout the curriculum areas to increase reading time on task.	Team Leaders, Reading Coach, Administration	Progress monitoring, weekly assessments, computer generated reports	IRI, Mini Benchmarks, FCAT Benchmark tests
2	Educating all teachers on meeting students needs through accomoodations	Interventions that Work Workshops Teachers will use Struggling Readers Chart.	ESE Specialist, ESE Teacher, Administration	Data chats, Progress monitoring of students, meetings with ESE teachers, CWTs to make sure reading is being infused throughout the day	Weekly assessments, Benchmark assessments
	Educating General	Differentiated Instruction	Classroom teachers,	Data chats, Progress	Weekly

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
3	Education teachers on differentiated instruction in Reading.	in reading workshop and PLC.	administration	monitoring of students, meetings with ESE teachers.	assessments, Benchmark assessments
4	Teachers will learn to monitor the Progress of students to ensure appropriate instructional placement.	Progress Monitoring workshop	Classroom teachers, administration, Team Leaders	Meetings with administrators and ESE teachers.	Charts, Graphs, weekly assessments, Benchmark assessments.
5	Teachers do not know the area of deficiency for an ESE student in Reading.	Utilize the DAR for diagnostic assessment data to determine deficient areas and prescribe appropriate reading intervention programs. At Tradewinds, we use a variety of alterative programs: Wilson, Rewards, Phonics for Reading, and Read Naturally.	ESE Specialist, Administration,Reading Specialist	Data from DAR's, weekly progress assessments from intervention programs, data chats, classroom walkthroughs.	Weekly Assessments, DAR's,and IRI's.
6	General Education teachers do not know that strategies to reach ESE students.	General Education teachers will collaborate with ESE teachers to utilize effective strategies for ESE students through a Professional Learning COmmunity that meets on a monthly basis for 50 minutes.	ESE Specialist, Administration	CWT's, observations, IRI, DAR, and weekly assessment	Charts and graphs of use of effective strategies. Weekly assessments.

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	By June 2013, the number of economically disadvantaged not making satisfactory progress on the Reading FCAT 2.0 will decrease by 3% (7) and and By June 2013, 58% of FRL students will achieve proficiency and meet the AMO target as evidenced on the Reading FCAT 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
45.2% (100) of Economically Disadvantaged students did not make satisfactory progress on the Reading FCAT 2.0.	42% (93) of Economically Disadvantaged students will not make satisfactory progress on the Reading FCAT 2.0 and By June 2013, 58% of FRL students will achieve proficiency and meet the AMO target as evidenced on the Reading FCAT 2.0.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	55% of Economically Disadvantaged students were proficient on the 2012 FCAT test. With larger class sizes students may not receive as much individual assistance.	Teachers will incorporate reading throughout the curriculum to increase the time on task in reading.	Team Leaders,Reading Coach, Administration	Progress Monitoring, weekly assessments, computer generated reports, CWTs to make sure reading is being infused through out the day.	IRI, Mini Benchmark, FCAT Benchmark tests
2	Students need the use of technology based programs to help increase skills.	Enroll students in the computer Lab istation so students can work at his/her own pace.Students will be given time in classroom to work on FCAT Explorer and teachers will promote it as an at home program.	Maria Guiliani (lab Assistant), Administration	Istation reports, CWT's, classroom observations, FCAT Expoler reports	Unit assessments on isttation

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
Connecting Common Core State Standards to the Instructional Framework	Pre-K through 5 and 100% instructional staff	Leadership Team: K - Amy Towne 1 - Kelly Weingart 2 - Susan Didway 3 - Keelyn Stein 4 - Erin Bell 5 - Laura Lee Reading Coach - Denise Acevedo ESE Specialist - Lisa Widelitz Guidance Counselor - Raiko Knight Autism Coach - Erika Valbuena Assistant Principal - Tracy Gruendel	School-wide (instructional staff)	8/13, 9/27, 10/26, 11/20, 12/3, 12/4, 12/5, 1/18, 1/28, 1/29, 1/30, 5/24	Marzano's Evaluation Tool (Walkthrough snapshot, Informal and Formal Evaluations)	Principal
Marzano's The Arts and Science of Teaching	Pre-K through 5 and 100% instructional staff	Leadership Team: K - Amy Towne 1 - Kelly Weingart 2 - Susan Didway 3 - Keelyn Stein 4 - Erin Bell 5 - Laura Lee Reading Coach - Denise Acevedo ESE Specialist - Lisa Widelitz Guidance Counselor - Raiko Knight Autism Coach - Erika Valbuena Assistant Principal - Tracy Gruendel	School-wide (instructional staff)	8/13, 9/27, 10/26, 11/20, 12/3, 12/4, 12/5, 1/18, 1/28, 1/29, 1/30, 5/24	Marzano's Evaluation Tool (Walkthrough snapshot, Informal and Formal Evaluations)	Principal
The Seven Keys to Comprehension	K-5	Rosemary Manners and Linda Steward (Professional Development Team)	School-wide (instructional staff)	10/18, 11/8 and 11/29	Marzano's Evaluation Tool (Walkthrough snapshot, Informal and Formal Evaluations)	Principal

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
SAC Accountability Funds will support implementation of The Common Core State Standards.	Accountability	State	$1,343.00
The Instructional Materials allocation will support implementation of The Common Core State Standards.	Instructional Materials	State	$1,881.00
			Subtotal: $3,224.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

To increase the capacity of productivity to support the 21st Century and technology standards	Multimedia and Productivity Tools	Internal Accounts	$1,500.00
			Subtotal: $1,500.00

Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Teacher Training will support implementation of The Common Core State Standards.	Instructional Staff Training	State	$654.50
Connecting Common Core State Standards to the Instructional Framework	District Summer Leadership	State	$1,164.50
			Subtotal: $1,819.00

Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
PTA will support the various genres of reading	Instructional Supplemental Materials (e.g. Time For Kids, National Geographic)	PTA	$5,000.00
			Subtotal: $5,000.00
			Grand Total: $11,543.00

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:	In 2013, 54% (96) students will achieve Proficiency on the Listening/Speaking Assessment of the Florida Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:

51% (91) of students achieved Proficiency on the Listening/Speaking Assessment of the Florida Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment.

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	Larger class size due to budget cuts will reduce the amount of time teachers can spend with an individual student and pull out programs.	Teachers will incorporate reading throughout the curriculum to increase reading time on task.Students will use FCAT Explorer at school and home to increase reading on task.	Administration, Reading Coach	Progress monitoring, weekly assessments, computer generated reports	IRI,MiniBenchmark,FCAT Benchmark tests, CELLA, rograms. Administration, Reading IPT
2	ELL students have difficulty with reading comprehension	ELL teacher will identify strengths and weaknesses and work with small groups throughout the day to address deficiencies and CAVS learning system. ESOL Instructional Matrix will be used.	Reading Resource Specialist, Administration	Frequent review of student achievement data	Pre/Post Test, istation reports, BAT results, CELLA, IPT

3	Students require frequent repetition of material with audio and visuals.	A1-B2 students will participate in Reading Assistance Computer Program (istation)on a daily basis during RAP, classroom time and/or Computer Reading Assistance program to promote academic achievement.	Support Staff, Reading Resource Specialist, Administration	Progress monitoring, weekly assessments, computer generated reports.	Computer based assessments, weekly assessments by classroom teachers.

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:	By June 2013, 46% (81) of students will achieve Proficiency on the Reading Assessment of the Florida Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

41% (70) of students achieved Proficiency on the Reading Assessment of the Florida Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment.

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	Larger class size due to budget cuts will reduce the amount of time teachers can spend with an individual student and pull out programs. Teachers will incorporate reading throughout the curriculum to increase reading time on task.	Teachers will incorporate reading throughout the curriculum to increase reading time on task.Students will use FCAT Explorer at school and home to increase reading on task.	Administration, Reading Coach	Progress monitoring, weekly assessments, computer generated reports	IRI, MiniBenchmark,FCAT Benchmark tests, CELLA, rograms. Administration, Reading IPT
2	ELL students have difficulty with reading comprehension ELL teacher will identify strengths and weaknesses and work with small groups throughout the day to address deficiencies and CAVS learning system. ESOL Instructional Matrix will be used.	ELL teacher will identify strengths and weaknesses and work with small groups throughout the day to address deficiencies and CAVS learning system. ESOL Instructional Matrix will be used.	Reading Resource Specialist, Administration	Frequent review of student achievement data	Pre/Post Test, istation reports, BAT results, CELLA, IPT
3	Teachers will be trained in the use of ESOL Supplemental Materials to be used to differentiate instruction based on the needs of students.	Students will be pulled for small group instruction and iStation weekly.Classroom teachers will use supplemental materials purchased through Title III Funds and the ESOL Matrix.	Maria Guiliani,Claudia Barros, Reading Coach, Administration	Frequent review of student achievement data and iStation reports, CWTs	Computer based assesments and reports,weekly observation and assessments by classroom teachers, CELLA, IPT

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	By June 2013, 32% (57) students will achieve Proficiency on the Writing Assessment of the Florida Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

29% (51) of students achieved Proficiency on the Writing Assessment of the Florida Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment.

	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	Larger class size due to budget cuts will reduce the amount of time teachers can spend with an individual student and pull out programs.	Teachers will incorporate reading throughout the curriculum to increase reading time on task.Students will use FCAT Explorer at school and home to increase reading on task.	Administration, Reading Coach	Progress monitoring, weekly assessments, computer generated reports	IRI,MiniBenchmark,FCAT Benchmark tests, CELLA, rograms. Administration, Reading IPT
2	Teachers will be trained in the use of ESOL Supplemental Materials to be used to differentiate instruction based on the needs of students.	Students will be pulled for small group instruction and iStation weekly.Classroom teachers will use supplemental materials purchased through Title III Funds and the ESOL Matrix.	Maria Guiliani,Claudia Barros, Reading Coach, Administration	Frequent review of student achievement data and iStation reports, CWTs	Computer based assesments and reports,weekly observation and assessments by classroom teachers, CELLA, IPT, FCAT Benchmarks

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	By June 2013, students scoring Achievement Level 3 on the Math FCAT 2.0 will increase by at least 3% (14) and By June 2013, students scoring Achievement Level 3 and above on the Math FCAT 2.0 will meet the AMO Target of 75%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
32% (158) of students scored at Achievement Level 3 on the 2011-2012 Math FCAT 2.0.	33% (172) of students will score at Achievement Level 3 on the Math FCAT 2.0 and By June 2013, students scoring Achievement Level 3 and above on the Math FCAT 2.0 will meet the AMO Target of 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	Teachers will need to be trained in the Common Core Standards.	Teachers in all grades will be trained during pre-planning week to infuse the Common Core Standards into the curriculum. Appropriate grade levels will attend district workshops on Common Core Standards for each academic area. Teachers shall meet with teams weekly and discuss which core standards are being used in which curriculum areas. Teachers will use IFCs provided on BEEP for their grade level.	Administration/Leadership Team	CWT(Classroom Walkthroughs) will be done on a weekly basis to determine if Common Core Standards are being used.	Data chats with administration, Chapter tests, Mini Benchmark tests
2	Insufficient implementation of differentiated instructional strategies	Teachers will participate in PLC's and focus on Differentiated Instruction for all learners. Teachers will utilize the new Go Math series to provide instructional materials to meet the needs of all learners.	Team Leaders, Administration	Weekly assessments, Mini-Benchmark assessments, CWT's	Weekly assessments, Mini-Benchmark assessments, Key Math
3	Providing sufficient rigor during instruction and assessment.	Low achieving math students will participate in First in Math, a computer based program ,in order to reinforce previously taught skills in the classroom.	Computer Lab assistant, Administration	Fist in MAth (FIM) report, weekly assessments, Benchmark assessments	First in Math skills tests, BAT scores, STAR data.
4	Teachers need extra time reteaching concepts and strategies to below level students.	Students will participate in First In Math (FIM) program.Teachers will utilize the new Go Math Intervention Materials	Team Leaders administration	Weekly assessments in FIM (First in MAth).	Classroom assessments, progress monitoring, First in Math tests.Go

		to provide extra instructional practice to meet the needs of all learners.			Math 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:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	By June 2013, 83% (5) students will score at Levels 4, 5 and 6 on the Florida Alternate Assessment in Math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67% (4) students scored at Levels 4, 5 and 6 on the Florida Alternate Assessment in Math.	83% (5) students will score at Levels 4, 5 and 6 on the Florida Alternate Assessment in Math.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Alignment of Access Points to The Common Core State Standards ("Connecting to Core")</td><td>Continued utilization of the Prerequisites to The Common Core State Standards and current access points, Supplementing programs with addition resources (e.g. Basic Math from Struggler's Math Chart)</td><td>Classroom teachers, Autism Coach and Administration</td><td>Use Brigance Diagnostic Inventory Assessment and IEP Data Collection Forms.</td><td>Florida Alternate Assessment</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>Behavior Management</td><td>Utilization of TEACCH Strategies and Skills (reinforcement and assessment), Daily Picture Behavior Charts</td><td>Classroom teachers, Autism Coach and Administration</td><td>Use Brigance Diagnostic Inventory Assessment, IEP Data Collection Forms, Behavior Charts and Daily Home Notes</td><td>Florida Alternate Assessment</td></tr>
</table>

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	By June 2013, students scoring Achievement Level 4 or above on the Math FCAT 2.0 will increase by at least 3% (14) and By June 2013, students scoring Achievement Level 3 and above on the Math FCAT 2.0 will meet the AMO Target of 75%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41%, (201) students scored at Achievement Level 4 or above on the 2011-2012 Math FCAT 2.0.	44% (205) students will score at Achievement Level 4 or above on Math FCAT 2.0 and By June 2013, students scoring Achievement Level 3 and above on the Math FCAT 2.0 will meet the AMO Target of 75%.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Providing Differentiated Instruction to meet the needs of all learners.</td><td>Teachers will participate in PLC's and focus on Differentiated Instruction for all learners. Teacher's will utilize the new Go Math series to provide instructional materials to meet the needs of all</td><td>Classroom teachers, Support staff, administration</td><td>Weekly assessments. Mini-Benchmark assessments, Unit Tests</td><td>I-Station skills tests, BAT scores, STAR data.</td></tr>
</table>

					learners
2	All students need extra time to participate in Math reviews and enrichment practice daily.	Calendar math will be utilized in all classrooms.	TEam Leaders, Support Staff, Administrators	Teacher observation, Administrator, teacher and student data chats, CWTs	Tools include: BAT, STAR, and mini benchmarks
3	Students need to be challenged with more higher level math concepts.	Teachers will use GLENCO math program to challenge and enrich learners.	Gifted Teachers and classroom teachers and support staff	Projects, assessments, CWTs	Classroom assessments, BAT, and mini-benchmark assessments.

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	By June 2013, 50 % (1) students will score at or above Level 7 on the Florida Alternate Assessment in Math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33% (2) students scored at or above Level 7 on the Florida Alternate Assessment in Math.	50% (3) students will score at or above Level 7 on the Florida Alternate Assessment in Math.

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Alignment of Access Points to The Common Core State Standards ("Connecting to Core")	Continued utilization of the Prerequisites to The Common Core State Standards and current access points, Supplementing programs with addition resources (e.g. Basic Math from Struggler's Math Chart)	Classroom teachers, Autism Coach and Administration	Use Brigance Diagnostic Inventory Assessment and IEP Data Collection Forms.	Florida Alternate Assessment
2	Behavior Management	Utilization of TEACCH Strategies and Skills (reinforcement and assessment), Daily Picture Behavior Charts	Classroom teachers, Autism Coach and Administration	Use Brigance Diagnostic Inventory Assessment, IEP Data Collection Forms, Behavior Charts and Daily Home Notes	Florida Alternate Assessment

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	By June 2013, students making learning gains on Math FCAT 2.0 will increase by 3% (12).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
78% (259.6) of students made learning gains on the Math FCAT 2.0.	81% (271) of students will make learning gains on the Math FCAT 2.0.

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

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

1	Teachers need to be trained in the use of programs on the Struggling Readers and math charts.	Teachers will use programs as defined in the Struggling Readers Chart for students who are demonstrating difficulty.	Reading Coach, Administration	Targeted students will be assessed quarterly to determine if they are progressing in the alternative programs.Data Chats with teachers.	Program specific evaluations
2	Students need extra opportunities to practice previously taught math skills on a daily basis.	Teachers will provide opportunities to increase speed and accuracy of basic mathematical calculations using Go Math materials.	Team Leaders, Support Staff, Administrators	Timed drill assessments. Drops in the Bucket assessments,Data chats with administrators and teachers.	Tools include: BAT,STAR and mini benchmarks
3	Students have difficulty learning math facts for addition, subtraction, multiplication and division.	Teachers will implement CAT's Magic 45 (The top 45 Math facts students need to know to succeed) and Go Math Intervention Materials	Classroom teachers, Support Staff, Administration	Weekly charting of CAT's magic 45, discussions at team meetings,CWTs	Weekly assessments
4	Students will require additional practice with basic math skills and concepts	Students will use the First in Math program in the computer lab once per week and/or the online Go Math Intervention program in the classroom.	Administration,Team Leaders, Support staff	Weekly charting of student progress	Weekly assessment,Mini-benchmarks
5	Technology accessibility for newly implemented on-line differentiated and leveled math program (First in Math).	Teachers will increase opportunities to utilize the First in Math program during the regular school day including computer lab time.	Administration	First in Math progress monitoring reports	Minibenchmarks, Go Math assessments, BAT

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	By June 2013, students making learning gains on the Florida Alternate Assessment will increase by 15% (.9)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
85% (5.1) students made learning gains on the Florida Alternate Assessment.	100% (6) students will make earning gains on the Florida Alternate Assessment.

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	Alignment of Access Points to The Common Core State Standards ("Connecting to Core")	Continued utilization of the Prerequisites to The Common Core State Standards and current access points, Supplementing programs with addition resources (e.g. Basic Math from Struggler's Math Chart)	Classroom teachers, Autism Coach and Administration	Use Brigance Diagnostic Inventory Assessment and IEP Data Collection Forms.	Florida Alternate Assessment
2	Behavior Management	Utilization of TEACCH Strategies and Skills (reinforcement and assessment), Daily Picture Behavior Charts	Classroom teachers, Autism Coach and Administration	Use Brigance Diagnostic Inventory Assessment, IEP Data Collection Forms, Behavior Charts and Daily Home Notes	Florida Alternate Assessment

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	By June 2013, the percentage of students in the lowest 25th making learning gains will increase by at least 3% (2.66).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71% (63.2) of students in the lowest 25th percentile made learning gains on the Math FCAT 2.0.	74% (65.86) of students in the lowest 25 percentile will make learning gains on the Reading FCAT 2.0 in 2013.

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 will need additional help and assistance with basic math skills.	Students in the lowest quartile will receive additional instruction and reinforcement in mathematics in the First In Math Program	Michael Breslaw,Principal, First in Math (FIM) Coordinator	Review of data, analysis of mini-benchmark data, FIM weekly assessments	Mini-benchmarks, classroom assessments, FIM unit assessments.
2	Students require targeted skills practice with various math concepts.	Teachers will participate in trainings and Learning Communities and learn ways to differentiate instruction for diverse learners	Michael Breslaw, Principal, Learning Community Coaches	Review of previous data, analysis of mini-benchmark data, Teacher and administration observation	Mini benchmarks, Informal assessments, weekly assessments, Benchmark Assessment Test 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%.	Elementary School Mathematics Goal # 5A : By June 2013, students scoring Achievement Level 3 and above on the Reading FCAT 2.0 will meet the AMO Target of 75%.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	74%	75%				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	By June 2013, the percentage of White students (7), Black students (2), Hispanic students (5) and Asian students (1) not making satisfactory progress will decrease by 3% on the Math FCAT 2.0
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
18.4% (43) of White students did not make satisfactory progress on the Math FCAT 2.0 47.6% (30) of Black students did not make satisfactory progress on the Math FCAT 2.0. 34% (48) of Hispanic students did not make satisfactory progress on the Math FCAT 2.0. 4% (1) of Asian students did not make satisfactory progress	15.4% (36) of White students will not make satisfactory progress on the Math FCAT 2.0 and achieve the AMO target of 83%. 44.6% (28) of Black students will not make satisfactory progress on the Math FCAT 2.0 and achieve the AMO target of 50%. 31% (43) of Hispanic students will not make satisfactory progress on the Math FCAT 2.0 and achieve the AMO target of 68%.

| | | | on the Math FCAT 2.0. | | 0% (1) of Asian students will not make satisfactory progress on the Math FCAT 2.0 and achieve the AMO target of 89%. |

on the Math FCAT 2.0.	0% (1) of Asian students will not make satisfactory progress on the Math FCAT 2.0 and achieve the AMO target of 89%.

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	Providing Differentiated Instruction to meet the needs of all learners.	Teachers will participate in PLC's and focus on Differentiated Instruction for all learners. Teacher's will utilize the new Go Math Series and Struggling Math Chart to provide instructional strategies to meet the needs of all learners.	Classroom teachers	Weekly assessments. Mini-Benchmark Assessments	STAR Data, BAT scores, Weekly assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	By June 2013, the percentage of ELL students not making satisfactory progress on the Math FCAT 2.0. will decrease by 5% (3) and By June 2013, 61% of ELL students will achieve proficiency and meet the AMO target as evidenced on the Math FCAT 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
53.1% (26) of ELL students did not make satisfactory progress on the Math FCAT 2.0.	48.1% (23) of ELL students will not make satisfactory progress on the Math FCAT 2.0 and By June 2013, 61% of ELL students will achieve proficiency and meet the AMO target as evidenced on the Math FCAT 2.0.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students require more intensive instruction in math.	Students will utilize digital classrooms to enhance learning and add hands on experiences for students.	Support Staff	Classroom walk throughs by administrators and Leadership Team, Data Chats, Assessments, Promethean Board activities	Mini-benchmarks, BAT ,FCAT scores, student survys, Key Math
2	Weakness of students concepts and strategies	Students will participate in First In Math, (FIM) computer program weekly.	Classroom teachers, FIM coordinator, Administration	Progress report from FIM program, Classroom teacher assessment	Computer generated assessments, weekly assessments by classroom teacher
3	ELL students do not understand vocabulary words and concepts in Math	ELL teacher will identify strengths and weaknesses and work with small groups throughout the day to address deficiencies and utilize the CAVS learning system	Support Staff, Administration	Frequent review of student achievement data,	BAT scores, classroom assessments, istation reports
4	General Education teachers do not know strategies to reach ESE students.	General Education teachers will collaborate with ESE teachers to utilize effective strategies for ESE students through a Professional Learning Community that meets on a monthly basis for 50 minutes.	ESE Specialist, Administration	CWT's, observations,and student weekly assessment	Charts and graphs to show effective strategies of weekly assessments

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	By June 2013, the percentage of SWD students that will not make satisfactory progress on the Math FCAT 2.0 will decrease by 5% (5.4) and By June 2013, 58% of SWD students will achieve proficiency and meet the AMO target as evidenced on the Math FCAT 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
54.2% (58) of SWD students did not make satisfactory progress on the Math FCAT 2.0.	49.2% (52.6) of SWD students will not make satisfactory progress on the Math FCAT 2.0 and By June 2013, 58% of SWD students will achieve proficiency and meet the AMO target as evidenced on the Math FCAT 2.0.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Insufficient implementation of student ESE accomodations.	Teachers will participate in training on how to provide accommodations to students with disabilities	Classroom teachers/ Administration	Classroom assessments	BAT,mini benchmarks, Key Math
2	Insufficient implementation of differentiated instructional strategies.	Teachers will participate in trainings and learning community groups which will focus on differentiating instruction for all learners.	Tracy Gruendel, Assistant Principal Susan Whiting, Principal	Weekly assessments,	Key Math 3, BAT, mini benchmarks
3	General Education teachers do not know strategies to reach ESE students.	General Education teachers will collaborate with ESE teachers to utilize effective strategies for ESE students through a Professional Learning Community that meets on a monthly basis for 50 minutes.	ESE Specialist/ Administration	CWT's, Observations,IRI,DAR, and weekly assessment	Use charts and graphs of effective strategies. Weekly assessments.

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

E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:	By June 2013, the number of economically disadvantaged not making satisfactory progress on the Math FCAT 2.0 will decrease by 3% (7) and By June 2013, 61% of FRL students will achieve proficiency and meet the AMO target as evidenced on the Math FCAT 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
39.8% (88) of Economically Disadvantaged students did not make satisfactory progress on the Math FCAT 2.0.	36.3% (81) of Economically Disadvantaged students will not make satisfactory progress on the Math FCAT 2.0 and and By June 2013, 61% of FRL students will achieve proficiency and meet the AMO target as evidenced on the Math FCAT 2.0.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	FRL need small group instruction in mathematics literacy and/or fluency,especially in the area or problem solving for FRL students.	Teachers will implement small group instruction weekly to work with struggling students. Differentiation of	Team Leaders, Support staff, Administration	First in Math reports, classroom assessments, CWTs, Data Chats	Mini- Benchmark Assessments, Benchmark Assessments, Key Math, Informal teacher tests

1		instructional practices and assessments using Go Math iTools, Virtual Manipulatives, graphic organizers, Destination Math tutorials accessed through Go Math.				

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
Connecting Common Core State Standards to the Instructional Framework	Pre-K through 5 and 100% instructional staff	Leadership Team: K - Amy Towne 1 - Kelly Weingart 2 - Susan Didway 3 - Keelyn Stein 4 - Erin Bell 5 - Laura Lee Reading Coach - Denise Acevedo ESE Specialist - Lisa Widelitz Guidance Counselor - Raiko Knight Autism Coach - Erika Valbuena Assistant Principal - Tracy Gruendel	School-wide (instructional staff)	8/13, 9/27, 10/26, 11/20, 12/3, 12/4, 12/5, 1/18, 1/28, 1/29, 1/30, 5/24	Marzano's Evaluation Tool (Walkthrough snapshot, Informal and Formal Evaluations)	Principal
Marzano's The Arts and Science of Teaching Pre-K through 5	Pre-K through 5 and 100% instructional staff	Leadership Team: K - Amy Towne 1 - Kelly Weingart 2 - Susan Didway 3 - Keelyn Stein 4 - Erin Bell 5 - Laura Lee Reading Coach - Denise Acevedo ESE Specialist - Lisa Widelitz Guidance Counselor - Raiko Knight Autism Coach - Erika Valbuena Assistant Principal - Tracy Gruendel	School-wide (instructional staff)	8/13, 9/27, 10/26, 11/20, 12/3, 12/4, 12/5, 1/18, 1/28, 1/29, 1/30, 5/24	Marzano's Evaluation Tool (Walkthrough snapshot, Informal and Formal Evaluations)	Principal
		ESE Specialist - Lisa Widelitz Leadership				

First in Math fluency program	Grades 1-5	Team: 1 - Kelly Weingart 2 - Susan Didway 3 - Keelyn Stein 4 - Erin Bell 5 - Laura Lee	School-wide (instructional staff)	9/10	On-line Reports (progress monitoring), Go Math Assessments, BAt 1 and 2	Principal

Mathematics Budget:

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
SAC Accountability Funds will support implementation of The Common Core State Standards.	Accountability	State	$1,343.00
The Instructional Materials allocation will support implementation of The Common Core State Standards.	Instructional Materials	State	$1,881.00
			Subtotal: $3,224.00

Technology

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
To increase the capacity of productivity to support the 21st Century and technology standards	Multimedia and Productivity Tools	Internal Account	$1,500.00
			Subtotal: $1,500.00

Professional Development

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Teacher Training will support implementation of The Common Core State Standards.	Instructional Staff Training	State	$654.50
Connecting Common Core State Standards to the Instructional Framework	District Summer Leadership	State	$1,164.50
			Subtotal: $1,819.00

Other

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $6,543.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	In June 2013, the number of students scoring a level 3 in FCAT Science will increase by 3% (6).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
40% (65), of 5th graders scored at Achievement Level 3 on the FCAT Science.	43% (71), of 5th graders will score at Achievement Level 3 on the FCAT Science.

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
				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 will need lessons that engage and excite students to learn about science.	Team leaders will review the Next Generation Science standards,BEEP Lesson Plans, to plan hands on activities to correlate with the standards. Instructional Focus Calendar(IFCs) will be implemented.BEEP Lessons will be discussed at team level meetings monthly. Student science notebooks will be implemented	Team Leaders, Administration, Support Staff	Student assessments in Science from Florida Fusion and BEEP lessons; Science Notebooks.Data Chats,CWTs	Students chapter assessments from Science Fusion and demonstrations in Science Notebooks
2	Students will act like scientists and engage in active inquiry.	Students will create Science journals to include important skills and concepts taught and observed during experiments.	Team Leaders, Administration, Support Staff	Teacher monitoring, classroom activities and assessments, Science lab experiments	Completion of experiments, Science journals, rubrics
3	Students have limited background knowledge in Science	Teachers will integrate science passages from Science Fusion and Broward County Hands on Kits into the reading block to build background knowledge and ask high cognitive level questions.	Team Leaders, Administration, Support Staff	Discussions, classroom activities, United Streaming videos	Discussions with teacher/students, Chapter assessments,Science Notebooks
4	Students will increase knowledge in Scientific Thinking process	All K-5 classes will complete class science projects	Team Leaders, Administration, Support Staff	Application of process in class projects, and individual projects in grades 3-5.	Inforaml classroom assessments to determine level of delivery success; observations, Rubric
5	ELL students have difficulty understanding vocabulary words and concepts in Science	General Education teacher will identify strengths and weaknesses and work with small groups throughout the day to address deficiencies	Support Staff, Administration	Weekly review of student achievement data, Data Chats, CWTs to observe appropriate implementation of Science Fusion Program	Rubrics, discussions with teachers/student, Science journals to determine level of delivery success.
6	Teachers will need training on the new Science Fusion Program.	Teachers that attended the Science trainings this summer will train their respective grade levels.	Team Leaders, Administration	Student assessments in science; science journals	Students Science Fusion assessments; Experiments in Science Notebooks.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b:	By June 2013, 75% (3) students will score at Levels 4, 5 and 6 on the Florida Alternate Assessment in Science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

75% (3) students scored at Levels 4, 5 and 6 on the Florida Alternate Assessment in Science.			By June 2013, 75% (3) students will score at Levels 4, 5 and 6 on the Florida Alternate Assessment in Science.	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Alignment of Access Points to The Common Core State Standards ("Connecting to Core")	Continued utilization of the Prerequisites to The Common Core State Standards and current access points, Supplementing programs with addition resources (e.g. Basic Math from Struggler's Math Chart)	Classroom teachers, Autism Coach and Administration	Use Brigance Diagnostic Inventory Assessment and IEP Data Collection Forms.	Florida Alternate Assessment
2	Behavior Management	Utilization of TEACCH Strategies and Skills (reinforcement and assessment), Daily Picture Behavior Charts	Classroom teachers, Autism Coach and Administration	Use Brigance Diagnostic Inventory Assessment, IEP Data Collection Forms, Behavior Charts and Daily Home Notes	Florida Alternate Assessment

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	By June 2013, the number of students who will score a score Level 3 on the FCAT Science will increase by at least 3% (6).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
20% (32), of 5th graders scored at Achievement Level 3 on the FCAT Science.	23% (38), of 5th graders will score at Achievement Level 3 on the FCAT Science.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students deficiency in scientific method and the process of inquiry in Science	All classes will create science projects. Students in grades 3-5 will complete individual science projects. Teachers will use hands-on activities found in BCHS kits and Science Fusion hands on science activities.	Team Leaders, Support Staff, Administration	Science Fair Chairs, Support Staff, CWTs, Data Chats	Evaluation of science projects, Science Notebooks

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:	By June 2013, 50 % (2) students will score at or above Level 7 on the Florida Alternate Assessment in Science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

	25% (1) students scored at or above Level 7 on the Florida Alternate Assessment in Science.	50% (2) students will score at or above Level 7 on the Florida Alternate Assessment in Science.

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Alignment of Access Points to The Common Core State Standards ("Connecting to Core")	Continued utilization of the Prerequisites to The Common Core State Standards and current access points, Supplementing programs with addition resources (e.g. Basic Math from Struggler's Math Chart) Classroom teachers, Autism	Classroom teachers, Autism Coach and Administration	Use Brigance Diagnostic Inventory Assessment and IEP Data Collection Forms.	Florida Alternate Assessment
2	Behavior Management	Utilization of TEACCH Strategies and Skills (reinforcement and assessment), Daily Picture Behavior Charts	Classroom teachers, Autism Coach and Administration	Use Brigance Diagnostic Inventory Assessment, IEP Data Collection Forms, Behavior Charts and Daily Home Notes	Florida Alternate Assessment

---

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
Effective Use of Science Journals Elementary (1 day)

Elementary Science and the Core (2 days)

STEM Inquiry Investigations (1 day)

STEM 2 Problem Based Learning in Science (1 day)

Problem Based Learning in Science: Matter 1 (1 day) | K-5 All Instructional Staff | Core Curriculum | All K through 5 instructional staff | 10/4

9/25 and 10/3 or 10/17 and 10/24

10/3, 11/7 or 11/28

10/17, 11/8, or 12/12

11/1, 11/29 or 12/13 | STEM Projects, Core Fusion Assessments, BAT 1 and 2

Student performance demonstrations | Principal |

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
SAC Accountability Funds will support implementation of The Common Core State Standards.	Accountability State	State	$671.50
The Instructional Materials allocation will support implementation of The Common Core State Standards.	Instructional Materials	State	$940.50
			Subtotal: $1,612.00
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
Teacher Training will support implementation of The Common Core State Standards., STEM Training	Instructional Staff Training	State	$654.50
			Subtotal: $654.50
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $2,266.50

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	By June 2013, there will be an increase of 5% (10) students scoring at Achievement Level 3 or above on the FCAT Writing Assessment. scoring level 4 or above
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
85% (181) of 4th grade students scored at Achievement Level 3 or above on the FCAT Writing Assessment.	90% (191) of 4th grade students will score at Achievement Level 3 or above on the FCAT Writing Assessment.

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 will learn the writing process and the different types of writings, (expository, narrative, persuasive)	Reinforce use of school wide model for creating a paragraph with a beginning, middle and ending for instruction.	Denise Acevedo, Reading Coach Tracy Grundel, Assistant Principal Mr. Micheal Breslaw,	Quarterly school-wide writing debriefing, teacher observations, peer coaching and review, classroom walk-throughs	Student writing samples and FCAT Writing, FCAT rubric for baseline and midyear reporting of results,

			Principal		six traits monitoring throughout year.
2	Differentiate instruction and provide small groups as done in reading and mathematics	Co-teacher assigned will plan and collaborate with classroom teachers in order to provide remediation and/or enrichment to students utilization Writing In Control.	Mr. Michael Breslaw, Principal	Progress monitoring	Student writing samples and FCAT Writing, FCAT rubric for baseline and midyear reporting of results, six traits monitoring throughout year.
3					

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:	By June 2013, 100% (1) will score at Achievement Level 4 or above on the Alternate Writing Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (1) students scored at Achievement Level 4 or above on the Alternate Writing Assessment.	100% (1) will score at Achievement Level 4 or above on the Alternate Writing Assessment.

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	Alignment of Access Points to The Common Core State Standards ("Connecting to Core")	Continued utilization of the Prerequisites to The Common Core State Standards and current access points, Supplementing programs with addition resources (e.g. Basic Math from Struggler's Math Chart)	Classroom teachers, Autism Coach and Administration	Use Brigance Diagnostic Inventory Assessment and IEP Data Collection Forms.	Florida Alternate Assessment
2	Behavior Management	Utilization of TEACCH Strategies and Skills (reinforcement and assessment), Daily Picture Behavior Charts	Classroom teachers, Autism Coach and Administration	Use Brigance Diagnostic Inventory Assessment, IEP Data Collection Forms, Behavior Charts and Daily Home Notes	Florida Alternate Assessment

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
		Leadership				

Connecting Common Core State Standards to the Instructional Framework	Pre-K through 5 and 100% instructional staff	Team: K - Amy Towne 1 - Kelly Weingart 2 - Susan Didway 3 - Keelyn Stein 4 - Erin Bell 5 - Laura Lee Reading Coach - Denise Acevedo ESE Specialist - Lisa Widelitz Guidance Counselor - Raiko Knight Autism Coach - Erika Valbuena Assistant Principal - Tracy Gruendel	School-wide (instructional staff)	8/13, 9/27, 10/26, 11/20, 12/3, 12/4, 12/5, 1/18, 1/28, 1/29, 1/30, 5/24	Marzano's Evaluation Tool (Walkthrough snapshot, Informal and Formal Evaluations)	Principal

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
SAC Accountability Funds will support implementation of The Common Core State Standards.	Accountability	State	$1,343.00
The Instructional Materials allocation will support implementation of The Common Core State Standards.	Instructional Materials	State	$1,881.00
			Subtotal: $3,224.00
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
Teacher Training will support implementation of The Common Core State Standards., STEM Training	Instructional Staff Training	State	$654.50
			Subtotal: $654.50
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $3,878.50

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:	To reduce the number of excessive absences in the 2012-13 school year by 1%
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
The current attendance rate is 95.8% (1123) or the 2012 school year.	In June 2012, attendance rate will increase by at least 1% .
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
51 students had excessive absences	30
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
169	130

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 often forget to call their child in sick.	Office will keep a calling log and use Parent Link,Parents sent home information sheet on BTIP to sign that they understand process	Theresa Amodeo, Assistant Principal	Daily Class Attendance log	End of year data, attendance rate
2	Implement the established BTIP Process to reinforce attendance.	Information gathered from Data Warehouse (DWH) to identify non-attendees early so early intervention can be done. BTIP incorporated into RTI and CTP conversations bi-weekly.	Administration, Guidnce Counselor, School Social Worker	Daily Class Attendance Logs on Pinnacle	End of year data from DWH and Virtual Counselor

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

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:	To maintain suspension rate at 0.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
For the 2011 school year, the suspension rate is 0.	For the 2012-2013 school year, we are expecting to maintain the current suspension rate of 0.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
0	0
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
0	0
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
0	0
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Training to use effective classroom and school management so that students are in their classrooms learning.	Provide training and guidance to teachers who need to improve their behavior management skills.	Guidance Counselor, Assistant Principal	Classroom feedback from teacher, Parent Teacher Survey	Referrals, ETS
2	Teachers can improve behavior strategies throughout school	Provide training and opportunity in Learning Communities to discuss effective behavior strategies	LC Coaches, Guidance Counselor and Assistant Principal	Observation by administration	Referrals, ETS, CWT

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: *Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	By June 2013, parent participation will increase by 5%.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
85% of parents attended events this year.	90% of parents will attend school activities this year.
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Parents being informed of events being held at school.	Post information online and in weekly school newsletter.Provide topics of interest and dynamic guest speakers and events to attract a larger audience.	Michael Breslaw, Principal	Attendance at events	Attendance sheets from events
2	Parents are less likely to attend informational sessions, yet more likely to attend student performances.	Include student performances with informational sessions	Assistant Principal, Leadership Team	Attendance at events	Attendance sheets from events

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:	By June 2013, 43% (79), of 5th graders will score at Achievement Level 3 on the FCAT Science and 65% (119) will score at Achievement Level 3 or above.

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 will need to be trained in the Common Core Standards. Teachers in all grades will be trained during pre-planning week to infuse the Common Core Standards into the curriculum. Appropriate grade levels will attend district workshops on Common Core Standards for each academic area. Teachers shall meet with teams weekly and discuss which core standards are being used in which curriculum areas.	Teachers will use IFCs provided on BEEP for their grade level.	Administration/Leadership Team	CWT(Classroom Walkthroughs) will be done on a weekly basis to determine if Common Core Standards are being used.	Data chats with administration, Chapter tests, Mini Benchmark tests
2	Students will increase knowledge in Scientific Thinking process	All K-5 classes will complete class science projects	Team Leaders, Administration, Support Staff	Application of process in class projects, and individual projects in grades 3-5.	Informal classroom assessments to determine level of delivery success; observations, Rubric

3	Teachers will need lessons that engage and excite students to learn about science. Team leaders will review the Next Generation Science standards,	Team leaders will review the Next Generation BEEP Lesson Plans, to plan hands on activities to correlate with the standards. Instructional Focus Calendar (IFCs) will be implemented. BEEP Lessons will be discussed at team level meetings monthly. Student science notebooks will be implemented.	Team Leaders, Administration, Support Staff	Student assessments in Science from Florida Fusion and BEEP lessons; Science Notebooks.	Data Chats,CWTs Students chapter assessments from Science Fusion and demonstrations in Science Notebooks
4	The time and cost to increase the capacity of trained teachers in the Effective Use of Science Journals, STEM 1 Inquiry Investigations, STEM 2 Problem Based Learning in Science and Problem-Based Learning in Science: Matter	Representation from every grade level will attend district trainings and lead their grade level team to the integration of STEM within the classrooms.	Administration/Leadership Team	Classroom observations will be done on a weekly basis to determine if Common Core Standards and the STEM curriculum are being implemented with fidelity.	Data Chats, CWTs Students chapter assessments from Science Fusion, demonstrations in Science Notebooks and BAT 1 and 2.

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
Effective Use of Science Journals Elementary (1 day)

Elementary Science and the Core (2 days)

STEM Inquiry Investigations (1 day)

STEM 2 Problem Based Learning in Science (1 day)

Problem Based Learning in Science: Matter 1 (1 day) | K-5 All Instructional Staff | Core Curriculum | All K through 5 instructional staff | 10/4

9/25 and 10/3 or 10/17 and 10/24

10/3, 11/7 or 11/28

10/17, 11/8, or 12/12

11/1, 11/29 or 12/13 | STEM Projects, Core Fusion Assessments, BAT 1 and Student performance demonstrations | Principal |

STEM Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
SAC Accountability Funds will support implementation of The Common Core State Standards and STEM district trainings.	Accountability State	State	$671.50
The Instructional Materials allocation will support implementation of The Common Core State Standards.	Instructional Materials	State	$940.50
		Subtotal:	$1,612.00

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:	$1,612.00

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	SAC Accountability Funds will support implementation of The Common Core State Standards.	Accountability	State	$1,343.00
Reading	The Instructional Materials allocation will support implementation of The Common Core State Standards.	Instructional Materials	State	$1,881.00
Mathematics	SAC Accountability Funds will support implementation of The Common Core State Standards.	Accountability	State	$1,343.00
Mathematics	The Instructional Materials allocation will support implementation of The Common Core State Standards.	Instructional Materials	State	$1,881.00
Science	SAC Accountability Funds will support implementation of The Common Core State Standards.	Accountability State	State	$671.50
Science	The Instructional Materials allocation will support implementation of The Common Core State Standards.	Instructional Materials	State	$940.50
Writing	SAC Accountability Funds will support implementation of The Common Core State Standards.	Accountability	State	$1,343.00
Writing	The Instructional Materials allocation will support implementation of The Common Core State Standards.	Instructional Materials	State	$1,881.00
STEM	SAC Accountability Funds will support implementation of The Common Core State Standards and STEM district trainings.	Accountability State	State	$671.50
STEM	The Instructional Materials allocation will support implementation of The Common Core State Standards.	Instructional Materials	State	$940.50
				Subtotal: $12,896.00

Technology

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	To increase the capacity of productivity to support the 21st Century and technology standards	Multimedia and Productivity Tools	Internal Accounts	$1,500.00
Mathematics	To increase the capacity of productivity to support the 21st Century and technology standards	Multimedia and Productivity Tools	Internal Account	$1,500.00
				Subtotal: $3,000.00

Professional Development

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Teacher Training will support implementation of The Common Core State Standards.	Instructional Staff Training	State	$654.50
Reading	Connecting Common Core State Standards to the Instructional Framework	District Summer Leadership	State	$1,164.50
Mathematics	Teacher Training will support implementation of The Common Core State Standards.	Instructional Staff Training	State	$654.50
Mathematics	Connecting Common Core State Standards to the Instructional Framework	District Summer Leadership	State	$1,164.50
Science	Teacher Training will support implementation of The Common Core State Standards., STEM Training	Instructional Staff Training	State	$654.50
Writing	Teacher Training will support implementation of The Common Core State Standards., STEM Training	Instructional Staff Training	State	$654.50
				Subtotal: $4,947.00

Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	PTA will support the various genres of reading	Instructional Supplemental Materials (e.g. Time For Kids, National Geographic)	PTA	$5,000.00
				Subtotal: $5,000.00
				Grand Total: $25,843.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

jn Priority	jn Focus	jn Prevent	jn NA

Are you a reward school: jn Yes jn No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 9/7/2012)

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

Our school purchased leveled reading materials aligning with The Common Core State Standards, an online differentiated reading leveled program called Raz-Kids (K-2), an online fluency-building math program called First In Math (2-5 and Florida Coach instructional materials in Reading, Mathematics and Science. These programs have been fully implemented and our future use of SAC funds will be determined from the success and learning gains of our students. The data from the Broward Assessment Test (BAT) will determine the academic needs for the 2013-2014 school year.	$5,372.00

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

The School Advisory Committee (SAC) will meet monthly to collaborate on school improvement objectives. The Common Core State Standards, Robert J. Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching, The Daily 5, CAFE, The Seven Keys to Comprehension and alignment of the progress monitoring system are the focus areas for learning at SAC. We will analyze data and learn the Annual Measurable Objectives (AMO) with the goal of meeting 100% of our AMO targets. The committee will focus on innovative programs and learning opportunities that will assist all students making learning gains. As a continuous practice, we will update and improve the SIP after various benchmarks.

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Broward School District
TRADEWINDS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	85%	89%	97%	57%	328	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	66%	71%			137	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?	56% (YES)	66% (YES)			122	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					587	
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
TRADEWINDS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	87%	87%	85%	63%	322	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	66%	71%			137	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?	51% (YES)	60% (YES)			111	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					570	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested