

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

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

School Name: STIRLING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Broward

Principal: Alfred Dobronz

SAC Chair: Marienid O'Neill, Maribel Garcia

Superintendent: Robert Runcie

Date of School Board Approval: December 4, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/25/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
					Principal of Stirling Elementary School 2011-2012 Reading Mastery: 60% Math Mastery: 61% Science Mastery: 49% Writing Mastery: 84% 2010-2011 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 75% Math Mastery: 79% Science Mastery: 35% Writing Mastery: 84% AYP: ELL did not make AYP in Reading 2009-2010 Grade: B

Principal	Alfred C. Dobronz	1973- B.A. in History Queens College 1977- Master's in Divinity from The Lutheran Theological Seminary 1983-1991- Special Education Certification from Buffalo State Teacher's College and Deauville College 1991- Educational Leadership Certification from the State University of NY	10	23	Reading Mastery: 70% Math Mastery: 68% Science Mastery: 32% Writing Mastery: 89% AYP: Black, ED, and SWD did not make AYP in Reading and Math 2008-09 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 71% Math Mastery: 74% Science Mastery: 39% Writing Mastery: 90% AYP: Black, ED, and SWD did not make AYP in Reading and Math 2007-08 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 71% Math Mastery: 75% Science Mastery: 35% Writing Mastery: 86% AYP: Yes 2006-07 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 71% Math Mastery: 69% Science Mastery: 34% Writing Mastery: 82% AYP: Black, ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in Reading and Math ED did not meet AYP in Math 2009-2010 Grade: A Reading Mastery: % Math Mastery: % Science Mastery: % Writing Mastery: % AYP: Black, ED, and SWD did not make AYP in Reading and Math
Assis Principal	MariaElena A Menendez	2002- B.S. in Pre-K Primary Education with ESOL Endorsement from Barry University 2004- Master's in Reading K-12 from Barry University 2005- Post-Master's Certification in Educational Leadership from St. Thomas University	2	2	2010-2011 Grade: A 2011-2012 Reading Mastery: 60% Math Mastery: 61% Science Mastery: 49% Writing Mastery: 84% Reading Mastery: 75% Math Mastery: 79% Science Mastery: 35% Writing Mastery: 84% AYP: ELL did not make AYP in Reading 2009-2010 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 70% Math Mastery: 68% Science Mastery: 32% Writing Mastery: 89% AYP: Black, ED, and SWD did not make AYP in Reading and Math

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)
					2010-2011 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 75% Math Mastery: 79% Science Mastery: 35% Writing Mastery: 84% AYP: ELL did not make AYP in Reading

Reading	Lorilee Pearl	1979- B.A. SLD K-12 from Florida Atlantic University 1994-Masters in Educational Leadership from NOVA Southeastern University 1997- Certification in Elementary Education 2010-Reading Endorsement 2010- National Board Certified Early and Middle Childhood Literacy and Language Arts	13	13	2009-2010 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 70% Math Mastery: 68% Science Mastery: 32% Writing Mastery: 89% AYP: Black, ED, and SWD did not make AYP in Reading and Math 2008-09 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 71% Math Mastery: 74% Science Mastery: 39% Writing Mastery: 90% AYP: Black, ED, and SWD did not make AYP in Reading and Math 2007-08 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 71% Math Mastery: 75% Science Mastery: 35% Writing Mastery: 86% AYP: Yes 2006-07 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 71% Math Mastery: 69% Science Mastery: 34% Writing Mastery: 82% AYP: Black, ELL, and SWD did not make AYP in Reading and Math ED did not meet AYP in Math
---------	---------------	---	----	----	--

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1. Professional Development based on needs of educators	NESS Liaison, Professional Development Committee, Reading Coach and Administrator (s)	June 2012	
2	2. Induction plan including preplanning opportunities	Administrator (s) and Ness Liaison	Ongoing	
3	3. Instructional coaches/mentors paired with targeted educators	Administrator (s)	Ongoing	
4	4. Support Group Meeting	NBCT Teachers	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
42	0.0%(0)	4.8%(2)	45.2%(19)	54.8%(23)	47.6%(20)	90.5%(38)	9.5%(4)	19.0%(8)	97.6%(41)

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
National Board Certified Teachers and Broward County Recognition Program Teachers	Suzanne Frazier	To receive NBCT/BCRP Certification	Monthly

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

Stirling Elementary has 2.63 teachers supported with Title I, Part A funds, particularly low performing students.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

n/a

Title I, Part D

n/a

Title II

Classroom teachers will attend District training for the new Go Math series.
 Two teachers per grade level attended District training for the new Science Fusion series and the Writing Common Core Standards between June & July of 2011.
 Kindergarten teachers attended District training for the Common Core Standards.
 An ESE teacher attended District training for the (P-BASSS) Positive Behavioral and Academic Strategies for Student Success.

Title III

Multicultural supplemental materials were received from Sundance, which included a listening library with leveled readers.

Title X- Homeless

n/a

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Will pay 53.47% of average teacher salary which equals to \$28,477.11

Violence Prevention Programs

District-wide Bullying Program/Policy
 Gun Safety- United States Attorney's Office grades 3-5
 Internet Safety- United States Attorney's Office grades 3-5

McGruff: Stranger Danger grades K-5
Thumbody & Thumbody 2- Kindergarten
Hands are for Helping- Kindergarten
Get Real About Violence- grades 4-5

Nutrition Programs

n/a

Housing Programs

n/a

Head Start

n/a

Adult Education

n/a

Career and Technical Education

n/a

Job Training

n/a

Other

n/a

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Alfred C. Dobronz- Principal
MariaElena Menendez- Assistant Principal
Dr. Mucenic- psychologist
Jan Twomey- ESE Specialist
Kim Mowatt- Social Worker
Marina Frankovitz- School Counselor
Lorilee Pearl- Reading Resource Specialist/CPST Coordinator

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?

Each RtI leadership team member is assigned a specific grade-level to review CPST referrals. Instructional and/or behavioral interventions are recommended, implemented, documented and reviewed on an "as needed" basis by each grade-specific RtI leadership team member. Scheduled team meetings review and evaluate data provided by classroom teachers twice a month.
The need for additional interventions and/or a formal evaluation will be determined at those meetings. Teacher communicates with parents on interventions and progress.

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

The RtI Leadership Team is part of the academic committee group that is coordinated by L. Pearl, Reading Coach/Curriculum Specialist, and Title I Coordinator. Each RTI leadership team will become the case manager assigned to a specific grade-level to coordinate ongoing interventions (Tier II and Tier III and progress monitoring.) The case manager maintains communication frequency as determined by initial intervention recommendations. The entire RtI committee reconvenes to review the data collected, which includes graphs. Different subgroups are identified and possible SWD may be referred for additional comprehensive evaluation. This additional testing might yield an increase in SWD, which may effect the SIP recommendations for subgroup activities in order to meet AYP.

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.

Tier II and Tier III resources are Interventions Records and AIM progress monitoring graphs generated for an individual student. Frequency of interventions will be determined by initial intervention recommendations. Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading in K-5 (FAIR); Treasures/Trophies Unit Exams, The Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA), Diagnostic Assessment in Reading (DAR), Rigby, Burns and Roe Informal Reading Inventory (IRI),
In the area of Math, we will collect analyze data provided by the following assessments: Harcourt Go Math Assessments and QBAT for grades 1 & 2.
In the area of Science, we will collect and analyze data provided by the following assessments: Harcourt Unit/Chapter Assessments, Delta Hands On Science Assessments found on BEEP and Science mini-bats. In the area of Writing, we will collect and analyze data provided by the School-wide Writing Prompts as mandated by the Differentiated Instruction Model. Behavior will be monitored and tracked through the use of Behavior Monitoring frequency charts.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional development on the RtI process and the use of BASIS to progress monitor intervention students will be provided during the first four weeks of school. The training will review the RtI process, including the data collection process and how to appropriately use BASIS to document data. Additionally, RtI members will meet with grade group teams each semester to determine and provide additional RtI training as needed.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

n/a

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

n/a

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

n/a

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.

A kindergarten orientation/open house will be held prior to the start of the school year for kindergarten students and their families to familiarize them with the school and expectations for the coming year.
In October, the kindergarten team will host a family event that will cover strategies to help parents assist their child/children meet kindergarten grade-level expectations.
Kindergarten tours are available upon request throughout the school year for parents and neighboring pre-schools. Our

kindergarten teachers give the visiting preschoolers a tour of their kindergarten classroom and prepare a small activity to do with the students giving them a "taste" of kindergarten.

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

N/A

*High Schools Only

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

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

N/A

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

N/A

Postsecondary Transition

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

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the [High School Feedback Report](#)

N/A

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal # 1a:	Two-Year Trend Data of FCAT Results: 2011- 40% (100 students) 2012- 32% (88 students)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
32% (88 students) in Grades 3-5 scored at a Level 3 on the 2012 FCAT.	37% (101 students) in Grades 3-5 will score at a Level 3 on the 2013 FCAT.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Difficulty in addressing individual needs of all students.	Additional support through "Push-in" & "Pull-out" instruction.	Admin.	Instructors will meet with grade level teachers bimonthly for collaboration and revisions	FAIR Weekly progress-monitoring probes teacher observations
2	Ineffective management of instructional time.	Staggered grade level instructional blocks and the use of District provided instructional focus calendars.	Admin.	Administration and instructional staff will conduct classroom walk throughs. Specific CWT data will be provided to grade levels at monthly meetings in order to reflect on and improve instruction.	Weekly progress-monitoring probes Teacher observation checklist FAIR Weekly Assessments
3	Limited independent reading	Participation in a coterie to share Sunshine State reading books in a variety of formats: literature circles, book talks, skits, commercials and character cubes	Media Specialist Reading Resource Specialist Classroom Teacher	Number of books read Group project	Reading log Rubric

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal # 1b:	2012- 67% (12 students) scored at Levels 4,5, and 6 in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 67% (12 students) scored a Level 4, 5, 6 on the Reading portion of the FAA.	In 2013, 73% (13 students) will score a Level 4, 5, 6 on the Reading portion of the FAA.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Person or	Process Used to
--	-----------	-----------------

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students in this category are intellectually deficient.	Teacher trained in Unique Curriculum and Access Points. 1:3 teacher/student ratio for reading instruction for multi-sensory instructional approach.	Admin ESE Specialist ESE Teachers	Ongoing progress monitoring	Weekly assessments FAA

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	Two-Year Trend Data FCAT Results: 2011- 35% (86 students) 2012- 26% (71 students)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
26% (71 students) scored at a level 4-5 on the 2012 FCAT.	31% (85 students) in Grades 3-5 will score at a Level 4-5 on the 2013 FCAT.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teacher focus on targeted struggling students limits the amount of time they spend challenging above leveled students.	Increase student opportunities for collaboration & independent work/ projects to enhance critical thinking skills using Webb's Complexity Levels	Admin. Classroom Teacher	Ongoing progress monitoring	Rubrics/checklist; teacher/student conferencing
2	Limited personnel to teach enrichment camps due to multiple camps scheduled.	Monday/Wednesday-ELO camps Tuesday/Thursday-SES camps	Admin. SES Coordinator	Number of student participants	Student/parent survey

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	2012- 22 % of students (4 students) scored above a Level 7.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On the 2012 FAA, 22% of students (4 students) scored above a Level 7 on the Reading FAA.	In 2013, 26% (4.5 students) of students will score above a Level 7 on the Reading FAA.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Students in this category	Teachers trained in	Admin	Ongoing progress	Weekly informal

1	are intellectually deficient.	Unique Curriculum and Access Points. 1:3 teacher/student ratio for reading instruction for multi-sensory instructional approach	ESE Specialist ESE teachers	monitoring	assessments FAA
---	-------------------------------	--	--------------------------------	------------	--------------------

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	Two-Year Trend Data FCAT Results: 2012- 70% (141 students)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
73% (141 students) in Grades 3-5 made learning gains in FCAT 2012.	78% (150 students) in Grades 3-5 will make learning gains in the 2013 FCAT.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Mastery of all pre-requisite benchmarks in subject areas from previous year not achieved	Small group instruction targeting the skills that need mastery	Admin. Reading Coach & Classroom Teachers	Teacher/student conferencing Monthly data chats conducted with team leaders and administration	BAT 1 and BAT 2

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	2012- 21% of students (2 students) made learning gains in reading
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On the 2012 FAA, 21% of students (2 students) made learning gains in reading	In 2013, 26% (4.5 students) of students will make learning gains in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students in this category are intellectually deficient.	Teacher trained in Unique Curriculum and Access Points. 1:3 teacher/student ratio for reading instruction for multi-sensory instructional approach.	Admin. ESE Specialist ESE Teachers	Ongoing Progress Monitoring	Weekly Assessments FAA

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	Two-Year Trend Data FCAT Results: 2011- 69% (33 students) 2012- 77% (39 students)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
77% of struggling readers in the lowest 25th percentile (39 students) made learning gains in Reading.	82% in the lowest 25th percentile will make learning gains or the 2013 FCAT.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited support staff	Title I SES after school tutoring; ELO Camp;	SES School Facilitator ELO- admin	SES & ELO Pre-post Test	Comparison of pre & post test
2	Lack of phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary and fluency skills.	Targeted students will receive additional instruction in Reading using district recommended programs found on the struggling readers chart.	Admin Reading Resource Specialist Classroom Teacher	Ongoing progress monitoring through data chats with admin and reading resource specialist.	FAIR IRI DAR Cool Tools

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 2013, 64% of students will be proficient in Reading as measured by the FCAT. 5A :					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	60	64	68	71	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 reading. Reading Goal #5B:	Two-Year Trend Data FCAT Results: 2011- 64% of black students (35 students) 65% of hispanic students (84 students) 77% of white students (69 students); 2012- 52% of black students (25 students) 40% of hispanic students (49 students) 33% of asian students (5 students)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2012- 52% of black students (25 students) 40% of hispanic students (49 students) 33% of asian students (5 students)	2013- Decrease (by 5%) the number of students not making satisfactory progress in reading 47% of black students (23 students) 35% of hispanic students (43 students) 28% of asian students (4 students)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

1	Lack of student motivation	Target & mentor students in "Leaders of Tomorrow" program	School Counselor ESE Specialists Admin Selected Teachers	Teachers in grades 3-5 will recommend student Admin/Support Staff will meet with designated grade-level students monthly "Breakfast Bunch"	Increase student participation, motivation, and attitude in classroom per teacher observation
---	----------------------------	---	---	---	---

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:	Two-Year Trend Data FCAT Results: 2011- 56% (35 students) 2012- 78% (31 students)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
78% of ELL learners did not make satisfactory progress in Reading.	In 2013, we will decrease the percentage of ELL learners not making satisfactory progress by atleast 5% bringing the percentage down to 73% or less.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited knowledge of English vocabulary	Use of graphic organizers, peer buddy, extended time for exploring prior knowledge, and additional time provided for practice	Admin. Classroom Teacher	On going progress monitoring	Computer-generated progress reports Rubric Teacher observations Teacher/student conferencing Weekly Assessments
2	Limited time for practice based on individual needs	Utilization of various computer programs to reinforce phonics, vocabulary, and fluency	Admin Classroom Teachers	On-going progress monitoring	Computer generated reports

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:	Two-Year Trend Data FCAT Results: 2010- 43% (28 students) 2011- 50% (29 students)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
73% (19 students) are not making satisfactory progress in reading	In 2013, the percentage of SWD students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics will be decreased by 5% (less than 68%).

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
	Providing students with additional instruction in	Staggered academic blocks scheduling to	Admin ESE Specialist	Ongoing progress monitoring	Weekly assessments

1	their area of need without infringing on other academic instructional time.	provide additional support to SWD Students.	ESE Teacher		FCAT
2	Students lack necessary skills in the 6 areas of reading.	Students are assessed using the FAIR and grouped according to their needs. The following interventions will be used for reading push-in & pull-out: Phonics for Reading, REWARDS, Quick Reads, Foundations, Super QAR, & Elements of Reading Vocabulary.	VE Teachers Classroom Teachers	Ongoing progress monitoring	DAR Fair iStation Cool Tools

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:	Two-Year Trend Data FCAT Results- 2011- 63% (142 students) 2012- 50% (96 students)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (96 students) of Economically Disadvantaged students did not make satisfactory progress in reading.	Less than 45% of Economically Disadvantaged students will not make satisfactory progress 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	An increase in disadvantage student ratio from 68% to 70%	Increase parent participation in Title I parent/academic events	Admin Grade-level teams Subject area committee	Sign-in sheets	Parent surveys

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
Unique Curriculum District Training	ESE	District trainer	ESE Teachers K-5	May 2013	Classroom walkthroughs	Admin ESE Specialist
Access Points District Training	ESE	District trainer	ESE Teachers K-5	May 2013	Classroom walkthroughs	Admin ESE Specialist
3-5 Text Complexity & use of CCSS Sentence Stems	3-5	District Trainer Reading Coach	3-5 Teachers	May 2013	Classroom walkthroughs	Admin 3-5 Teachers Reading Coach
K-2 Common Core State Standards						

District & In School and CCSS Sentence Stems Training	K-2	District trainer Reading Coach	K-2 Teachers	May 2013	Classroom walkthroughs	Admin K-2 Teachers Reading Coach
Daily 5 District Training	K-5	District trainer	K-5 Teachers	May 2013	Classroom walkthroughs	Admin K-5 Teachers
Common Core State Standards PLC	K-5 ESE	PLC Facilitator	K-5 Teachers ESE Teachers	May 2013	Classroom walkthroughs	Admin
Daily 5 PLC	K-5 ESE	PLC Facilitator	K-5 Teachers ESE Teachers	May 2013	Classroom walkthroughs	Admin

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Implementation of the Daily 5 in all K-5 classrooms	The Daily 5 written by Gaily Boushey and Joan Moser	PD Funds	\$150.00
			Subtotal: \$150.00
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
Teachers are given release time to attend professional development during the school day.	District provided training	Professional Development Funds	\$3,800.00
Teachers are provided release time to observe in model classrooms throughout Broward County.	Broward County Schools	Professional Development Funds	\$1,600.00
			Subtotal: \$5,400.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$5,550.00

End of Reading Go:

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	2012- 17% (13 students) are scoring proficient in listening/speaking
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	

2012- 17% (13 students) are scoring proficient in listening/speaking will increase to 22% (17 students) by 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	Limited English language	Increase use of books on tape Increase time on iStation and Rosetta Stone programs Increase use of Bilingual picture dictionaries Increase use of websites (ex: Tumblebooks, StarFall, etc.) Practice listening and speaking with a peer buddy	Classroom Teacher	Ongoing progress monitoring	Computer generated reports Teacher/student conferencing Weekly assessments CELLA

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

2. Students scoring proficient in reading.

CELLA Goal #2:

2012- 17% (7 students) are proficient in reading

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

2012- 17% (7 students) are proficient in reading and will increase 22% (9 students) by 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	Limited English language	Increase use of books on tape Increase time on iStation and Rosetta Stone programs Increase use of Bilingual picture dictionaries Increase use of websites (ex: Tumblebooks, StarFall, etc.) Practice reading with a peer buddy	Classroom Teacher	Ongoing progress monitoring	Computer generated reports Weekly Assessments CELLA Teacher/student conferencing

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

2012- 18% (6 students) are proficient in writing

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

2012- 18% (6 students) are proficient in writing and will increase to 23% (8 students) by 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	Limited English writing application	Increase time on iStation and Rosetta Stone programs Increase use of Bilingual picture dictionaries Increase use of websites (ex: Tumblebooks, StarFall, etc.) Practice writing with a peer buddy	Classroom Teachers	Ongoing progress monitoring Writing samples in Writer's Notebook	Computer generated reports Teacher/student conferences 6 Traits of Writing Rubric CELLA

CELLA Budget:

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

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:	Two-Year Trend Data FCAT Results 2011- 37% of students (91 students) 2012- 31% of students (86 students)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
31% of students (86 students) achieved proficiency in the FCAT Math.	36% will achieve proficiency on the 2013 Math FCAT

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Difficulty in addressing individual needs of all students.	Additional support through "Push-in" & "Pull-out" instruction.	Admin.	Instructors will meet with grade level teachers bimonthly for collaboration and revisions	FAIR Weekly progress-monitoring probes teacher observations
2	Ineffective management of instructional time.	Staggered grade level instructional blocks and the use of District provided instructional focus calendars.	Admin.	Administration and instructional staff will conduct classroom walk throughs. Specific CWT data will be provided to grade levels at monthly meetings in order to reflect on and improve instruction.	Weekly progress-monitoring probes Teacher observation checklist FAIR Weekly Assessments
3	Lack of teacher experience with the GO Math series.	Teachers who are implementing the GO Math series for the first time will attend District trainings.	Admin.	On-going progress monitoring	Checklist
4	Limited time for practice based on individual needs	Utilization of V-Math, FCAT Explorer, and Compass Learning Odyssey computer programs	Admin.	On-going progress monitoring	Computer generated reports

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	2012- 33% of students (6 students) scored at Levels 4.5. and 6 in mathematics
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2012- 33% of students (6 students) scored at Levels 4.5. and 6 in mathematics	2013- 35% of students (6 students) scored at Levels 4.5. and 6 in mathematics

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

			Person or	Process Used to	
--	--	--	-----------	-----------------	--

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students in this category are intellectually deficient.	Teacher trained Unique Curriculum and Access Points. 1:3 teacher/student ratio for math instruction for multi-sensory instructional approach using hands-on manipulatives.	Admin ESE Specialist ESE Teachers	Ongoing progress monitoring	Weekly assessments FAA

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	Two-Year Trend Data FCAT Results 2011- 42% of students (104 students) 2012- 31% of students (85 students)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
31% (85 students) of students achieved above proficiency Level 4 in mathematics.	36% of students will achieve above proficiency Level 4 in mathematics 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	Teacher focus on targeted struggling students limits the amount of time they spend challenging above leveled students.	Increase student opportunities for collaboration & independent work/projects to enhance critical thinking skills using Webb's Complexity Levels	Admin. Classroom Teacher	Ongoing progress monitoring	Rubrics/checklist; teacher/student conferencing
2	Limited personnel to teach enrichment camps due to multiple camps scheduled.	Monday/Wednesday-ELO camps Tuesday/Thursday-SES camps	Admin. SES Coordinator	Number of student participants	Student/parent survey
3	Students not being challenged though whole group instruction.	Teachers will use the Enrich GO Math materials as well as student centered projects for application of knowledge.	Admin.	Administration and instructional staff will conduct classroom walk throughs. Specific CWT data will be provided to grade levels at monthly meetings in order to reflect on and improve instruction.	Checklist

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	2012- 18% (2 students) scored at/above achievement Level 7.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

2012- 18% (2 students) scored at or above achievement Level 7 in Mathematics.

In 2013, 23% (4 students) of students will score at or above achievement Level 7 in Mathematics.

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 in this category are intellectually deficient.	Teacher trained in Unique Curriculum and Access Points. 1:3 teacher/student ratio for math instruction for multi-sensory instructional approach using hands-on manipulatives.	Admin. ESE Specialist ESE Teachers	Ongoing progress monitoring	Weekly assessments FAA

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.

Two-Year Trend Data FCAT Results 2011- 78% (158 students)
2012- 78% (151 students)

Mathematics Goal #3a:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

78% (151 students) made learning gains

83% will make learning gains on the 2012 FCAT

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Mastery of all pre-requisite benchmarks in subject areas from previous year not achieved	Small group instruction targeting the skills that need mastery	Admin. Reading Coach & Classroom Teachers	Teacher/student conferencing Monthly data chats conducted with team leaders and administration	BAT 1 and BAT 2

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment:
Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.

Mathematics Goal #3b:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

			Person or	Process Used to	
--	--	--	-----------	-----------------	--

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students in this category are intellectually deficient.	Teacher trained in Unique Curriculum and Access Points. 1:3 teacher/student ratio for math instruction for multi-sensory instructional approach using hand-on manipulatives.	Admin ESE Specialist ESE Teachers	Ongoing progress monitoring	Weekly assessments FAA

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	Two-Year Trend Data FCAT Results 2011- 77% (37 students) 2010- 79% (44 students)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
79% (44 students) in the lowest 25th percentile made learning gains	84% in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on the 2013 FCAT.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited support staff	Title I SES after school tutoring; ELO Camp;	SES School Facilitator ELO- admin	SES & ELO Pre-post Test	Comparison of pre & post test
2	Students are entering their grade level not having mastered previous years benchmark skills.	Small group instruction targeting the skills that need mastery Utilization of V-Math, FCAT Explorer, and Compass Learning Odyssey computer programs	Admin.	Monthly data chats conducted with team leaders and administration	Go Math Assessment Guide BAT I & II Computer Generated Reports

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 #					
	In 2013, 63% of students will achieve proficiency in Math as measured by the FCAT. 5A :					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	60	63	66	70	74	

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.	Two-Year Trend Data FCAT Results 2011- 84% of White (76 students) 58% of Black (32 students) 70% of Hispanic (91 students) 2012- 36% of White (30 students), 52% of Black (25
--	--

Mathematics Goal #5B:	students), 36% of Hispanic (44 students)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012 36% of White (30 students) 52% of Black (25 students) 36% of Hispanic (44 students) 13% of Asians (2 students) did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics	In 2013, we will decrease the amount of students in each subgroup not making satisfactory progress in mathematics by at least 5%. 31% of White, 48% of Black, 31% of Hispanic, and 8% of Asians.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of student motivation	Target & mentor students in "Leaders of Tomorrow" program	School Counselor ESE Specialists Admin Selected Teachers	Teachers in grades 3-5 will recommend student Admin/Support Staff will meet with designated grade-level students monthly "Breakfast Bunch"	Increase student participation, motivation, and attitude in classroom per teacher observation

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:	Two-Year Trend Data FCAT Results 2011- 69% (43 students) 2012- 65% (26 students)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
65% (26 students) of ELL students did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics.	In 2013, we will decrease the percentage of students who did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics by at least 5% (under 60%).

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited knowledge of English vocabulary	Use of graphic organizers, peer buddy, extended time for exploring prior knowledge, and additional time provided for practice	Admin. Classroom Teacher	On going progress monitoring	Computer-generated progress reports Rubric Teacher observations Teacher/student conferencing Weekly Assessments
2	GO Math Series requires all students to read real-world word problems	Use of GO Math manipulatives, ELL GO Math resource book, close proximity to the teacher, and pairing up with a non-ELL bi-lingual student	Classroom Teacher	Classroom observations, and assignment/assessment results	GO Math assessment guide

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:	Two-Year Trend Data FCAT Results- 2011- 52% (30 students) 2012- 68% (19 students)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
68% (19 students) of SWD students did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics.	In 2013, the percentage of SWD students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics will be decreased by 5% (less than 63%).

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 students with additional instruction in their area of need without infringing on other academic instructional time.	Staggered academic blocks scheduling to provide additional support to SWD Students.	Admin ESE Specialist ESE Teacher	Ongoing progress monitoring	Weekly assessments FCAT
2	Limited time for practice based on individual needs	Classroom Teachers will collaborate with the VE Teachers to plan for students' individual needs. They will place students in an intervention group and provide extensive hands-on practice.	Classroom Teacher VE Teacher ESE Specialist	On-going progress monitoring	Go Math Assessment Guide

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	Two-Year Trend Data FCAT Results-2011- 65% (147 students) 2012- 43% (84 students)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 43% (84 students) of ED students did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics.	In 2013, we will decrease the number of ED students not making satisfactory progress by 5% bringing the percentage down to under 38%.

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	An increase in disadvantage student ratio from 68% to 70%	Increase parent participation in Title I parent/academic events	Admin Grade-level teams Subject area committee	Sign-in sheets	Parent surveys

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core State Standards	K-2	District Trainer	K-2 Teachers	May 2013	Classroom walkthroughs	Admin
Access Points District Training	ESE	District Trainer	ESE Teachers	May 2013	Classroom walkthroughs	Admin ESE Specialist
Unique Curriculum District Training	ESE	District Trainer	ESE Teachers	May 2013	Classroom walkthroughs	Admin ESE Specialist
GO Math District Training	K-5	District Trainer	K-5 Teachers	May 2013	Classroom walkthroughs	Admin

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Teachers are given release time to attend professional development during the school day.	District Trainings	Professional Development Funds	\$640.00
			Subtotal: \$640.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$640.00

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:	Two-Year Trend Data FCAT Results-2011- 26% (20 students) 2012- 39% (40 students)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
39% (40 students) of students scored a Level 3 in FCAT Science.	In 2013, 44% of students will score a 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	Ineffective management of instructional time.	Staggered grade level instructional blocks and the use of District provided instructional focus calendars.	Admin.	Administration and instructional staff will conduct classroom walk throughs. Specific CWT data will be provided to grade levels at monthly meetings in order to reflect on and improve instruction.	Weekly progress-monitoring probes Teacher observation checklist FAIR Weekly Assessments
2	Mastery of prerequisite skills from previous years not achieved	Teachers in K-5 will utilize Science IFC's, BEEP lessons, Florida Science Fusion, and Hands-on Science Kits.	Admin. Classroom Teacher	Administration will conduct classroom walk throughs. Specific CWT data will be provided to grade levels at monthly meetings in order to reflect on and improve instruction.	Mini BATs Unit Assessments Scientist Journal Rubric Checklist
3	Limited exposure to the scientific method	Teachers will utilize the primary & intermediate science labs to conduct hands-on experiments based on Science IFC's. Students in K-5 will complete a Science Fair project by applying the Scientific Method.	Admin. Classroom Teacher Science Committee	Administration will conduct classroom walk throughs. Specific CWT data will be provided to grade levels at monthly meetings in order to reflect on and improve instruction.	Science Fair Project Rubric Checklist
4	Teachers need training in the new Science Fusion series.	Teachers will attend Science Fusion District training throughout the school year.	Admin. Classroom Teacher	Administration will conduct classroom walk throughs. Specific CWT data will be provided to grade levels at monthly meetings in order to reflect on and improve instruction.	Checklist

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b:	2012- 71% (5 students)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71% (5 students) of students scored at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science.	In 2013, 76% of students will score at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in 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
	Students in this category are	Teacher trained in Unique Curriculum and	Admin ESE Specialist	Ongoing progress monitoring	Weekly assessments

1	intellectually deficient.	Access Points. 1:3 teacher/student ratio for science instruction for multi-sensory instructional approach using hand-on labs.	ESE Teachers		FAA
---	---------------------------	--	--------------	--	-----

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	Two-Year Trend Data FCAT Results- 2011- 9% (7 students) 2012- 7% (7 students)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
7% of students (7 students) scored a Level 4 in science.	12% of students will score a Level 4 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	Teacher focus on targeted struggling students limits the amount of time they spend challenging above leveled students.	Increase student opportunities for collaboration & independent work/projects to enhance critical thinking skills using Webb's Complexity Levels	Admin. Classroom Teacher	Ongoing progress monitoring	Rubrics/checklist; teacher/student conferencing
2	Limited personnel to teach enrichment camps due to multiple camps scheduled.	Monday/Wednesday-ELO camps Tuesday/Thursday-SES camps	Admin. SES Coordinator	Number of student participants	Student/parent survey

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:	2012- 14% (1 students) scored at or above Achievement Level 7 in science
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2012- 14% (1 students) scored at or above Achievement Level 7 in science	2012- 19% (2 students) scored at or above Achievement Level 7 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
	Students in this category are intellectually deficient.	Teachers trained in Unique Curriculum and Access Points.	Admin ESE Specialist ESE Teachers	Ongoing progress monitoring	Weekly assessments FAA

1		1:3 teacher/student ratio for science instruction for multi-sensory instructional approach including hands-on labs.			
---	--	---	--	--	--

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
Science Fusion District Training	K-5	District Trainer	K-5 Teachers	May 2013	Classroom walkthroughs	Admin
Unique Curriculum District Training	ESE	District Trainer	ESE Teachers	May 2013	Classroom walkthroughs	Admin
Access Points District Training	ESE	District Trainer	ESE Teachers	May 2013	Classroom walkthroughs	Admin

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Teachers are given release time to attend professional development during the school day.	District Provided Training	Professional Development Funds	\$320.00
			Subtotal: \$320.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$320.00

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	Two-Year Trend Data FCAT Results- 2011- 84% (76 students) 2012- 85% (74 students)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
85% of students (74 students) scored at Achievement Level 3.0 or higher on the FCAT writing.	90% of students will achieve FCAT Level 3.0 or higher on the 2013 writing FCAT.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Limited ability to write on grade-level expectations	K-5 Teachers will utilize BEEP lesson plans Writer's Round-up: Fourth grade students will meet in the cafeteria for group writing instruction Grades K-5 will participate in school-wide writing assessments	Admin Classroom teachers	Teacher/student conferencing 4th Grade Weekly Writer's Round-up School-wide writing assessments- Pre, mid, & post	Six Traits Writing Rubric

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	2012- 60% (3 students) scored at Level 4 or higher in writing.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
60% of students (3 students) scored at Level 4 or higher in writing.	In 2013, 65% (3.5 students) of students will score at a Level 4 or higher in writing.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students in this category are intellectually deficient.	Teacher trained in Unique Curriculum and Access Points. 1:3 teacher/student ratio for writing instruction for multi-sensory instructional approach.	Admin ESE Specialist ESE Teachers	Ongoing progress monitoring	Handwriting Without Tears Program Rubric Weekly assessments FAA

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
4th Grade Writing Strategies	4th	Consultant	4th grade teachers	May 2013	Classroom walkthroughs	Admin
Access Points District Training	ESE	District Training	ESE Teachers	May 2013	Classroom walkthroughs	Admin
Common Core State Standards District Training	K-2	District Training	K-2 Teachers	May 2013	Classroom walkthroughs	Admin
Unique Curriculum District Training	ESE	District Training	ESE Teachers	May 2013	Classroom walkthroughs	Admin

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
School will hire a consultant who will meet with the teachers monthly to analyze student writing samples in 4th grade and develop writing curriculum to address student needs.	Current student writing samples	Professional Development Funds	\$2,700.00
			Subtotal: \$2,700.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
K-2 Teachers will attend Common Core Writing Training	Substitutes need to be hired	PD Funds	\$2,560.00
			Subtotal: \$2,560.00
			Grand Total: \$5,260.00

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

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

1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	2010- 94% Daily Attendance rate 2011- 94% Daily attendance rate 2012- 94% Daily Attendance rate
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
2012- 94% Daily attendance rate	In 2013, we'll have a 99% Daily attendance rate.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
77 students have excessive absences.	In 2013, we will reduce the number of students with excessive absences by 5%.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
157 students have excessive tardies.	In 2013, we will reduce the number of students with excessive absences by 5%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Excessive Absences	Phone calls home, educate parents regarding attendance policies at Open House, remind parents about attendance policies through Parent Link and at parent conferences	Teachers, Administration, BTIP Coordinator	School attendance records	Student attendance

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
N/A						

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:		2010 internal suspension was 5 2011 internal suspension was 7 2012 internal suspentions was 3 2010 external suspension was 3 2011 external suspension was 3 2012 external suspensions was 5 2010 students sent to AES was 4 2011 students sent to AES was 6 2012 students sent to AES was 5			
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions		2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions			
The total number of in school suspensions was 3.		The expected number of in-school suspensions will be 1.			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School		2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School			
The total number of students suspended in school was 5.		The total number of expected suspensions in school will be 2.			
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions		2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions			
The total number of out of school suspensions was 4.		The total number of out of school suspensions will be 2.			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School		2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School			
The total number of students suspended out of school was 3.		The total number of expected students suspended will be 2.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

1	Classroom Management	Behavior Chats with Administration Sending Teachers to Champs training as needed	Assistant Principal	Decrease in unwanted behavior/Increase in desired behaviors	School Data Behavior/Referrals
2	Parental Support of the Educational Process	Provide parents with outside services for counseling and parenting classes	Guidance	Decrease in unwanted behavior/Increase in desired behaviors	School Data Behavior/Referrals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
N/A						

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	On average, 50% of Stirling Elementary parents participated in school activities/trainings/PTO and SAC in 2009-2010.			
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:			
On average, 50% (337) of Stirling Elementary parents participated in parent events/training, PTO and SAC in 2009-2010.	In 2011, 55% (371)of parents will participate in parent trainings/events/ PTO and SAC.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

Subtotal: \$0.00
Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:				
1. STEM				
STEM Goal #1:				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Implementation of the Daily 5 in all K-5 classrooms	The Daily 5 written by Gaily Boushey and Joan Moser	PD Funds	\$150.00
				Subtotal: \$150.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Teachers are given release time to attend professional development during the school day.	District provided training	Professional Development Funds	\$3,800.00
Reading	Teachers are provided release time to observe in model classrooms throughout Broward County.	Broward County Schools	Professional Development Funds	\$1,600.00
Mathematics	Teachers are given release time to attend professional development during the school day.	District Trainings	Professional Development Funds	\$640.00
Science	Teachers are given release time to attend professional development during the school day.	District Provided Training	Professional Development Funds	\$320.00
Writing	School will hire a consultant who will meet with the teachers monthly to analyze student writing samples in 4th grade and develop writing curriculum to address student needs.	Current student writing samples	Professional Development Funds	\$2,700.00
				Subtotal: \$9,060.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Writing	K-2 Teachers will attend Common Core Writing Training	Substitutes need to be hired	PD Funds	\$2,560.00
				Subtotal: \$2,560.00
				Grand Total: \$11,770.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

<input type="checkbox"/> Priority	<input type="checkbox"/> Focus	<input type="checkbox"/> Prevent	<input type="checkbox"/> NA
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

The majority of the SAC members are not employed by the school district. The SAC is composed of the principal and an appropriately balanced number of teachers, education support employees, students (for middle and high school only), parents, and other business and community citizens who are representative of the ethnic, racial, and economic community served by the school. Please verify the statement above by selecting "Yes" or "No" below.



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

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
SAC Funds will be used to purchase Soar to Success Reading Program (from the Broward County Struggling Readers Chart) for grades 3-5.	\$3,000.00

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

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Broward School District STIRLING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	75%	79%	84%	35%	273	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	70%	78%			148	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	69% (YES)	77% (YES)			146	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					567	
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 STIRLING ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	70%	68%	89%	32%	259	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	65%	52%			117	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	69% (YES)	51% (YES)			120	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					496	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested