

# 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: FLORANADA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Broward

Principal: Keith Peters

SAC Chair: Terri Chelton/Cary Boardman

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.*

<a href="#">School Grades Trend Data</a>
<a href="#">Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)/Statewide Assessment Trend Data</a>
<a href="#">High School Feedback Report</a>
<a href="#">K-12 Comprehensive Research Based Reading Plan</a>

### 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, Floranada Elementary 2011-2012 Grade: A. Reading Mastery: 64%, Math: 76%, Science: 77% Principal, Floranada Elementary 2010-2011 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 88% Math Mastery: 90% Science Mastery: 78% Writing Mastery: 98% AYP: YES Sub-groups SWD and Economically Disadvantaged met proficiency in Reading and Math.  Principal, Floranada Elementary

Principal	Keith Peters	BA- Elementary Education, Florida Atlantic University; MA- Florida Atlantic University; Certifications – Education Leadership (All Levels), Elementary Education 1-6, School Principal (All Levels), and ESOL Endorsement	4	9	2009-2010 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 82% Math Mastery: 88% Writing Mastery: 95% Science Mastery: 65% Reading Gains: 61% Math Gains: 65% Lowest 25th Reading: 49% Lowest 25th Math: 63% AYP: SWD (Reading and Math); FRL (Reading)  Assistant Principal of Lauderhill Paul Turner Elementary 2008-2009. Grade: C Reading Mastery: 55% Math Mastery: 60% Science Mastery: 31% Writing Mastery: 85% AYP: Black and FRD  Assistant Principal of Lauderhill Paul Turner Elementary 2007-2008. Grade: C Reading Mastery: 56% Math Mastery: 61% Science Mastery: 26% Writing Mastery: 78% AYP: Black and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in Reading or Math
Assis Principal	Dr. Sheila K. Lewis	Ed.D. Education Leadership and Curriculum Instruction (All Levels). Ed. S. Education Leadership (All levels). M.Ed in Exceptional Education (K-12)  B.Ed majoring in English and Social Studies  Certifications in: Ed. Leadership (All Levels) Varying Exceptionalities K-12 Lang. Arts 6-12 ESOL Endorsement Reading	3	5	Assistant Principal, Floranada Elementary 2011-2012 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 64%, Math: 76%, Science: 77% Assistant Principal, Floranada Elementary 2010-2011 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 88% Math Mastery: 90% Science Mastery: 78% Writing Mastery: 98% AYP: YES Sub-groups SWD and Economically Disadvantaged met proficiency in Reading and Math.  Assistant Principal, Lloyd Estates Elementary 2009-2010 Grade: B Reading Mastery: 67% Math Mastery: 76% Science Mastery: 28% Writing Mastery: 81% AYP: Lowest 25% YES in Reading (52%) Math (77%)  Assistant Principal, Lloyd Estates Elementary 2008-2009 Grade: C Reading Mastery: 69% Math Mastery: 70% Science Mastery: 36% Writing Mastery: 88% AYP: No in Reading (42%) YES in Math (61%)

## 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)
					2011-2012 Grade: A. Reading Mastery: 64%, Math: 76%, Science: 77% 2010-2011 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 88%

Reading	Terri Chelton	BS Elementary Education MS in Reading K-12 Exceptional Student Education K-12 ESOL Endorsement	23	10	<p>Math Mastery: 90% Science Mastery: 78% Writing Mastery: 98% AYP: YES Sub-groups SWD and Economically Disadvantaged met proficiency in Reading and Math.</p> <p>2009-2010 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 82% Math Mastery: 88% Writing Mastery: 95% Science Mastery: 65% Reading Gains: 61% Math Gains: 65% Lowest 25th Reading: 49% Lowest 25th Math: 63% AYP: SWD (Reading and Math); FRL (Reading)</p> <p>2008-09 Grade: B Reading Mastery: 87% Math Mastery: 90% Writing Mastery: 97% Science Mastery: 51% Reading Gains: 71% Math Gains: 70% Lowest 25th Reading: 47% Lowest 25th Math: 70% AYP: SWD (Reading and Math)</p> <p>2007-08 Grade: B Reading Mastery: 85% Math Mastery: 88% Writing Mastery: 76% Science Mastery: 76% Reading Gains: 64% Math Gains: 63% Lowest 25th Reading: 48% Lowest 25th Math: 62% AYP: SWD (Reading and Math)</p>
Autism coach	Dana DeLorenzo	BA Social Work Nationally Board Certified in Behavior Analysis ESE K-12	3	3	<p>2011-2012 Grade: A. Reading Mastery: 64%, Math: 76%, Science: 77%</p> <p>2010-2011 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 88% Math Mastery: 90% Science Mastery: 78% Writing Mastery: 98% AYP: YES Sub-groups SWD and Economically Disadvantaged met proficiency in Reading and Math.</p> <p>Ms. DeLorenzo was assigned to the District for the previous seven years.</p>

## 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. Retention: Positive, cooperative, and caring environment with emphasis on teacher achievement.	Principal and Assistant Principal	On-going	
2	1. Retention: Open door policy, leadership team meetings, team leader monthly meetings to facilitate input of staff into goals and strategies.	Principal, Assistant Principal, Leadership Team, and Team Leaders	On-going	
3	3. Retention: Teacher orientation and pairing with experienced teacher as well as support staff guidance.	Principal, Assistant Principal, support staff	On-going	
4	4. Retention: Monthly Professional Learning Communities (PLC's) with grade team members. Weekly Team Meetings with grade level chair.	Team Leader	On-going	

## 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
Julia Reeves ESOL Grade 1	Currently taking ESOL courses to complete certification. Paired with a mentor teacher

### 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
53	3.8%(2)	26.4%(14)	49.1%(26)	28.3%(15)	37.7%(20)	100.0%(53)	7.5%(4)	9.4%(5)	98.1%(52)

### 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
Terri Chelton, Reading Coach	Julia Reeves	New first grade teacher	Sharing best practices, lesson planning, management techniques and reviewing NGSSSS, Common Core Curriculum, PLC's
Lourdes Nocera	Allison Alexander	New first grade teacher	Sharing best practices, lesson planning, management techniques and reviewing NGSSSS, Common Core Curriculum PLC's
Dawn Whittenberg	Renata Novak	New to Kindergarten	Sharing best practices, lesson planning, management techniques and reviewing NGSSSS, Common Core Curriculum PLC's

## 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)

NA

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

NA

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

### School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The RTI Leadership Team is composed of a multi-disciplinary group of educators. Members include:

- Keith Peters, Principal-Monitors curriculum instruction, analyzes test assessment data and instructional practices, advises and provides support to teachers and staff in educational practices.
- Dr. Sheila K.Lewis, Assistant Principal-Monitors curriculum instruction and discipline issues, advises and provides support to teachers and staff in educational practices.
- Cindy Olstein, Guidance Counselor-Coordinates and schedules the RTI and Collaborative Problem Solving Team Meetings. She provides counseling services to students and parents, assists with behavior plans, and monitors behavior plans of students on Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3.
- Terri Chelton, Reading Specialist-Works with teachers to make informed reading decisions, assists with students assessment, analyzes reading data to make informed decisions on reading interventions, monitors and helps teachers with Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 readers and reports back to the RTI team.
- Dana DeLorenzo, Autism Coach-Assists the cluster in making informed educational decisions for students. Monitors problems and solutions to problems.
- Cynthia Groth, ESE Specialist-Assists with problem identification, analysis, and progress monitoring for students who are ESE or going through the process of Collaborative Problem Solving.

Melanie Acton, School Psychologist-Completes Psychological Testing, meets with teachers and parents to discuss interventions and the results of testing. Monitors behavior plans of students on Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3.

Cathy Sheridan, School Social Worker-Assists students and families in need of support.

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 works to customize intervention plans for students with intensive problems involving academics or behavior. The team along with the teacher identifies the students problem in specific, measurable, attainable, and observable terms. The team analyzes the problem to uncover reasons to explain why the problem is occurring and implements research-based interventions. The team's goal is to provide high-quality instruction to all students. The team also provides interventions aligned to students' need, monitoring progress frequently to make decisions about changes in instruction or goals. Data is utilized to make educational decisions.

Throughout the year, the team meets at least twice a month and as often as needed. school-wide child study to This team provides a framework to support all students with appropriate instruction and interventions.

The Team uses Broward County's Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 data sheets. Mrs. Olstein is in charge of tracking and storing records.

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 continually seeking to improve all areas of school operations. Meetings with SAC and Team Leaders are scheduled frequently to develop and implement the SIP. All data such as FCAT scores, BAT scores, student, parent, and teacher surveys, and discipline referrals are analyzed to prioritize needs.

#### MTSS Implementation

Describe the data source(s) and the data management system(s) used to summarize data at each tier for reading, mathematics, science, writing, and behavior.

- Baseline data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN, FAIR), Broward Assessment Test (BAT 2 for reading, math and science), Florida Comprehensive Assessment test (FCAT), Running Records, STAR reports, iStation reports
  - Progress Monitoring: Mini Assessments, FCAT simulation, Oral Reading Fluency Probes, Assessments associated with curriculum, teacher observation both formal and informal, writing prompts, Diagnostic Assessment in reading (DAR), Running Records, student work samples, anecdotal records, teacher generated assessments, STAR reports, iStation reports
  - Midyear: Florida Assessment in Reading (FAIR), Midyear assessments for reading and math, teacher observation, both formal and informal, student work samples, anecdotal records, teacher generated assessments, STAR reports, iStation reports
  - End of year: FAIR, FCAT, End of year assessments for reading and math, teacher observation both formal and informal, Running Records, student work samples, anecdotal records, teacher generated assessment, STAR reports, iStation reports
- Frequency of data analysis: Twice a month  
Data is graphed to process and make decisions regarding Tier1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Training sessions are scheduled for the staff during pre-planning week(August 13 - 19, 2012) about the RtI process.  
Professional Development: Faculty and staff will receive additional training on the RtI Process during a faculty meeting in September, 2012 and ongoing 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).

- The Literacy Leadership team is composed of a multidisciplinary group of educators. Members include:
- Keith Peters, Principal
  - Dr. Sheila K.Lewis, Assistant Principal

- Cindy Olstein, Guidance Counselor
  - Terri Chelton, Reading Specialist
  - Dana DeLorenzo, Autism Coach
  - Cynthia Groth, ESE Specialist
  - Dana Holmquist, Speech Pathologist
  - Sumitra Rios, ELL Representative
- Team Leaders from each grade group

- Kris Barclay, 5th Grade Teacher
- Roni O'Hara, 2nd Grade Teacher

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

The Literacy Leadership Team is a collaborative Team that encourages school-wide literacy programs supporting effective teaching and learning. This Team creates a shared literacy vision through collegiality and collaboration. Each member of the team brings specific expertise to build a culture of literacy in the school. The actions of the Team include:

- Monthly meeting to discuss literacy activities within the school
- Provide continual monitoring of the academic climate of the school
- Investigate areas to improve and utilize the PDSA/CIP model for planning
- Determine the effectiveness of current plans and Programs
- Engage in coaching/mentoring teachers
- Videotaping class sessions
- Professional Development throughout the year
- Forming Study Groups/Learning Communities
- Providing materials, resources, assistance to address concerns of students, teachers and parents
- Attend workshops/conferences and share information with a all stakeholders
- Collect, analyze, and share data

This team meets monthly to discuss how they will support the educational goals of the school. This communication will allow team members to not only support the school but also each other in the quest for educational excellence.

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

Ensure that all teachers are utilizing small group instruction with rigor and fidelity during the reading block. Differentiated Instruction will be monitored through observation, BAT scores, Mini-Assessments and weekly tests will be used to review and prescribe instructional strategies. Transition to Common Core Standards.

Implement and monitor reading incentive programs.

## Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification  
No Attachment

### \*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

### \*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

## \*High Schools Only

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

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

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

## Postsecondary Transition

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

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



## PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

### Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	To increase the number of students by 4% scoring a level 3 or higher in Reading on the 2012-2013 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29% (98) of our students scored a Level 3 on the 2011-2012 FCAT.	33% (114) of our students will score a Level 3 or above on the 2012-2013 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	1.1 Transition to Common Core Standards	Utilize school-wide PLC's to address the transition to Common Core Standards. PLC's will focus on District CCSS Literacy Focus. Discussion will include resources, webinars, Marzano- Instructional Framework Elements, teaching strategies and what will each look like in the classroom.	Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach	Progress Monitoring using iObservation and post observation conferences; Snapshot walkthroughs Monthly data chats, Lesson plans	Accelerated Reader reports, Project-based Learning, FCAT, BAT, iStation, STAR
2	1.2 Increase student participation in recreational Reading outside school the school day.	School-wide Accelerated Reader reading goal which incorporates reading outside of the school day. Initiate and maintain school motivational reading programs and activities. Utilize the FCIM Process.	Reading Coach Literacy Leadership Team	Monitor classroom and student use of the Accelerated Reader program Reading Challenge: 23,000 books at the end of May 2013	Accelerated Reader 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 reading. Reading Goal #1b:	To increase the number of students from 28% scoring level 4, 5, or 6 in FAA by 4%. in 2012-2013
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28.6%(4) scored at levels 4,5 and 6 in FAA reading.	33% (3) will score a level 4,5 and 6 in FAA 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	.Transition to Common Core Standards.	Utilize school-wide PLCs to address the transition to Common Core Standards. PLCs will focus on District CCSS Literacy Focus. Discussion will include possible resources, Marzano-Instructional Framework Elements, teaching strategies and what will each look like in the classroom.	Principal, Asst. Principal, and Reading Coach	Progress Monitoring using iObservation and post observation conferences; Snapshot walkthroughs, Monthly data chats, lesson plans	Formal and Informal Assessment, FAA, SMILE
2	Student participation in recreational reading outside of the school day.	School- wide Accelerated Reader monthly reading goal which incorporates reading outside of the school day. Initiate and maintain school motivational reading programs and activities. Utilize the FCIM Process.	Reading Coach, Literacy Leadership Team	Monitor classroom and student use of the Accelerated Reader program; Celebrate quarterly students who have achieved reading goals. AR Reading Challenge: 23,000 books at the end of May 2013	Accelerated Reader reports, Project-based Learning, FCAT, BAT, iStation, STAR

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:	To increase the number of students by 4% scoring a level 4 or higher in Reading on the 2012-2013 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
42% (141) of our students scored levels 4 or 5 in Reading on the 2010-2011 FCAT.	46% (160) of our students will score levels 4 or 5 in Reading on the 2010-2011 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	2.1.Lack of enrichment opportunities	2.1. Extend the curriculum through a variety of leveled materials and genres to extend learning opportunities outside of the core curriculum. Foster opportunities for choices and enhance independent and creative higher-level thinking into all activities.	2.1. Reading Coach, AP, Principal	2.1. iObservation; Snapshot Walkthroughs; Data Chats with teachers	2.1. Lesson Plans; Project-based Learning, FCAT, BAT, AR, STAR, iStation
2	2.2. Project-based learning activities.	2.2 Students will use Key notes and Power point to create presentations on various research topics. Students will learn about particular topics in depth by reading, doing projects and engaging in hands-on- learning to extend and expand their knowledge.	2.2. Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach	2.2. Evaluation of student-created projects, display of student work in media center, classrooms, and hallways; Academic and Creative Showcases	2.2. Lesson Plans; Project-based Learning, FCAT, BAT, AR, STAR, iStation

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:	To increase the number of students scoring level 7 from 50% in FAA by 4% in 2012-2013
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50%(7)will score at or above Achievement Level 7 in FAA reading.	54%(5)will score level 7 Achievemnet Level in FAA 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	Lack of enrichment opportunities	2b.1. Extend the curriculum through the use of a variety of complex texts and materials supported through the content areas. Provide learning opportunities outside of the core curriculum. Foster opportunities for choices and enhance independent and creative higher-level thinking into all activities.	Reading Coach, Autism Coach, ESE Coach, AP, Principal	1 iObservation; Snapshot Walkthroughs; Data Chats with teachers	1 Lesson Plans; Project-based Learning; FAA, SMILE Program
2	Project-based learning activities.	Students will use Key note and Power point to create presentations on various research topics. Students will learn about particular topics in depth by reading, doing projects and engaging in hands-on- learning to extend and expand their knowledge.	Reading Coach, Autism Coach, ESE Coach, AP Principal	Evaluation of student-created projects, display of student work in media center, classrooms, and hallways; Academic and Creative Showcases	Rubrics for student-created projects; FAA, SMILE Program

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:	Target and increase the number of students making learning gains by 4% in Reading on the 2012-2013 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
64% (233) of our students made learning gains in Reading on the 2011-2012 FCAT.	68% (236) of our students will make learning gains in Reading on the 2012-2013 FCAT.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	3.1. Provide small group and individualized intervention to students not demonstrating mastery of standards.	3.1 Maintain reading block of 120 minutes. Fully implement with fidelity and consistency the research-based core reading program. Students will be provided differentiated instruction with intensity in alignment with their specific needs.	3.1. Principal Assistant Principal, Reading Coach	3.1. Monthly Data chats;  iObservation reports, snapshot walkthroughs	3.1 . 3a.2. DAR, BAT 2, Core curriculum assessments, Formal, and informal Assessments, FCAT, STAR, iStation, AR Reports
2	3.2. Lack of individualized attention to students need.	3.2 Train specials teachers and paraprofessionals in research-based reading strategies and programs to provide additional support in intensive reading classrooms. This supports delivery of more effective and intensive instruction in co-ordination with the tiered RTI model.	3.2. Reading Coach, Assistant Principal	3.2 Comparison of baseline and end-of-year reading scores.	3.2. DAR, BAT 1,2, Core curriculum assessments, Formal, and informal Assessments
3	3.3 Providing additional opportunities to meet the needs of struggling students.	3.3 Extend school day through the use of after care, morning programs and Saturday Camp. These activities will be used to enhance instruction based on the needs of the students/school.	3.3 Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach	3.3 Comparison of BAT 2, grade level assessments, and Bi- weekly data chats,	3.3 BAT 2, FCAT, Teacher Assessments, FCAT Explorer, Istation and AR 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:

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading.  Reading Goal #3b:	To increase percentage of students making learning gains from 37% by 4% in 2012-2013
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
37%(4)of students made learning gains in FAA reading.	41% (5)of students will make learning gains in FAA 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	Provide small group and individualized intervention to students not demonstrating mastery of standards.	Maintain reading block of 120 minutes. Fully implement with fidelity and consistency the Common Core Standards. Students will be provided differentiated instruction with intensity in alignment with their specific needs.	Reading Coach, Autism Coach, ESE Coach, AP, Principal	Monthly Data chats; iObservation reports, snapshot walkthroughs	BAT 2, FCAT, Formal and Informal Assessments, STAR, iStation, AR
	Lack of individualized attention to students need.	Train specials teachers and paraprofessionals in research-based reading strategies and programs to provide additional	Reading Coach, Autism Coach, ESE Coach, AP, Principal	Comparison of baseline and end-of- year reading scores.	Comparison of baseline and end-of- year reading scores.

2		support in intensive reading classrooms. This supports delivery of more effective and intensive instruction in co-ordination with the tiered RTI model.		
---	--	---	--	--

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:	Target and increase the number of students making learning gains in the lowest 25% by 4% in Reading on the 2012-2013 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
61% (38) our of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in Reading on the 2011-2012 FCAT.	65% (42) of our students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains in Reading on the 2012-2013 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	4.1. Identifying trends and data patterns to accommodate individual needs of all students.	4.1. Maintain the reading block of 120 minutes. Fully implement with fidelity and consistency the research- based core-reading program. Students will be provided differentiated instruction with intensity in alignment with their specific needs.	4.1. Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach	4.1. Ongoing formal and informal assessments to monitor student progress, redesign instruction as needed, provide remediation, acceleration, and enrichment. Progress monitoring will occur during bi-weekly data chats.	4.1. Mini-benchmark assessments, ORF probes, Core Curriculum assessments, BAT 2, iStation, AR reports, STAR, Formal and Informal Assessments.
2	4.2. Providing additional opportunities to meet the needs of struggling students.	4.2. Extended school day through use of after care, morning programs and Saturday Camp. These activities will be used to enhance instruction based on the needs of the students/school.	4.2. Principal Assistant Principal	4.2. Comparison of test scores between those who attend the extended learning opportunities and those who did not attend.	4.2. BAT 2 FCAT Explorer, iStation and AR reports.
3	4.3 Technology	4.3 Istation, AR and FCAT Explorer will be used to support reading instruction and project based learning	Principal Assistant principal Reading Coach	4.3 Progress monitoring using monthly assessments in Istation, quizzes taken in AR and FCAT Explorer data.	4.3 Reports generated by Istation, AR, and FCAT Explorer.

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal #					
	In six years school will reduce their achievement gap by 87% .					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	71% (338) students	75% of students	78% of students	81% of students	84% of students	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.  Reading Goal #5B:	To increase the number of Asian, White, Black, and Hispanic students making learning in Reading by 1% on the 2012-2013 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
85% (169) of White students made learning gains in Reading on the 2010-2011 FCAT. 83% (77) of Hispanic students made learning gains in Reading on the 2010-2011 FCAT. 63% (25) of Black students made learning gains in Reading on the 2010-2011 FCAT. 71% (10) of Asian students made learning gains in Reading on the 2011-2012 FCAT.	86% (172) of our White students will make learning gains in Reading on the 2011-2012 FCAT. 85% (87) of our Hispanic students will make learning gains in Reading on the 2011-2012 FCAT. 67% (32) of our Black students will make learning gains in Reading on the 2011-2012 FCAT. 74% (12) of our Asian students will make learning gains in Reading on the 2012-2013 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	5A.1. Increase small group and individualized intervention to students not demonstrating mastery of standards.	5A.1.. Maintain the reading block of 120 minutes. Fully implement with fidelity and consistency the research- based core-reading program. Students will be provided differentiated instruction with intensity in alignment with their specific needs.	5A.1. Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach	5A.1. Progress monitoring will occur during Bi-monthly teacher/grade level Data chats	5A.1. Mini benchmark assessments ORF probes Core Curriculum assessments, iStation, AR, Formal and Informal Assessments
2	5A.2. Identifying trends and patterns in data.	5A.2.Training faculty in data analysis and targeted reading instruction that demonstrate explicit and systematic instruction meeting the needs of students.	5A.2. Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach,	5A.2. Bi-monthly teacher/grade level Data chats and evaluation of CWT's reports discussion	5A.2. Mini benchmark assessments ORF probes Core Curriculum assessments, iStation, AR, Formal and Informal Assessments
3	5A.3. Lack of practice and application of reading skills.	5A.3. Apply reading strategies and skills across all subject areas (i.e. journals; research projects)	5A.3. Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach	5A.3. Lesson plan reviews Bi-monthly teacher/grade level Data chats CWT observations	5A.3. Mini benchmark assessments ORF probes Core Curriculum assessments, iStation, AR, Formal and Informal Assessments . Lesson plans

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:	To increase the learning gains in the ELL subgroup by 4% in Reading on the 2012-2013 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
81% (9) of our ELL students made learning gains in Reading on the 2010-2011 FCAT.	77% (8) of our ELL students will make learning gains in Reading on the 2012-2013 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	5B.1. Lack of English language acquisition for ELL subgroup.	5B.1. Use of ELL materials for differentiated instruction for English Language Learners (Newcomer Kit, English in My Pocket), Dictionary use in their home lang.	5B.1. Reading Coach ELL Contact, AP	5B.1. Grade level/Team Meeting discussion on students not meeting proficiency and prescribe instruction based on student needs to Increase English language, communication skills	5B.1.CELLA Teacher observation, BAT Assessments, iStation, AR, FCAT Explorer, Informal and Formal Assesments
2	5B.2. Provide small group and individualized intervention to students not demonstrating mastery of standards.	5B.2. Maintain the reading block of 120 minutes. Fully implement with fidelity and consistency the research- based core-reading program. Students will be provided differentiated instruction with intensity in alignment with their specific needs.	5B.2. Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach	5B.2. Bi-weekly data chats with teachers of students not meeting proficiency and prescribe instruction based on student specific needs	5B.2. CELLA, Mini benchmark assessments ORF probes Core Curriculum assessments, Informal and Formal Assesments

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:	To increase learning gains in Reading by 4% in the number of (SWD) students on the 2012-2013 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
57% (39) of (SWD) students made learning gains in Reading on the 2011-2012 FCAT.	53% (39) of our (SWD) students will make learning gains in Reading on the 2012-2013 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	5C.1. Identifying trends and data patterns to accommodate individual needs of all students.	5C.1. Maintain the reading block of 120 minutes. Fully implement with fidelity and consistency the research- based core-reading program. Students will be provided differentiated instruction with intensity in alignment with their specific needs	5C1.1. Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach	5C1.1. Ongoing formal and informal assessments to monitor student progress, redesign instruction as needed, provide remediation, acceleration, and enrichment. Progress monitoring will occur during bi-weekly data chats. Progress monitoring will occur during bi-weekly data chats with teachers to analyze data to make instructional decisions.	5C1.1. Mini benchmark assessments ORF probes Core Curriculum assessments, formal and informal assessments,DARs, CWT reports. iStation, AR, FCAT Explorer
2	5C.2. Providing additional opportunities to meet the needs of struggling students.	5C.2. Extended school day through use of after care, After school programs and Saturday Camp. These activities will be used to enhance instruction based on the	5C.2. Principal, AP Reading Coach	5C.2. Ongoing formal and informal assessments to monitor student progress, redesign instruction as needed, provide remediation, acceleration, and	5C.2. Mini benchmark assessments ORF probes Core Curriculum assessments, formal and informal

		needs of the students/school.		enrichment. Progress monitoring will occur during bi-weekly data chats with teachers.	assessments, DAR's CWT reports. iStation, AR, FCAT Explorer
3	5C.3.Technology	5C.3. Teachers will utilize Istation, AR and FCAT Explorer to support reading instruction and project based learning of students not meeting proficiency.	5C.3.ESE Specialist Autism Coach Reading Coach, AP	5C.3.Ongoing formal and informal assessments to monitor student progress, redesign instruction as needed, provide remediation, acceleration, and enrichment. Progress monitoring will occur during bi-weekly data chats. Data chats and evaluation of classroom walkthroughs that focus on curriculum and instruction.	5C.3.Mini benchmark assessments ORF probes Core Curriculum assessments, formal and informal assessments, DAR's, iStation. AR, FCAT Explorer

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:	To increase the learning gains in the (FRL) subgroup by 4% in Reading on the 2012-2013 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
38% (66) of (FRL) students made learning gains in Reading on the 2011-2012 FCAT.	34% (58) of our (FRL) students will make learning gains in Reading on the 2012-2013 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	5D1.1. Provide small group and individualized intervention to students not demonstrating mastery of standards.	5D1.1. Maintain the reading block of 120 minutes. Fully implement with fidelity and consistency the research- based core-reading program. Students will be provided differentiated instruction with intensity in alignment with their specific needs	5D1.1. Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach	5D1.1. Teachers will use ongoing formal and informal assessments to monitor student progress, redesign instruction as needed, provide remediation, acceleration, and enrichment. Progress monitoring will occur during bi-weekly data chats with classroom teachers analyzing data and making instructional decisions on curriculum.	5D1.1. Mini benchmark assessments ORF probes Core Curriculum assessments, formal and informal assessments, DRA's, CWT reports. iStation, AR, FCAT Explorer
2	5D.2. Identifying trends and data patterns to accommodate individual needs of all students.	5D.2. Training in data analysis and targeted reading instruction that delivers explicit and systematic instruction according to the needs of students.	5D.2. Principal, AP Reading Coach.	5D.2. Teachers will use ongoing formal and informal assessments to monitor student progress, redesign instruction as needed, provide remediation, acceleration, and enrichment. Progress monitoring will occur during bi-weekly data chats. curriculum and instruction.	5D.2. Mini benchmark assessments ORF probes Core Curriculum assessments, formal and informal assessments, DRA's, CWT reports. iStation, AR, FCAT Explorer



				Data chats and evaluation of Classroom Walkthrough reports.	
3	5D.3 Technology	5D.2 Teachers will utilize Istation, AR and FCAT Explorer to support reading instruction and project based learning of students not meeting proficiency. AM, After school and Saturday Camp.	5D.2 Principal, AP, Reading Coach	5D.2 Teachers will use ongoing formal and informal assessments to monitor student progress, redesign instruction as needed, provide remediation, acceleration, and enrichment. Progress monitoring will occur during bi-weekly data chats. Data chats and evaluation of classroom walkthroughs that focus on curriculum and instruction.	5D.2 Mini benchmark assessments ORF probes Core Curriculum assessments, formal and informal assessments, DRA's, CWT reports. iStation, AR, FCAT Explorer

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						

Reading Budget:

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

## 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:		KG: 22% proficient, increase by 4% 1st grade 52% proficient, increase by 4% 2nd grade 59% proficient, increase by 4% 4th grade 30% proficient, increase by 4%			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
KG: 22% proficient 1st grade 52% 2nd grade 59% 4th grade 30%					
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	1.1. Lack of Language development skills	1.1. Slow, but natural levels of speech, clear enunciation, controlled vocabulary, frequent comprehension checks, visual reinforcement, short simple sentences	1.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach	1.1. Lesson Plans, data chats, iObservation, informal classroom visits, PLC's, Team Meetings	1.1. CELLA, BAT, FCAT, formal and informal assessment
2					

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal # 2:		1st grade 43% proficient, increase by 4% 2nd grade 76% proficient, increase by 4% 3rd grade 20% proficient, increase by 4% 4th grade 20% proficient, increase by 4%			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:					
1st grade 43% 2nd grade 76% 3rd grade 20% 4th grade 20%					
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. Lack of prior knowledge of the topic/story passage.	2.1. Teach comprehension first, receptive and expressive vocabulary, phonics skills, use pictorial, semantic, and syntax clues, discuss new words in context, encourage students to predict, confirm, and self correct.	2.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach.	2.1. Lesson Plans, data chats, iObservation, informal classroom Observations, PLC's, Team Meetings.	2.1. CELLA, BAT, FCAT, formal and Informal Assessments

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	KG: 6% proficient, increase by 4% 1st grade: 24% proficient, increase by 4% 2nd grade 53% proficient, increase by 4% 4th grade 40% proficient, increase by 4% 5th grade 50% proficient, increase by 4%
--	--

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

KG: 6%  
1st grade: 24%  
4th grade 40%  
5th grade 50%

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	2.1.Lack of prior knowledge and vocabulary	2.1. Brainstorm to generate ideas and word bank, utilize recipes for procedural text, and hands-on activities, journals for personal narratives and content-area learning, integrate reading with writing using a variety of genres and formats for writing activities. Utilize magazines, newspapers, street signs, webbing strategies etc., modify difficult tasks for writing assignments,	2.1. Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach	2.1. Lesson Plans, data chats, iObservation, informal classroom visits, PLC's, Team Meetings	2.1. CELLA, BAT, FCAT, formal and informal assessments

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:	Increase the number of students scoring a level 3 in FCAT mathematics from 28.9% by 4%. in 2012-2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28% (98) of students scored level 3 in Math in the 2011-2012	32% (111) of students will score a level 3 in Math on the 2012-2013 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	1.1. Lack of basic number sense by students.	1.1. Implement use of math manipulatives and hands on resources including iTools, flash cards, academic games.	1.1. Principal, Assistant Principal	1.1. Bi-weekly Data Chats (grade-level, individual teacher, grade-level team meetings, and student) to analyze data, as well as, make instructional decisions and prescribe individual instruction.	1.1. Formal informal assessments, Key math, STAR math.
2	1.2. Opportunities to remediate during the school day	1.2. Extended school day through use of after care, morning program and Saturday Camp; encourage students to utilize FCAT Explorer/ Riverdeep Math outside of the school setting. Create worthwhile problems as a foundation for daily instruction.	1.2. Principal Assistant Principal	1.2. Bi-weekly Data Chats (grade-level, individual teacher, grade-level team meetings and student) to analyze data, as well as, make instructional decisions and prescribe instruction.	1.2. Formal informal assessments, Key math, STAR math
3	1.3. Transition to Common Core State Standards	1.3. Teachers will become familiar and implement the CC Standards; Create a classroom environment where students make sense of problems and persevere in solving them.	1.3. Principal Assistant Principal	1.3. iObservation, Snapshot walkthroughs, informal observations, Teacher lesson plans	1.3. Benchmark assessments; Formal and Informal Assessments

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal # 1b:	Increase the number of students scoring a level 4, 5, and 6 in FAA mathematics from 35% by 4% in 2012-2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
35% of students scored a level 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics in 2011-2012 FAA.	Increase the number of students scoring a level 4, 5, and 6 in FAA mathematics 39% in 2012-2013.

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	1b.1.Lack of basic number sense by students.	1b.1. Implement use of math manipulatives, and hands on resources including iTools, flash cards, academic games.	1b.1. Principal, Assistant Principal	1b.1. Bi-weekly Data Chats (grade-level, individual teacher, grade-level team meetings and student) to analyze data, as well as, make instructional decisions and tailor individual instruction.	1b.1 Formal informal assessments, Key math, STAR math
2	1b.2. Opportunities to remediate during the school day	1b.2. Extended school day through use of after care, morning program and Saturday Camp; encourage students to utilize FCAT Explorer/ Riverdeep Math outside of the school setting. Create worthwhile problems as a foundation for daily instruction.	1b.2. Principal, Assistant Principal	1b.2 Bi-weekly Data Chats (grade-level, individual teacher, grade-level team meetings and student) to analyze data, as well as, make instructional decisions and prescribe instruction.	1b.2. Formal informal assessments, Key math, STAR math, Moving with math
3	1b.3. Transition to Common Core Standards	1b.3. Teachers will become familiar and implement the CC Standards; Create a classroom environment where students make sense of problems and persevere in solving them.	1b.3. Principal, Assistant Principal	1b.3.iObservation, Snapshot walkthroughs, informal observations, Teacher lesson plans	1b.3. Benchmark assessments; Formal and Informal Assessments
4					
5					

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:	Increase the number of students scoring a level 4 or 5 in FCAT mathematics from 46% by 4%. in 2012-2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
46% (156) of students scored a level 4 or 5 on the 2011-2012 FCAT Math.	50% (174) of students will score a level 4 or 5 on the 2011-2012 FCAT Math.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1. Transition to Common Core Standards.	2.1 Teachers will become familiar and implement the Anchor Standards; Create a classroom environment where students make sense of problems and persevere in solving them.	2.1. Principal, Assistant Principal	2.1. iObservation, Snapshot walkthroughs, informal observations, Teacher lesson plans.	2.1. Benchmark assessments; Formal and Informal Assessments.
	2.2 Inadequate	2.2. Increased use of	2.2. Principal,	2.2. Bi-weekly data chats	2.2. Benchmark

2	knowledge of multiplication tables	extension activities (i.e. academic games, competitions) including activities incorporating Calender Math	Assistant Principal	to analyze data and make instructional decisions PLC's and grade level discussions	assessments, Core curriculum assessments, formal and informal assessments, FCAT explorer
---	------------------------------------	---	---------------------	---	--

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:	Increase the number of students scoring at or above a level 7 in FAA mathematics from 35% by 4% in 2012-2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
35% (5) Students scored at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics on the FAA.	39% (4) Students will score at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics on the 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
1	2b.1. Transition to Common Core State Standards.	2b.1. Teachers will become familiar and implement the Anchor Standards; Create a classroom environment where students make sense of problems and persevere in solving them.	2b.1. Principal, Assistant Principal	2b.1. iObservation, Snap shot walkthroughs, informal observations, Teacher lesson plans	2b.1. Benchmark assessments, Formal and Informal Assessments
2	2b.2. Lack of basic number sense by students.	2b.2. Implement use of math manipulatives and hands on resources including iTools, flash cards, academic games.	2b.2. Principal, Assistant Principal	2b.2. Bi-weekly Data Chats (grade-level, individual teacher, grade-level team meetings and student) to analyze data, as well as, make instructional decisions and prescribe individual instruction.	2b.2 Formal and informal assessments, Key Math 3, STAR math, beginning year math

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:	Increase the number of students making Learning Gains in FCAT mathematics from 75% by 4%. in 2012-2013
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
75% (233) of our students made learning gains in Math in the 2011-2012 FCAT.	79% (274) of our students will make learning gains in Math on the 2012-2013 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
	3.1. Transition to	3.1. Teachers will	3.1. Principal,	3.1. iObservation, Snap	3.1. Benchmark

1	Common Core State Standards	become familiar and implement the Anchor Standards; Create a classroom environment where students make sense of problems and persevere in solving them.	Assistant Principal	shot walkthroughs, informal observations, Teacher lesson plans.	assessments; Formal and Informal Assessments, Key Math 3, STAR math, beginning year math
2	3.2. Opportunities to remediate skills during the school day.	3.2. Extension of the school day through AM Computer Camp, aftercare, after school, and Saturday Camp. Small group instruction, centers aligned with core standards	3.2. Principal Assistant Principal	3.2. Bi-weekly data chats with teachers to analyze data and make instructional decisions, level discussions to ensure curriculum implementation with fidelity.	3.2. Core curriculum and Math assessments aligned with the Go Math series. Benchmark assessments, Formal and informal assessments, FCAT Explorer, First in Math Reports
3	3.3. Meeting needs of non proficient students.	3.3. Utilization of small group instruction to either remediate or enhance instruction. Teachers will utilize technology and FCAT explorer to remediate skills	3.3. Principal Assistant Principal	3.3. Bi-weekly data chats with teachers to analyze data and make instructional decisions PLC's and grade level discussions to ensure curriculum implementation with fidelity.	3.3. Go Math series. Benchmark assessments, Formal and informal assessments, FCAT Explorer

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:	Increase the number of students making learning gains in FAA from 27% by 4%. in 2012-2013
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27% (3) students made learning gains in the FAA	31% ((3) students will make learning gains in the 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
1	3b.1. Transition to Common Core State Standards	3b.1. Teachers will become familiar and implement the Anchor Standards; Create a classroom environment where students make sense of problems and persevere in solving them.	3b.1. Principal, Assistant Principal	3b.1. iObservation, Snap shot walkthroughs, informal observations, Teacher lesson plans	3b.1. Benchmark assessments; Formal and Informal Assessment, Key math, STAR math, beginning. year math
2	3b.2. Opportunities to remediate skills during the school day	3b.2. Extension of the school day through AM Computer Camp, aftercare, after school, and Saturday Camp. Small group instruction, centers aligned with core standards.	3b.2. Principal, Assistant Principal	3b.2. Bi-weekly data chats with teachers to analyze data and make instructional decisions; grade level discussions to ensure curriculum implementation with fidelity. Analyze data and prescribe instruction.	3b.2. Core curriculum and Math assessments aligned with the Go Math series. Benchmark assessments, Formal and informal assessments, FCAT Explorer, First in Math Reports.



3	3b.3. Meeting needs of non-proficient students.	3b.3. Utilization of small group instruction to either remediate or enhance instruction. Teachers will utilize technology and FCAT explorer to remediate skills.	3b.3 Principal, Assistant Principal	3b.3. Bi-weekly data chats with teachers to analyze data and make instructional decisions; grade level discussions to ensure curriculum implementation with fidelity.	3b.3. Go Math series. Benchmark assessments, Formal and informal assessments, FAA 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:

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #4:	Increase the numbers of students making learning gains in lowest 25% in mathematics from 61% by 4% in 2012-2013.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
61% (31) of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in Mathematics on the 2011-2012 FCAT.	65% (33) of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains in Mathematics on the 2012-2013 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	4.1. Opportunities to remediate skills during the school day.	4.1. Extension of the school day through AM Computer Camp, aftercare, after school, and Saturday Camp. Small group instruction, centers aligned with core standards	4.1. Principal, Assistant Principal	4.1. Bi-weekly data chats with teachers to analyze data and make instructional decisions PLC's and grade level discussions to ensure curriculum implementation with fidelity.	4.1. Core curriculum and Math assessments aligned with the Go Math series. Benchmark assessments, Formal and informal assessments, FCAT Explorer, First in Math Reports
2	4.2. Lack on basic number sense by students.	4.2. Teacher emphasis on basic number sense through calendar and mountain math practice. Utilize RiverDeep Math program to enhance mastery. Small group instruction, centers aligned with core standards	4.2. Principal, Assistant Principal	4.2. Bi-weekly data chats with teachers to analyze data and make instructional decisions PLC's and grade level discussions to ensure curriculum implementation with fidelity.	4.2. Core curriculum and Math assessments aligned with the Go Math series. Benchmark assessments, Formal and informal assessments, FCAT Explorer, First in Math Reports
3	4.3. Teaching Math concepts and making real-world connections	4.3. Math Journals to emphasize student explanations of the mathematical process at hand, providing hands-on resources to reinforce and support Common Core Standards.	4.3. Principal, Assistant principal	4.3. Teacher/Student Conferences; Parent Conferences; Bi- weekly data chats with teachers to analyze data and make instructional decisions; grade level discussions to ensure Common Core curriculum implementation with fidelity.	4.3. BAT 2, FCAT, Informal and Formal Assessments. Go Math 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%.		<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">           28% of our students scored a level 3 in math on the 2011-2012 FCAT            32% will score a level 3 in math on the 2012-2013 FCAT         </div>				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	28% scored a level 3	32% will score a level 3	36% will score a level 3	40% will score a level 3	43% will score a level 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 subgroup:

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #5B:	Decrease the number of students in subgroups not making satisfactory progress in mathematics by 4% on the 2012-2013 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 45% (183) Black: 19% (45) Hispanic: 14% (84) Asian: 3% (14) American Indian: NA	White: 41%() Black: 15% Hispanic: 11% Asian: 0% (0) American Indian: NA

**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	5A.1. Pacing of core math program. White: Black: Hispanic: Asian: American Indian:	5A.1. Monthly/weekly follow-up at grade level, team meetings to discuss successes and weaknesses of core math program. Teams analyze data and make instructional decisions and develop strategies to ensure successful implementation	5A.1. Principal, Assistant Principal	5A.1. Bi-weekly data chats with teachers to analyze data and make instructional decisions PLC's and grade level discussions to ensure curriculum implementation with fidelity.	5A.1. Core curriculum and Math assessments aligned with the Go Math series. Benchmark assessments, Formal and informal assessments, FCAT Explorer
2	5A.2. Student comprehension of word problems and understanding problem solving strategies	5A.2. Use of reading/math strategies during math; collaborative groupin	5A.2. Principal, Assistant Principal	5A.2. Bi-weekly data chats with grade level and individual teachers to analyze data and prescribe differentiated instruction	5A.2. BAT 2, FCAT, formal and informal assessments, FCAT Explorer
3	5A.3. Lack of basic number sense by students.	5A.3. Emphasis on basic number sense through daily calendar math, mountain math and First in Math instruction. Use of manipulatives, and multiplication tables, mental math	5A.3. Principal, Assistant Principal	5A.3. Bi-weekly data chats with teachers to analyze data and prescribe instruction. iObservations, walkthroughs	5A.3. BAT 2, First in Math reports FCAT Explorer, Formal, informal assessments, Core curriculum 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:	Decrease the number of ELL students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics from 54% by 4% in 2012-2013
---	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
54% (6) of our ELL students made learning gains on the 2011-2012 FCAT Math.	51% (5) of our ELL students will make learning gains on the 2012-2013 FCAT Math.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5B.1. Increase use of manipulatives during math instruction.	5B.1. Teachers will utilize manipulatives on a regular basis to ensure that students understand math concepts on a concrete level.	5B.1. Principal Assistant Principal	5B.1. Lesson Plans (instructional strategies) Bi-weekly data chats with teachers to analyze data and make instructional decisions PLC's and grade level discussions to ensure curriculum implementation with fidelity.	5B.1. Core curriculum and Math assessments aligned with the Go Math series. Mini Benchmark Assessments, Formal and informal assessments, FCAT Explorer, First in Math Reports
2	5B.2. . Student comprehension of word problems and understanding how to problem solve	5B.2. Use of reading strategies during math; collaborative grouping; use of ESOL strategies with fidelity during math instruction.	5B.2. Principal, Assistant principal	5B.2. Bi-weekly data chats; grade level discussions to analyze data and prescribe differentiated instruction	5B.2. BAT 2, FCAT, formal and informal assessments, FCAT Explorer
3	5B.3. Lack of targeted instruction.	5B.3. Teacher training in data analysis and targeted math instruction. Teachers will utilize IFC's, Core math Standards, instructional strategies to plan lessons	5B.3. Principal, Assistant Principal	5B.3. Bi-weekly data chats with teachers to analyze data and make instructional decisions PLC's and grade level discussions to ensure curriculum implementation with fidelity.	5B.3. Classroom assessments, Core curriculum and Math assessments aligned with the Go Math series. Mini Benchmark Assessments, Formal and informal assessments, FCAT Explorer, First in Math Report

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:	Decrease the number of students with disabilities not making satisfactory progress in FCAT mathematics from 48% by 4% in 2012-2013.
--	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
48% (33) of (SWD) subgroup made Adequate Yearly Progress in math on the 2010-2011 FCAT.	44% (29) of (SWD) subgroup will make Adequate Yearly progress on the 2011-2012 FCAT Math.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	5C.1. . Insufficient use of math manipulatives during math instruction.	5C.1. Teachers will utilize math manipulatives on a regular basis to ensure that students understand math concepts on a	5C.1. Principal, Assistant Principal	5C.1.. Lesson Plans; Bi-weekly data chats with teachers to analyze data and make instructional decisions and grade level	5C.1. Core curriculum and Math assessments aligned with the Go

1		concrete level.		discussions to ensure Common Core curriculum implementation with fidelity.	Math series. Mini Benchmark Assessments, Formal and informal assessments, FCAT Explorer.
2	5C.2. . Student comprehension of word problems and understanding of what to solve	5C.2. Use of reading strategies during math; collaborative grouping; use of ESOL strategies with fidelity during math instruction.	5C.2. Principal, Assistant Principal	5C.2. . BAT 2, FCAT, formal and informal assessments, FCAT Explorer	5C.2. . BAT 2, FCAT, formal and informal assessments, FCAT Explorer
3	5C.3. Lack of targeted instruction.	5C.3. Use data to prescribe differentiated instruction to meet needs of students.	5C.3. Principal, Assistant Principal	5C.3. Bi-weekly data chats with teachers to analyze data and make instructional decisions and grade level discussions to ensure curriculum implementation with fidelity.	5C.3. 5D.3. Core curriculum and Math assessments aligned with the Go Math series. Benchmark assessments, Formal and informal assessments, FCAT Explorer.

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:	Decrease the number of FRL students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics from 31% by 4% in 2012-2013
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
31% (135) of free and reduced lunch students made Adequate Yearly Progress on the 2011-2012 FCAT Math.	27% (129) of free and reduced lunch students will make Adequate Yearly Progress on the 2012-2013 FCAT Math.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5D.1. Student comprehension of word problems and understanding how to problem solve.	5D.1. Teachers will utilize math manipulatives on a regular basis to ensure that students understand math concepts on a concrete level.	5D.1. Principal, Assistant Principal	5D.1. Lesson Plans; Bi-weekly data chats with teachers to analyze data and make instructional decisions and grade level discussions to ensure Common Core curriculum implementation with fidelity.	5D.1. . Core curriculum and Math assessments aligned with the Go Math series. Mini Benchmark Assessments, Formal and informal assessments, FCAT Explorer.
2	5D.2. Lack of targeted instruction.	5D.2. Use data to differentiated instruction to meet needs of students. drive instruction.	5D.2. Principal, Assistant Principal	5D.2. Bi-weekly data chats with teachers to analyze data and make instructional decisions and grade level discussions to ensure curriculum implementation with fidelity.	5D.2. Core curriculum and Math assessments aligned with the Go Math series. Benchmark assessments, Formal and informal assessments, FCAT Explorer.
3	5D.3. Increase use of manipulatives during math instruction.	5D.3. Teachers will utilize manipulatives on a regular basis to ensure that students understand math concepts on a concrete level.	5D.3. Principal Assistant Principal	5D.3. Lesson Plans, (instructional strategies) Bi-weekly data chats with teachers to analyze data and make instructional decisions PLC's and grade level discussions to ensure curriculum implementation	5D.3. Diagnostic math assessment data (ex. Key math), Classroom assessments, Core curriculum and Math assessments aligned with the Go Math series.

				with fidelity.	Mini Benchmark Assessments, Formal and informal assessments, FCAT Explorer,
--	--	--	--	----------------	---

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

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

Mathematics Budget:

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

End of Mathematics Goals

## Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.

Increase the number of students scoring a level 3 or

Science Goal #1a:	higher by 4% in Science on the 2012-2013 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
39% (48) of our students scored a level 3 in Science on the 2011-2012 FCAT.	43% (58) of our students will score a level 3 or higher in Science on the 2012-2013 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	1.1. There is limited time allotted for science instruction	1.1.Science will be taught through the literacy block K-5.	1.1.Principal Assistant Principal	1.1.Schedules posted to reflect Science time, lesson plan review iObservations, data chats, informal observations.	1.1.. Science curriculum assessments formal, informal, FCAT
2	1.2.Insufficient use of Hands on Science experiments	1.2.New Science special focusing on hands-on experiences designed to enhance the lessons taught by the classroom teacher	1.2. Admin. Team Leaders	1.2. iObservation; Snapshot walkthroughs; Data Chats; lesson plan review.	1.2. Science curriculum assessments, formal, informal, FCAT

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.  Science Goal #1b:	Increase the number of students scoring levels 4,5,6 in Science on the FAA from 50% by 4% in 2012-2013
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% of students scored a level 4,5, or 6 in Science on the FAA.	54%(2) of students scored a level 4,5 or 6 in Science on the 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
1	50%Insufficient use of hands-on science experiments	Flexible Scheduling; Project-based learning; Research-based and hands-on activities/experimentsutilizing the Scientific Method; BEEP lessons and video streaming	Principal, Assistant Principal	Bi-monthly grade level data chats with administration; monthly lesson plan review; Team meeting discussions; iObservation; Snapshot walkthroughs, informal observations	Formal and informal assessments, FCAT

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.  Science Goal #2a:	Increase the number of students scoring levels 4 and 5 in Science from 87% (101) by 4% on the 2012-2013 FCAT
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
87%(101 of our students scored a level 4 or higher in Science on the 2011-2012 FCAT.	91%(117) of our students will demonstrate learning gains in Science on the 2012-2013 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	2.1. The need for more hands on experiments, and research projects.	2.1. Flexible Scheduling; Project-based learning; Research-based and hands-on activities/experimentsutilizing the Scientific Method; BEEP lessons and video streaming	2.1. Principal Assistant Principal	2.1.Bi-monthly grade level data chats with administration; monthly lesson plan review; Team meeting discussions; iObservation; Snap shot walkthroughs, informal observations	2.1.Formal and informal assessments, FCAT

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science.  Science Goal #2b:	
--	--

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

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

Science Budget:

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

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:		To increase the number of students scoring levels 3.0 or higher by 4% on the 2012-2013 FCAT Writing.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
88% (92) of our students scored level 3.0 or higher on the FCAT Writing in 2011-2012.		93% of our students will score a level 3.0 or higher on the 2012-2013 FCAT 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	1.1. Students' regular use of Conventions and Grammar in the writing process.	1.1. Mini lessons throughout the content area; Writing journals; Student-led conferences; Parent-teacher conferences. Peer editing	1.1. Assistant Principal, Principal Reading Coach.	1.1. Writing samples monthly/bi-weekly submitted to Principal	1.1. Student writing samples scored by grade-level created rubrics, scores submitted to Principal
2	1.2. Cohesion of writing scoring rubrics	1.2. Mini lessons throughout the content area; Writing journals; Teacher/Student-led conferences; Parent-teacher conferences	1.2. Principal; Asst. Principal; Classroom teacher	1.2. . Writing samples bi-weekly, monthly to Principal	1.2. Student writing samples scored by grade-level created rubrics



	focusing on writing at home		
--	-----------------------------	--	--

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:	50% of our students scored a level 4 on the 2011-2012 FAA 54% of our students will score a level 4 or higher on the 2012-2013 FAA.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% of students scored a level 4 or higher on FAA writing.	54% of students will score a level or higher on FAA writibg.

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' regular use of Conventions and Grammar in the writing process.	Mini lessons throughout the content area; Writing journals; Teacher/Student-led conferences; Parent-teacher conferences focusing on writing at home	Principal; Asst. Principal; Classroom teacher	Writing samples bi-weekly, monthly to Principal	Student writing samples scored by grade-level created rubrics
2	Cohesion of writing scoring rubrics	Development of grade-level writing rubrics	Principal; Asst. Principal; Classroom	Writing samples submitted to Principal	Student writing samples scored by grade-level created

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
Grade-level meetings	K-5	Team Leaders	K-5 teachers	September 2012 and ongoing	Administrative meetings with Grade-level teams; iObservation; Snapshot walkthroughs	Principal; Asst. Principal
District training	4	District	Reading Specialist and grade 4 teachers	October 2012 and ongoing	Administrative meetings with Grade-level teams; iObservation; Snapshot walkthroughs	Principal, Asst. Principal

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

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:	The percentage of attendance will increase from 97% to 98% for the 2012-2013 school year.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
97% (720) of our students attended school on a regular basis for the 2011-2012 school year.	98% (727) of our students will attend school on a regular basis for the 2012-2013 school year.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
29% (137) students had excessive absences for the 2011-2012 school year.	To decrease the number of students with excessive absences by 4%(25%-111) for the 2012-2013 school year.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
77students had excessive tardies for the 2011-2012 school year.	To decrease the number of students with excessive tardies by 3%% (7%-52)in the 2012-2013 school year.

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Habitually absent students	1.1. Parent Notification/Conference Referral to Social Worker ParentLink	1.1. IMT Classroom Teacher Guidance Counselor Social Worker	1.1. Evaluation of daily attendance reports	1.1. TERMS Reports Data Warehouse BTIP
2	1.2. Consistency of parents being called when students are	1.2. More frequent communication with parents of tardy	1.2. IMT Social Worker Assistant Principal	1.2. Evaluation of daily attendance reports	1.2. TERMS Reports Data Warehouse

	tardy	students by teachers	Classroom Teacher		Reports BTIP
3	1.3. Consistency of school tardy letter being sent home	1.3. Staff training on tardy/absence procedures	1.3. Guidance Counselor Social Worker, Classroom Teacher	1.3. Evaluation of daily attendance reports	1.3. TERMS Reports Data Warehouse Reports

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

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

Suspension Goal #1:	The total number of Internal and External Suspensions will decrease from 1 to 0 for the 2012-2013 school year.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
1 student had Internal Suspension for the 2011-2012 school year.	To decrease the total of IS from 1 to 0 for the 2012-2013 school year.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
1 student had Internal Suspension for the 2011-2012 school year.	To decrease the total of IS from 1 to 0 for the 2012-2013 school year.
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
0 out of school suspensions for the 2011-2012 school year.	To maintain 0 IS suspensions for the 2011-2012 school year.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
20 students had out of school suspension for 2011-2012 school year.	To maintain 0 IS suspensions for the 2011-2012 school year.

**Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement**

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Inconsistency of behavior plans across grade levels	1.1. CHAMPS training, Classroom behavior plan across grade levels	1.1. Assistant Principal, Principal	Decreased number of referrals Classroom/Behavior Plan Evaluation of number of referrals	BASIS, Virtual Counselor, RtI

**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
Overview of school-wide discipline plan	K-5	Assistant Principal	school-wide	September 2012	Observation, Snapshot walkthroughs,	Principal, Assistant Principal

**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>	To increase parent participation and attendance at PTA meetings, Open House and parent trainings by 3% for the 2012-2013 school year.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
Attendance logs for PTA meetings, Open House and parent trainings in 2011-2012 indicated a 27%(183) participation.	To continue to recruit new members and families new to the community to attend meetings, trainings, school related activities, fund raisers etc. by 3%(204) for the 2012-201 school year.

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Communication	1.1. Use of parents' personal email to send out school information	1.1. Principal	1.1. Increased percentage of parent satisfaction/participation on customer survey	1.1. Parent sign-in sheets, Yearly Customer survey reports
2	1.3. Child care during parent meetings	1.3. PTA will Offer child care services for meetings. Teachers and para professionals will provide services.	1.3. PTA Chair	1.3. Review of parent sign-in sheets, Parent link as a reminder	1.3. Parent sign-in sheets Yearly Customer survey reports

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

*End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)*

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

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

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

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

## Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school



# FINAL BUDGET

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

## Differentiated Accountability

### School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school:  Yes  No

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

No Attachment

## School Advisory Council

### School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

The 2012-2013 SAC committee will study and reflect on the effectiveness of the school improvement plan, discuss the transition to Common Core Standards, and guide school programs that will increase student achievement.



# 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 FLORANADA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	88%	90%	98%	78%	354	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	72%	66%			138	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Improve FCAT Levels</li> <li>● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5</li> <li>● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2</li> </ul>
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	63% (YES)	64% (YES)			127	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					619	
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 FLORANADA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	82%	88%	95%	65%	330	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	61%	65%			126	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Improve FCAT Levels</li> <li>● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5</li> <li>● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2</li> </ul>
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	49% (NO)	63% (YES)			112	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					568	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested