FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: VIRGINIA SHUMAN YOUNG ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Broward

Principal: Danielle Smith

SAC Chair: Mary Jane Saavedra

Superintendent: Robert Runcie

Date of School Board Approval: December 4, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/23/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Danielle N. Smith	BA-Elementary Education, Florida Atlantic University MS-Educational Leadership, Florida Atlantic University	3	6	2011-2012: Grade A, 2010-2011: Grade A, AYP Met Reading Mastery 97%, Math Mastery 96%, Science Mastery 88%, Reading Learning Gains 74%, Math Learning Gains 78% Lowest 25%ile making Reading Gains 84%, Lowest 25%ile making math gains 84% 2009-2010: Assistant Principal at VSY, AYP met, Grade A Reading Mastery 94%, Math Mastery 94%, Science Mastery 90%, Reading Learning Gains 81%, Math Learning Gains 76% Lowest 25%ile making Reading Gains 88%, Lowest 25%ile making math gains 84% 2008-2009 School Grade A AYP Criteria not met in Math Subgroup-Students with Disabilities
Assis Principal					

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

List your school's instructional coaches and briefly describe their certification(s), number of years at the current school, number of years as an instructional coach, and their prior performance record with increasing student achievement at each school. Include history of school grades, FCAT/Statewide assessment performance (Percentage data for achievement levels, learning gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress. Instructional coaches described in this section are only those who are fully released or part-time teachers in reading, mathematics, or science and work only at the school site.

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading Specialist	Barbara Condry	BS – Elementary Education, University of Mass, 1973 MS – Barry University, Montessori Education, 1996	17	11	2011-2012: Grade A, 2010-2011: Grade A, AYP Met Reading Mastery 97%, Math Mastery 96%, Science Mastery 88%, Reading Learning Gains 74%, Math Learning Gains 78% Lowest 25%ile making Reading Gains 84%, Lowest 25%ile making math gains 84% 2009-2010: Grade A Reading Mastery 94%, Math Mastery 94%, Science Mastery 90%, Reading Learning Gains 81%, Math Learning Gains 76% Lowest 25%ile making Reading Gains 88%, Lowest 25%ile making math gains 84% 1998 - current: Grade A and met AYP every year with the exception of the 2002-2003 school year

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1. Regular meetings of teachers with Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal/NESS Liaison	Ongoing	
2	2. Partnering new teachers or teachers with less than 2 years experience with veteran staff	NESS Liaison	Ongoing	
3	3. Lesson plans, materials and classroom mgmt reviewed on as needed basis	Team Leaders	Ongoing	
4	4. Data Conferences and Classroom Walk Throughs	Principal/Support Staff	Ongoing	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).
*When using percentages, include the number of teachers the percentage represents (e.g., 70% [35]).

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
No data submitted	

Staff Demographics

Please complete the following demographic information about the instructional staff in the school.

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
49	0.0%(0)	30.6%(15)	44.9%(22)	28.6%(14)	67.3%(33)	93.9%(46)	4.1%(2)	6.1%(3)	53.1%(26)

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
Derrick Huff Tami George Tequila Howard Star Geisler Barbara Condry Michelle Frails	Jeffrey Calvin Laura Freidline Yolanda Nails Erica Bergstedt Heather Thomas Michelle DiMaria	All mentors and their mentees are paired according to grade level assignments.	Mentors will meet with their mentees and participate in sharing of Best Practices, familiarization with the Montessori curriculum and Common Core Standards; as well as observation opportunities for the mentees. Montessori Certified Educators will be used as mentors for all who are seeking certification (Montessori). This will be done through: observation, training, feedback, course work and learning communities.

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

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Title I, Part D

Title II

Title III

Title X- Homeless

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Violence Prevention Programs

Nutrition Programs

Housing Programs

Head Start

Adult Education

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

Other

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 and their positions are: Principal: Ms. Danielle N. Smith; Assistant Principal:; Select General Education Teachers/team leaders: Michelle Frails, Stephany Stock, Sue Wilcher, & Cony Moran; Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teachers: Amanda Knecht, Susan Kaufman & Erica Leonhardt; Carin Davis, ESE Specialist; Montessori Curriculum Coach & Reading Specialist: Barbara Condry; School Psychologist: Joanne Nemeroff; Technology Specialist: Jennifer Narkier; Speech Language Pathologist: Elisa Cartagena; Student Services Personnel: Bruce Barclay & Social Worker: (TBA)and Teachers of the student referred will be included as a core team member

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?

Barbara Condry will be responsible for coordinating and facilitating RtI meetings. Case managers are assigned on a case to case basis. The Child Study/Support Team meets once a week to engage in the following activities: 1st, Teacher identifies and describes the specific problems; 2nd, a pre-assessment related to the academic problem for baseline data is given s/a DAR, IRI, Dibels,and /or end of book test. For behavior a frequency chart, ABC data, and behavior observation will be completed. Behavioral/attendance data to evaluate if there is a need for tier one interventions in these areas.
3rd, Implement specific classroom interventions for 6-8 weeks, consult with RtI team, if needed; 4th, Re-assess using same pre-instrument; 5th, If adequate progress has been made, continue what you are doing,if progress has not been met, complete Tier 1 Intervention record and turn into ESE Specialist, Carin Davis; 6th, RTI Team meeting will be scheduled with specific teacher. If after interventions have been put in place, the question asked: Have the interventions worked? If yes, then process ends; if not, then the process moves to Tier 2 steps will be followed which consists of general education and specialized intervention (small groups with 2 to 4 students) and will be monitored for progress; 7th, if adequate progress is not being made, then Tier 3 steps will be followed; 8th, special education is provided to individual students or small groups. Individualized Educations Program (IEP) goal setting, and through results of comprehensive evaluation; 9th, continuous progress monitoring informs the teaching process.

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 contributes to the development and implementation of the SIP by providing data to the SAC members and its recommendations for specific academic goals. The SAC team then initiates objectives to support each goal based on data collected by the RtI Team.
Modifications are made according to the data, assessments given and specific students monitored for adequate progress.

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), Benchmark Assessment Test (BAT 1 & 2 for reading, math, and science), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) Progress Monitoring: PMRN, Mini Assessments, FCAT Simulation Midyear: Diagnostic Assessment for Reading (DAR), Early Reading Diagnostic Assessment (ERDA) End of year: In addition, Montessori materials and assessments will be used to meet the needs of the individual children identified through the RtI process.
For tier 1 students, teacher and case manager will determine appropriate source of intervention based on individual need and baseline data.
For tier 2 and 3 students, individual intervention records and progress monitoring graphs will be used as data sources. Behavioral/attendance will be additional data to evaluate if there is a need for in tier one interventions in these areas.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

A refresh training will be provided to all teachers during the Pre-Planning week regarding the RtI Process. Additional Professional development will be provided to teachers on an as-needed basis, due to the fact that there are no new staff members.
The RtI team will also evaluate additional staff PD needs during the RtI Leadership Team meetings.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The school-based Literacy Leadership Team consists of the following individuals: Principal: Ms. Danielle N. Smith; Assistant Principal: ; Support Staff/Reading Coach: Barbara Condry; Guidance/ELL Representative: Bruce Barclay; ESE Specialist: Carin Davis; Select teachers: Barbara Black, Jeffrey Calvin, Elisa Cartagena, Tequila Howard, Jennifer McHenry, Lauren Possenti, Nancy Romer, Mark Southworth, Laura Stapleton and Heather Thomas; and Media Specialist: Jennifer Narkier
Members selected based on vertical teaming to ensure representation from all grade levels.

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

The school-based LLT will meet monthly to share BEST practices and strategies to ensure that every child achieves a years growth in reading. It will also support and monitor the SIP (School Improvement Plan) goals in the areas of reading and writing. The major goal of the LLT is to support the goals of the School Improvement Plan and support teachers' learning development in the areas of reading. Data from benchmark strands will be used to determine the areas for sharing best practices.

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

1. Teachers will be trained with strategies to meet the needs of students in areas identified as weaknesses in strand-specific data.

2. Select members of the LLT will conduct Professional Learning Communities (PLC)on a monthly basis.

3. Teachers will utilize progress-monitoring to ensure that all areas of Reading and Writing are being assessed.

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.

NA

*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:	25%(80 students) scored at a Proficiency Level 3. Area of improvement is to have all students reach proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
25%(80 students) scored at a Proficiency Level 3.	By June 2013, 96% of the students will achieve proficiency at level 3 or above on the FCAT Reading Assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Fidelity of implementation	Literacy Leadership team will provide training for teachers on differentiated instructional strategies to use with strand data.	Reading Coach	Classroom Walk-Through	Mini-BATS/BAT
2	Students not demonstrating mastery of benchmarks and standards.	Differentiated small group lessons using supplemental materials.	Classroom teachers, Reading Coach	Data will be collected and analyzed to determine flexible groups.	Data chats, classroom walkthroughs
3	Identifying trends in data and identifying individual student needs.	Teachers will anaylze student data to determine student strengths/weakneses and/or students who are at risk of falling a level on FCAT to evaluate and restructure instruction to meet student needs.	Reading coach/ Classroom teachers	Classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans	Mini-BATs, BAT, assessments
4	Scheduling time to analyze, review and develop action plans.	Data chats will be done three times a year to monitor progress for all students.	Administration, Reading Coach, Classroom Teachers	Data chats	Various assessments, including but not limited to: Mini-BATs, fluency scores, Rigby, DAR, IRI, FAIR
5	Training and Monitoring	Students will engage in activities that require them to answer higher order thinking questions into all content areas (IE- Blooms, Marzano, Webb)	Reading coach/Classroom teachers	Teacher monitoring of student progress	Informal assessments, Mini-BATs, BAT
6	Training and Monitoring	Montessori Materials will be used to develop all areas of reading but not limited to phonemic awareness, fluency and reading comprehension.	Classroom teachers, Team Leaders	Lesson plans and classroom walkthroughs	Informal assessments, PMP

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:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	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
No Data Submitted				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	61%(192 students) scored at a Proficiency level 4 or 5 on the FCAT Reading. Area of improvement is to increase student proficiency to a higher level.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on the 2012 FCAT Reading assessment, 61%(192 students) scored at a Proficiency level 4 or 5.	By June 2013, 80% of the students in grades 3-5 will achieve at a Level 4 or 5 on the FCAT Reading assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Fidelity of Reading Curriculum	Through vertical teaming, Teachers will participate in Reading Professional Learning Communities to share BEST Practices.	PLC Liaison	Sharing evidence of student progress/work samples.	Portfolio Assessment (Work Samples)
2	Content Area implementation and training/monitoring	Students in grades K-5 will engage in activities that require them to answer higher order thinking questions into all content areas (IE-Blooms, Marzano, Webb).	Classroom Teachers, Reading Coach	Classroom walkthrough, lesson plans	Mini- BATs, weekly assessments, teacher created assessments formal and informal assessments
3	Identifying trends in data and identifying individual student needs.	Teachers will analyze class data and implement various reading strategies to meet differentiated needs	Reading Coach/Classroom Teachers	Classroom walkthrough, lesson plans	Mini bats, BAT, assessments, fluency scores
4	Availability of technology.	Students in grades K-5 will participate technology programs such as Riverdeep,	Reading Coach/Classroom Teachers,Technology Specialist	Monthly reports	Informal/formal assessments, Mini bats/BAT
	Training, Monitoring and Scheduling.	Students in grades K-5 who are exceeding grade level expectations will	Reading Coach/Classroom Teachers	Teacher monitoring of student progress	Formal and informal assessments,

5		utilize technology-based programs such as Accelerated Reader and Compass Learning for enrichment in order to add rigor to the standard curriculum.			Mini- BATs, BAT
6	Training and Monitoring.	Students in grades 3-5 will learn how to summarize and identify key details in informational text as part of the F.I.N.D.S. research method.	Reading Coach/Classroom Teachers	Lesson Plans	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:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	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
No Data Submitted				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	Percentage of students making learning gains in Reading were 78% (158) students. The area of improvement is to increase learning gains for all students.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on the 2012 FCAT Reading assessment, 78% (158) students showed learning gains in reading.	By June 2013, 85% of the students will make learning gains on the FCAT Reading assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students plateau	Provide in-service workshops/ training in differentiation strategies	District personnel	Classroom Walk-Through	Work Samples
	Access to technology	Students in grades K-8 will participate both in school and at home in	1 Reading Coach/classroom Teachers/	Monthly reports	Informal/formal assessments

2		technology based programs such as FCAT explorer, Accelerated Reader to support and enhance curriculum.	Technology Specialist		
3	Identifying trends in data and identifying individual student needs.	Teachers will analyze class data and implement various reading strategies to meet differentiated needs.	Reading Coach/Classroom Teachers	Lesson plans, data chats	Mini bats, BAT, assessments, fluency scores

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:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	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
No Data Submitted				

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	82%(28 students) in the lowest 25%ile made learning gains in Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on the 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment 34 students were identified in Lowest 25%. 28 of those students (82%) made learning gains.	By June 2013, 90% of the students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on the FCAT reading assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of student motivation	Parent education workshops in reading strategies/motivating struggling readers.	Reading Coach	Parent Communication	Teacher observation
2	Students not demonstrating mastery of benchmark and standards.	Students in grades K-5 will participate in differentiated small group lessons using supplemental materials.	Classroom Teachers, Reading coach	Data will be collected and analyzed to determine flexible groups.	Data chats, classroom walkthroughs

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 # 5A : BY 2016-2017, we will reduce the achievement gap by 7 percentage points from a proficiency level of 86 to 93.			
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	87	88	90	92	93	

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:	On the 2012 FCAT 2.0 in reading White - 14% (20 students out of 139); Black - 21% (19 students out of 92); Hispanic - 6% (3 students out of 52); Asian - 0% (0 out of 5) American Indian - NA did not make satisfactory progress in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White - 14% (20 students out of 139); Black - 21% (19 students out of 92); Hispanic - 6% (3 students out of 52); Asian - 0% (0 out of 5) American Indian - NA	100% of subgroups identified will make satisfactory progress on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of understanding of cultural influences on student performance.	Teachers will engage in a workshop in order to help them identify strategies to help learners from diverse backgrounds improve their reading skills	Reading Coach, Administratation	CWT, Student chats with administration	Informal assessments
2	Students not demonstrating mastery of benchmark and standards.	Students in grades K-5 will participate in differentiated small group lessons using supplemental materials.	Classroom Teachers, Reading coach	Data will be collected and analyzed to determine flexible groups.	Data chats, classroom walkthroughs

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:	On the 2012 FCAT 2.0 in reading, 40% (2 out of 5 students) did not make satisfactory progress in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
40% (2 out of 5) students	On the 2013 FCAT 2.0 80% (4 out of 5) students will make satisfactory progress in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

1	Language Barriers	The use of the appropriate ESOL strategies as provided by the district will be implemented in the classroom.	Classroom Teachers, ELL Coordinator	Teacher observation to monitor effectiveness of the ESOL strategies implemented	Informal assessments
2	Access to technology	Students will utilize various technology resources to develop vocabulary skills.	Classroom teachers, Reading Coach, Media Specialist	Lesson Plans	Formal and informal asessments

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:	On the 2012 FCAT 2.0, 50% (21 of 42) students did not make satisfactory progress in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (21 of 42) students did not make satisfactory progress in reading.	On the 2013 FCAT 2.0 assessment in reading 71% (30) of students will make satisfactory progress in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Scheduling and time for planning	The ESE Teacher will collaborate with classroom teachers to ensure that they aware of ESE students IEPs, understand curriculum modification, classroom environment and/ or schedules in order to meet the academic needs of students.	ESE Specialist	Lesson plans and IEP goals	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 subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	21% of students (22 of 103) did not make satisfactory progress in Reading on the 2012 FCAT 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
21% (22) students did not make satisfactory progress in Reading on the 2012 FCAT 2.0.	88% (91) students will make satisfactory progress in Reading on the 2013 FCAT 2.0

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Availability of resources	Students will be given all the supplies necessary for them to complete assignments.	Classroom teachers	Teacher monitor student progress	Formal and informal assessments
	Availability of technology	have access to	Media	Teacher monitor student	Formal and informal

2		technology at home will have access to the computer in the morning before the beginning of school so that they can work on Compass Learning and other technology based programs	Specialist /Reading Coach, Classroom Teacher	progress	assessments

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core	K-5	Barbara Condry	Principal: Ms. Danielle N. Smith; Assistant Principal; Support Staff/Reading Coach: Barbara Condry; Guidance/ELL Representative: Bruce Barclay; ESE Specialist: Carin Davis; Select teachers: Barbara Black, Jeffrey Calvin, Elisa Cartagena, Tequila Howard, Jennifer McHenry, Lauren Possenti, Nancy Romer, Mark Southworth, Laura Stapleton and Heather Thomas; and Media Specialist: Jennifer Narkier	On-going for the 2012-2013 school year.	Classroom Observations	Administration/Support Staff

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Wilson Training for select teachers	Provide teachers with strategies to reach struggling readers.		$200.00
			Subtotal: $200.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Online textbook support materials	Online resources support the curriculum across all grade levels	NA	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Professional development workshops offered by the district that support Common Core.	Provides teachers with the resources in transitioning to the Common Core in reading.	NA	$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:	
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:	
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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:	29%(90 students) scored at a Proficiency Level 3. The area of improvement is to increase Level 3 students' performance to Level 4.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
316 students tested on Math FCAT 2.0 assessment. 29% (90) students achieving proficiency Level 3.	By June 2013, 96% of students will achieve proficiency of a Level 3 or above.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Continuous implementation of Montessori Philosophy, Next Generation SSS and Common Core.	Math PLC	Math PLC Chairperson	Teacher observations/Classroom Walk-through	Prerequisite/Beginning of Year Assessment/Mid-Year and End of Year Assessment
2	Integration of Montessori Methods with the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards.	Team Level Meetings/Share BEST Practices	Team Leader/Administration	Reflection of implementation of Shared practices	On-going student assessment
3	Access to the materials.	Students will utilize math manipulatives to introduce and reinforce concepts using the hands-on, pictorial, and abstract concepts.	Teachers. Magnet Coordinator, Curriculum Specialist	Lesson plans and Classroom Walkthroughs	Checkpoint Assessments, Teacher Created Assessments, Mini-BATs
4	Scheduling and Data Analysis	Teachers will use the NGSSS and Common Core Standards to correlate Montessori Scope & Sequence to the new standards.	Administration, Curriculum Specialist, Math Focus Group	Lesson plans, Classroom Walkthroughs, Professional Learning Communities	Checkpoint Assessments, Teacher Created Assessments, Mini-BATS
5	Scheduling and Data Analysis	Students performing below mastery based on on-going evaluation will use district recommended math intervention.	Team Leaders, Classroom teachers	Lesson plans, Classroom Walkthroughs, Professional Learning Communities	Checkpoint Assessments, Teacher Created Assessments, Mini-BATS
6	Scheduling and data analysis.	Data Chats will be conducted with teachers of students in grades K-5.	Administration, Support Staff, Classroom teachers	Teacher observations	Mini-BATs/ BATs

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	58% (183) students achieved proficiency at Level 4 or 5. The area of improvement is to increase the number of students achieving proficiency at Level 4 and 5.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
58% (183) students achieving proficiency at Level 4 and Level 5.	By June 2013, % students will achieve proficiency at Level 4 or Level 5.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students plateau	Include higher order questions based on Marzano's research-based instructional strategies in lesson plans.	Administration/Support Staff	Lesson plans will be reviewed on an as needed basis and CWT's.	CWT Visitation Form
2	Scheduling and Staff Development.	Teachers will utilize the grade level Math Instructional Focus Calendar, BEEP, and county assessments in order to target weaknesses	Administrators, Team Leaders	Lesson plans and Classroom Walkthroughs	Mini-BATs/ BAT, On-going Assessments
3	Scheduling and Staff Development	Data Chats will be conducted with teachers for students in grades K-8.	Administration and Support staff	Teacher observations	On-going Assessments Mini-BATs/ BAT
4	Scheduling and Staff Development	Student Data Chats will be conducted with students in grades 3-8.	Team Leaders and Classroom teachers	Teacher observations	On-going Assessments Mini-BATs/ BAT
5	Scheduling and staff development	Students in all grade levels will be taught “Self-Correcting” strategies so that they understand how to review and correct their math work.	Classroom Teachers	Lesson plans	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:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics.	

Mathematics Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	87% (176) students out of 202 students made learning gains. The area of improvement is to increase learning gains for all students.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Math assessment, 87% (176) out of 202 made learning gains.	By June 2013, 90% students will show learning gains on the Math FCAT 2.0 assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Fidelity of implementation	Through vertical teaming, Teachers will participate in Math Professional Learning Communities to share BEST Practices.	Team Leader	Share Best practices and Classroom Walk-throughs	Prerequisite/Beginning of Year Assessment/Mid-Year and End of Year Assessment
2	Students who are deficient in basic foundation math skills at grade level.	Determine core instructional needs by reviewing common assessment data for all students in each grade level within bottom quartile. Utilize differentiated instruction/interventions during math lesson.	Teachers/Administrators	Review of assessment data	Assessments from the Go-Math series.
3	Access to technology	Students in grades K-5 will participate both in school and at home in technology based programs such as FCAT explorer, and other technology to support and enhance math curriculum.	Reading Coach, Classroom Teachers, Technology Specialist	Monthly reports	Formal and informal assessments
4	Scheduling and availability of resources	Students will utilize re-teach and intervention components of the Go Math series.	Classroom Teacher	Classroom assessments and Mini Bats, FCAT	Classroom assessments and Mini Bats, 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:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	81% (32) students out of 39 students in the lowest 25th percentile made learning gains. The area of improvement is to increase learning gains for all students.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
81% (32) students in the lowest 25% showed learning gains on the 2012 Math FCAT 2.0.	By June 2013, 85% of students in the lowest 25% will show learning gains on the Math FCAT 2.0 assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Low reading comprehension skills.	8 Step Process (Singapore Math Strategy)	Teacher	Informal Teacher Observation of students	Demonstration of Problem Solving using the 8 Step Process
2	Access to technology	Students in grades K-5 will participate both in school and at home in technology based programs such as FCAT explorer, and other technology to support and enhance math curriculum.	Reading Coach, Classroom Teachers,	Monthly reports	Formal and informal assessments
3	Scheduling and availability of resources	Students will utilize re-teach and intervention components of the Go Math series	Classroom Teacher	Classroom assessments and Mini Bats, FCAT	Classroom assessments and Mini Bats, FCAT

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Elementary School Mathematics Goal # 5A : BY 2016-2017, we will reduce the achievement gap by 7 percentage points from a proficiency level of 86 to 95.					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	84	87	89	92	93	

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:	Student subgroups not making learning gains on the 2012 Math FCAT 2.0: White 13% (18); Black 21% (19); Hispanic 6% (3); Asian 20% (1) Increase student subgroups not making learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA White 13% (18); Black 21% (19); Hispanic 6% (3); Asian 20% (1)	All student subgroups by ethnicity will make satisfactory progess on the 2013 Math FCAT 2.0

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Access to technology	Students in grades K-5 will participate both in school and at home in technology based programs such as Mega Math, FCAT explorer, and other technology to support and enhance math curriculum.	Reading Coach/Teachers/ Technology Specialist	Monthly reports	Informal and formal assessments.
2	Scheduling and availability of resource	Students will utilize Re-teach and intervention components of the Go Math series.	Classroom Teacher	Classroom assessments and Mini Bats, FCAT	Classroom assessments and Mini Bats, 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 subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	60% (3) of ELL students did not make satisfactory progress in math on the 2012 Math FCAT 2.0. Increase number of students make progress in this subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
60% (3) of ELL students did not make satisfactory progress in math on the 2012 Math FCAT 2.0	75% of ELL students will make satisfactory progress in math on the 2013 FCAT 2.0

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Scheduling and	Students will utilize Re-	Classroom teacher	Classroom assessments	Classroom

1	availability of resources	teach and intervention components of the Go Math series.		and Mini Bats, FCAT	assessments and Mini Bats, 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 subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	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	Scheduling and availability of resources	Students will utilize Re-teach and intervention components of the Go Math series.	Classroom Teachers	Classroom assessments and Mini Bats, FCAT	Classroom assessments and Mini Bats, 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 subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	21% (22) Economically Disadvantaged students did not make satisfactory progress in math. Increase the number of students making progress in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
21% (22) Economically Disadvantaged students did not make satisfactory progress in math	By 2013, 50% of Economically Disadvantaged students will make progress in math as indicated by the FCAT 2.0.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Access to technology	Students in grades K-5 will participate both in school and at home in technology based programs such as Destination Learning, Riverdeep,FCAT explorer, and other technology to support and enhance math curriculum.	Reading Coach/Classroom Teachers/ Technology Specialist	Monthly reports	Informal and formal assessments

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core Training	K-5	Stephany Stock Micheal Porter	Principal: Ms. Danielle N. Smith; Assistant Principal; Support Staff/Reading Coach: Barbara Condry; Guidance/ELL Representative: Bruce Barclay; ESE Specialist:	On-going for the 2012-2013 school year.	Classroom Walkthroughs and observation	Principal/Reading Coach

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. Science Goal #1a:	36% (37) students scored at or above Level 3 on the 2012 Science FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2012 Current Level of Performance: 36% (37) students achieved proficiency Level 3.	By June 2013, 85% of students will achieve proficiency at/or above Level 3 on the Science FCAT assessment.
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

			Person or	Process Used to	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Fidelity of Curriculum	Science Committee training/BEEP Lesson Plan utilization	Science Resource Teacher	Informal Teacher Observation	Mini-Benchmark Assessments
2	Lack of Real-World Experience	Provide real-world science experiences and engaging activities	Science Resource Teacher/Classroom Teacher	Students will complete Science Weekly newspaper	Science Weekly Mini-Assessment
3	Access to the materials and training	Montessori Materials will continue to be aligned to the revised IFC in order to incorporate lesson focusing on the natural world and practical life.	Science Focus Team and Magnet Coordinator	Lesson Plans and Classroom Walkthroughs	Informal assessments
4	Training and Monitoring	Students in grades 1-8 will utilize Science materials as a tool to develop science vocabulary.	Classroom teachers/Science Resource teacher	Lesson Plans and Classroom Walkthroughs	Checkpoint Assessments, Teacher Created Assessment Rubrics, Mini-BATs, Student Journals

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	36% (37) students achieved proficiency at Level 4 or 5.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
2012 Current Level of Performance: 36% (37 students out of 103) achieved proficiency Level 4 & Level 5.	By June 2013, 50% of students will achieve proficiency of Level 4 or 5 on the Science FCAT assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Fidelity of Curriculum	Science Committee training/BEEP Lesson Plan utilization	Administration/Science Resource Teacher	Informal Teacher Observations	Mini-Benchmark Assessments
2	Lack of student experience	All students will complete hands-on lab activities during their Science Lab rotation and use the Scientific Method format to document hands-on investigations	Science Resource Teacher	Scientific Method format to document hands-on investigations	Science Fair Project
3	Access to the materials and training	Students will participate in hands-on science experiments or activities using the Delta Science kits, Montessori Materials, and the Fusion Science Series.	Classroom teachers	Lesson plans and Classroom Walkthroughs	Checkpoint Assessments, Teacher Created Assessment Rubrics, Mini BATS, Student Journals

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
Science Weeekly	Monthly Science newspaper utilized by students in grade 2-5	Accountability Funds	$2,000.00
			Subtotal: $2,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Kinex Kits			$1,200.00
			Subtotal: $1,200.00
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: $3,200.00

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	Analysis of student achievement on the 2012 administration of the Writing FCAT, 90% (91) students scored at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher. The area in need of improvement is to increase the number of students scoring 3.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
90%, 91 out of 101students tested scored at a Level 3 or above.	By June 2013, 95% of students tested on the FCAT Writing assessment will score at or above a Level 4.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of student motivation	Implementation of Writer's Workshop model.	Team Leader/Classroom Teacher	Student Work Samples	School-wide Writing Prompts
2	Lack of fidelity of writing implementation	School-wide Writing Training	Committee Chairperson/Administration	Classroom Observation/Classroom Walkthroughs	School-wide writing prompts
	Scheduling, Staff Development and	Students in grades K-5 will participate in	Reading Coach/Team	Lesson plans	Student writing samples, FCAT

3	Monitoring.	daily writing activities.	Leaders/ Writing Focus Group		writing prompts scored by 6 trait writing rubric
4	Scheduling, Staff Development and Monitoring.	Teachers will implement the 6 traits of writing strategies into writing instruction	Reading Coach/Team Leaders/ Writing Focus Group	Lesson plans	Student writing samples, FCAT writing prompts scored by 6 trait writing rubric
5	Staff Development and Monitoring.	Students in grades K-5 will use the Montessori Language materials on a daily basis to improve grammar, sentence structure, mechanics, and vocabulary.	Reading Coach, Magnet Coordinator, Classroom Teachers	Lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs	Writing samples
6	Identifying trends in data and identifying individual student needs	Individual grade level plans to fit individual learner.	Reading Coach/Team Leaders/ Administration	Lesson plans	Writing samples
7	Identifying trends in data and identifying individual student needs	At grades 4/5 Utilization of (BAT) Writing prompts	Classroom teachers, Team Leaders/ Administration	Student work samples	Student writing samples, FCAT writing prompts scored by 6 trait writing rubric

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	
2012 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

Implementation of Common Core	K-5	Barbara Condry	School-wide	on-going	writing sample collection	Support Staff
Writing Across the Curriculum	K-5	Barbara Condry	School-wide	on-going	Classroom observations	Support Staff

Writing Budget:

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

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	Increase the overall daily attendance rate to 97%. Decrease the number of students with Excessive absences to 125 students. Decrease the number of students with excessive tardies to 35.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
2011 Current Daily Attendance Rate: 96.5%	The expected daily attendance rate for 2011-2012 school year will be at 97%.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
Based on 2011 Data Report, 136 students had excessive absences.	By June 2012, the expected number of students with excessive absences will be 125.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
Based on the 2011 Data Report, 41 students had excessive tardies.	By June 2012, the expected number of students with excessive tardies will be 35.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Transportation	Encourage parents to utilize bus service provided by county.	Administration	B-Tip Identification Letters to parents.	attendance report
2	Students' tardiness/absences	Interim report/Parent-Teacher Conference	Teacher	Attendance record review	Compared to previous school year reduction of students' tardies/absences.

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:	Number of students with any type of suspension will decrease. Alternative to External Suspension is an option made available to students that can help decrease the number of external suspensions.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
2012- 5 in-school suspensions	By June 2013, the number of in-school suspensions will be 5 or less.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
2012 in-school suspensions- 3 Students	By June 2013, the number of students suspended in-school will be less than 3.
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
2012 Number of out-of-school suspensions: 4	By June 2013, the number of out-of-school suspensions will be 4 or less.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
2012 Number of out-of-school suspensions: 4 students	By June 2013, the number sudnets suspended out-of-school s will be 4 or less.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Incoming students unfamiliar with Montessori philosophy/belief.	New parent and student Orientation on August 19th.	Administration and Support Staff	Number of new parents attending orientation.	Sign-In Sheet
2	Lack of student experience in a Montessori environment.	Normalization Strategies/Modeling appropriate behavior and expectations.	Administration, Support Staff, and Teachers	Teacher Observation/Classroom Walk-throughs	Report Card
3	Lack of life skills.	Implementation of life skills in the classroom.	Administration, Montessori Committee Chairperson	Decrease in student conflicts	Teacher Observation

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	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring

				meetings)		
Life Skills/Montessori PLC	Vertical across grade levels (PreK-5)	Jennifer Sekerchak and Sue Wilcher	J. Sekerchak/Wilcher , Chairperson K/1 S. Wilcher K/1 K. Spencer 2/3 T. George 2/3 J. Sekerchak 2/3 L. Friedline 4/5 C. Stella 4/5 I. Tagliareni PreK A. Knecht Support C. Davis Support J. Narkier	On-going	School-wide decrease in referrals and suspensions.	Administration

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	Increase the number of parents who participate in SAC to align with the socio-economic and demographic population(subgroups) of student enrollment.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
Current Level of Parent Involvement: Out of 52 SAC members, 88% (46) are female; 12% (6) are male; 69% (36) are non-SBBC Employees; 75% (39) are parents; SAC demographics are as follows: White 63% (33); Black 17% (9); Hispanic 13%(7); Asian 2%(1); American Indian 0%; and Multi-Racial 4%(2). School demographics (School Year 2010) White 56.2 % (456); Black 22.6% (183); Hispanic 11.9% (126); Asian 1.32% (10); American Indian 0.26% (6); Multi-Racial 7.67% (67);	By June 2012, the SAC Composition Report will show an increase of 2 members to reflect the demographic/socio-economic subgroups which are representative of the student population.

Female 49.3% (366) and Male 50.6% (356).

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Parents unable to attend meetings.	Provide phone calls directly to parents making them aware of SAC meetings and encourage them to attend.	SAC Chairperson/Vice Chairperson	SAC Sign-In sheets	SAC Composition Report
2	Lack of childcare	Provide child care services in order for parents to attend SAC meetings.	PTA	Sign-In Sheets with child attendance.	Attendance Report

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

Subtotal:	$0.00
Grand Total:	**$0.00**

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Wilson Training for select teachers	Provide teachers with strategies to reach struggling readers.		$200.00
Science	Science Weeekly	Monthly Science newspaper utilized by students in grade 2-5	Accountability Funds	$2,000.00
				Subtotal: $2,200.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Online textbook support materials	Online resources support the curriculum across all grade levels	NA	$0.00
Science	Kinex Kits			$1,200.00
				Subtotal: $1,200.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Professional development workshops offered by the district that support Common Core.	Provides teachers with the resources in transitioning to the Common Core in reading.	NA	$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: $3,400.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

○ Priority	○ Focus	○ Prevent	● 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

Montessori Philosophy and Life Skills Training
Common Core State Standards Training

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
VIRGINIA SHUMAN YOUNG ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	97%	96%	85%	88%	366	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	74%	78%			152	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	84% (YES)	84% (YES)			168	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					686	
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
VIRGINIA SHUMAN YOUNG ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	98%	96%	98%	90%	382	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	81%	76%			157	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	88% (YES)	84% (YES)			172	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					711	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested