

# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: COUNTRY HILLS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Broward

Principal: Kellee Stroup

SAC Chair: Jinky Anderson

Superintendent: Robert Runcie

Date of School Board Approval: December 4, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/19/2012

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.*

<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)
					Country Hills: 2011-2012 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 77% Reading Learning Gains: 74% Reading Gains Lowest 25%: 70% Math Mastery: 78% Math Learning Gains: 75% Math Gains Lowest 25%: 71% Writing Mastery: 88% Science Mastery: 68%  Country Hills: 2010-2011 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 92% Reading Learning Gains: 80% Reading Gains Lowest 25%: 72% Math Mastery: 92% Math Learning Gains: 72% Math Gains Lowest 25%: 72% Writing Mastery: 95% Science Mastery: 73% 90% of subgroups met AYP status

Principal	Kellee Stroup	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•B.S. in Elementary Education</li> <li>•M.S. in Educational Leadership K-12</li> <li>•ESOL Endorsement</li> </ul>	3	15	<p>McNab: 2009-2010  Grade: A  Reading Mastery: 81%  Reading Learning Gains: 67%  Reading Gains Lowest 25%: 56%  Math Mastery: 89%  Math Learning Gains: 74 %  Math Gains Lowest 25%: 64%  Writing Mastery: 90%  Science Mastery: 54%  95% of subgroups met AYP status</p> <p>McNab: 2008-2009  Grade: A  Reading Mastery: 85%  Reading Learning Gains: 78%  Reading Gains Lowest 25%: 71%  Math Mastery: 87%  Math Learning Gains: 70%  Math Gains Lowest 25%: 58 %  Writing Mastery: 92%  Science Mastery: 64%  100% of subgroups met AYP status</p> <p>McNab: 2007-2008  Grade: A  Reading Mastery: 83%  Reading Learning Gains: 69%  Reading Gains Lowest 25%: 58%  Math Mastery: 89%  Math Learning Gains: 78%  Math Gains Lowest 25%: 83%  Writing Mastery: 92%  Science Mastery: 57%  100% of subgroups met AYP status</p> <p>McNab: 2006-2007  Grade: B  Reading Mastery: 86%  Reading Learning Gains: 72%  Reading Gains Lowest 25%: 50%  Math Mastery: 82%  Math Learning Gains: 57%  Math Gains Lowest 25%: 47%  Writing Mastery: 97%  Science Mastery: 59%  100% of subgroups met AYP status</p>
Assis Principal	Veronica Roberts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•B.S. in Elementary Education</li> <li>•M.S. in Reading Education K-12</li> <li>•Certification in Educational Leadership</li> <li>•ESOL Endorsement</li> </ul>	1	1	<p>Country Hills: 2011-2012  Grade: A  Reading Mastery: 77%  Reading Learning Gains: 74%  Reading Gains Lowest 25%: 70%  Math Mastery: 78%  Math Learning Gains: 75%  Math Gains Lowest 25%: 71%  Writing Mastery: 88%  Science Mastery: 68%</p> <p>Panther Run: 2010-2011  Grade: A  Reading Mastery: 91%  Reading Learning Gains: 74%  Reading Gains Lowest 25%: 66%  Math Mastery: 85%  Math Learning Gains: 69%  Math Gains Lowest 25%: 54%  Writing Mastery: 90%  Science Mastery: 68%  85% of subgroups met AYP Status</p> <p>Panther Run: 2009-2010  Grade: A  Reading Mastery: 87%  Reading Learning Gains: 66%  Reading Gains Lowest 25%: 52%  Math Mastery: 87%  Math Learning Gains: 65%  Math Gains Lowest 25%: 70%  Writing Mastery: 90%  Science Mastery: 40%  92% of subgroups met AYP status</p> <p>Panther Run: 2008-2009  Grade : A  Reading Mastery: 88%  Reading Learning Gains: 76%  Reading Gains Lowest 25%: 65%  Math Mastery: 89%  Math Learning Gains: 76%  Math Gains Lowest 25%: 59%  Writing Mastery: 92%  Science Mastery: 68%  100% of subgroups met AYP status</p>

					<p>Panther Run: 2007-2008  Grade: A  Reading Mastery: 84%  Reading Learning Gains: 69%  Reading Gains Lowest 25%: 59%  Math Mastery: 88 %  Math Learning Gains: 68%  Math Gains Lowest 25%: 65%  Writing Mastery: 91%  Science Mastery: 52%  100% of subgroups met AYP status</p> <p>Panther Run: 2006-2007  Grade: A  Reading Mastery: 86%  Reading Learning Gains: 78%  Reading Gains Lowest 25%: 74%  Math Mastery: 91 %  Math Learning Gains: 73%  Math Gains Lowest 25%: 68%  Writing Mastery: 91%  Science Mastery: 48%  100% of subgroups met AYP status</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

## INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Jinky Anderson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•B.S. in Elementary Education</li> <li>•Reading Endorsement</li> <li>•ESOL Endorsement</li> </ul>	13	3	<p>Country Hills: 2011-2012  Grade: A  Reading Mastery: 77%  Reading Learning Gains: 74%  Reading Gains Lowest 25%: 70%  Math Mastery: 78%  Math Learning Gains: 75%  Math Gains Lowest 25%: 71%  Writing Mastery: 88%  Science Mastery: 68%</p> <p>Country Hills: 2010-2011  Grade: A  Reading Mastery: 92%  Reading Learning Gains: 80%  Reading Gains Lowest 25%: 72%  Math Mastery: 92%  Math Learning Gains: 72%  Math Gains Lowest 25%: 72%  Writing Mastery: 95%  Science Mastery: 73%  90% of subgroups met AYP</p> <p>2009-2010  Grade: A  Reading Mastery: 87%  Reading Learning Gains: 71%  Reading Gains Lowest 25%: 66%  Math Mastery: 93%  Math Learning Gains: 72%  Math Gains Lowest 25%: 81%  Writing Mastery: 89%  Science Mastery: 69%  97% of subgroups met AYP status</p> <p>2008-2009  Grade: A  Reading Mastery: 87%  Reading Learning Gains: 79%  Reading Gains Lowest 25%: 76%  Math Mastery: 91%  Math Learning Gains: 75%  Math Gains Lowest 25%: 73%  Writing Mastery: 98%  Science Mastery: 71%  100% of subgroups met AYP status</p> <p>2007-2008  Grade: A  Reading Mastery: 88%  Reading Learning Gains: 73%  Reading Gains Lowest 25%: 69%</p>

				Math Mastery: 91% Math Learning Gains: 74% Math Gains Lowest 25%: 68% Writing Mastery: 81% Science Mastery: 73% 100% of subgroups met AYP status  2006-2007 Grade: A Reading Mastery: 87% Reading Learning Gains: 79% Reading Gains Lowest 25%: 68% Math Mastery: 90% Math Learning Gains: 74% Math Gains Lowest 25%: 76% Writing Mastery: 92% Science Mastery: 58% 100% of subgroups met AYP status
--	--	--	--	---

## 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. Mentor Teacher for Grade Level changes	Reading Coach	Ongoing	
2	2. NESS, if applicable	Reading Coach	Ongoing	
3	3. Professional Book Studies	Team Leaders	Ongoing	
4	4. Differentiated Professional Development	Team Leaders	Ongoing	
5	5. Professional Learning Communities	Reading Coach/Administrator	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
55	0.0%(0)	1.8%(1)	23.6%(13)	74.5%(41)	60.0%(33)	100.0%(55)	10.9%(6)	30.9%(17)	94.5%(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
Christine Kennedy	Michele Forrester	Teacher Assignment Change from 4th to Kindergarten	Sharing best practices, lesson planning, review NGSSS
Allene Watkins	Kathryn Hanson	Teacher Assignment Change from 3rd to 1st	Sharing best practices, lesson planning, review NGSSS
Allene Watkins	Caryn Cuadra	Teacher Assignment Change from 2nd to 1st	Sharing best practices, lesson planning, review NGSSS
Jamie Quintero	Debbie Morris	Teacher Assignment Change from 1st to 2/3 Multiage	Sharing best practices, lesson planning, review NGSSS

## 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 is involved in the Collaborative Problem Solving Model that monitors student's academic growth and interventions and curriculum needs. The meetings are coordinated and facilitated by the ESE Specialist, Fig Dehlinger. She also serves as the case manager. Data is tracked and recorded through the use of a Filemaker database and hard copies of data are kept in a binder. Kids' Zone is used as a graphic device to note data trends in Tier 2 and 3 interventions. Different graphs are used to track progress monitoring.

The following interventions from the Struggling Reader Chart are used: Breakthrough to Literacy, Early Reading Intervention, Wilson's Foundations, Accelerated Literacy Learning (ALL), and Destination Reading. The following interventions from the Struggling Math Chart are used: Go Math Intervention, FCAT Explorer, and Destination Math.

All classroom teachers are involved in the RTI process depending on individual students. The following individuals are members of the RtI Team:

- Principal-Kellee Stroup-Monitors curriculum instruction, continuously analyzing test assessment data and instructional materials
- Assistant Principal-Veronica Roberts-Monitors curriculum instruction, discipline issues and behavior plans
- ESE Specialist-Fig Dehlinger-Coordinates and schedules the Collaborative Problem Solving Meetings and assists with problem identification, analysis, intervention design, and progress monitoring for students who are ESE or going through the Collaborative Problem Solving process
- Guidance Counselor-Brian Dektor-Provides counseling services to students and parents, assists with behavior plans, monitors attendance concerns and insures ELL services are provided
- Reading Coach-Jinky Anderson-models classroom instruction, assist with student assessment, schedules reading intervention groups, coordinates professional development
- Curriculum support-Margaret Campbell-models curriculum lessons, works with teachers to provide interventions for students, supports students in area of reading, writing, and math
- ESE Support Facilitator-Margaret Campbell-Provides academic support for ESE and regular education students communicating with both teacher, students and parents
- School Psychologist- Phyllis Shinn-completes Psychological Testing and meets with teachers and parents to discuss interventions and the supporting data and monitors referral process

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

- The RtI Leadership team meets monthly with Literacy Leadership Team and Team Leaders after school to discuss curriculum updates, instructional strategies, test data and professional development. Additionally, the CPST meets monthly, all day, or more as needed to discuss individual students, plan interventions, and monitor student data. Parents of students receiving RTI services are invited to attend meetings as needed to monitor their child's progress.

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

- The RTI Leadership Team meets with the curriculum committees to set goals and monitor the implementation of the SIP. In coordination with the School Advisory Council, this same team meets in May to collaborate with teachers to create goals after analyzing a variety of test data.

## 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: FAIR reports, Benchmark Assessment Test (BAT 1 & 2 for reading, math and science), Florida Comprehensive Achievement Test (FCAT 2.0), Writing Baseline Assessment, End of the Year Broward Assessment Test for grades 1 & 2, Developmental Reading Assessment (DRA),
- Progress Monitoring: FAIR, Mini Benchmark Assessments, math chapter tests, DRA, Oral Reading Fluency test, Diagnostic Assessment for Reading (DAR), Writing Prompts, Teacher Observation, Individual Behavior Plans
- End of Year: FAIR, FCAT 2.0, End of the Year Broward Assessment for reading and math, Access Points for ESE

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

- Training will be provided on reading/math interventions and data collection. Continued professional development will be provided as the state updates new RtI guidelines.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

### School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

- Principal-Kellee Stroup
- Assistant Principal-Veronica Roberts
- Reading Coach-Jinky Anderson
- ESE Support Facilitator-Margaret Campbell
- Guidance Counselor- Brian Dektor
- Media Specialist-Judith Phalen
- ESE Specialist-Fig Dehlinger
- ESE Resource Teacher-Jann Greenberg
- Team Leaders for each grade level and ESE

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

The Literacy Leadership Team meets monthly. Reading Coach provides district/state updates in the area of reading. Updates are provided on professional development and planning for future professional development is discussed. Team members are responsible for sharing information with all teachers on their grade level.

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

This year's initiatives will include PLCs based on the Common Core State Standards and "The Café." The team will analyze the FCAT 2.0 and Broward Assessment Test data to target weaker skills for future instruction. Cathy Kuhns will provide Common Core State Standards math professional development to K-5 teachers. A schoolwide PLC will meet monthly to discuss implementation and best practices of CCSS. Teams will meet weekly to discuss implementation of strategies and skills of CCSS including the 8 math practices and ELA Anchor Standards.

## 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:	In grades 3-5, 25% (105 of 423) of the students scored at Level 3 on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading. By June 2013, 28% (109) of the students in grades 3-5 will score at Level 3 on the Reading FCAT 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
25% (105 of 423)	28% (109 of 391)

#### 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	Transient students who have gaps in their reading foundation skills	Use DAR's and DRA's to determine reading gaps and provide appropriate interventions from the Struggling Readers Chart	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach	Monitor placement of students into appropriate guided reading groups based on DRA levels  Administration will meet with each grade level on a monthly basis to conduct Data Chats  Teachers and students will meet monthly to set goals and target strategies to reduce the gap	Developmental Reading Assessment, Diagnostic Assessments of Reading, Benchmark Assessment Test data and FAIR  Classroom observation logs and mini BAT test preparation materials
2	Students need to increase use and understanding of a variety of strategies to increase higher level thinking skills	Grade levels will share best practices using higher level comprehension skills among teams and teachers will incorporate the use of these strategies into their daily lessons  Grade levels will incorporate Common Core State Standards	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, classroom teachers	Lesson plans will be reviewed and monthly classroom observations will be conducted	Classroom observation logs and mini BAT test preparation material

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:	In grades 3-5, 50% (6 of 12) of the students scored at Levels 4, 5, and 6 on the 2012 FAA Assessment in reading. By June 2013, 52% (6 of 11) of the students in grades 3-5 will score at Levels 4, 5, and 6 on the FAA in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

50% (6 of 12)			52% (6 of 11)		
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 appropriate differentiated instruction to target students' academic needs	Provide modeling of best practices by the ESE specialist to target the needs of IND students	ESE Specialist	Lesson plans will be reviewed and monthly snapshots will be conducted	Classroom observation logs
2					

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	In grades 3-5, 53% (224 of 423) of the students scored at or above Level 4 on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test. By June 2013, 56% (219 of 391) of the students in grades 3-5 will score at or above Level 4 on FCAT 2.0 reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
53% (224 of 423)	56% (219 of 391)

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 need to use a variety of strategies to increase higher level thinking skills	Sharing of best practices showcasing higher level questioning techniques to target differentiated instruction and enrichment	Principal, Assistant Principal and Reading Coach	Reading lesson plans will be reviewed  Administration will meet with each grade level on a monthly basis to conduct Data Chats  Teachers and students will meet monthly to discuss student data	Developmental Reading Assessment, DAR, BAT 1 and BAT 2, mini BAT's

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:	In grades 3-5, 0% (0 of 12) of the students scored at or above Level 7 on the 2012 FAA Assessment in reading. By June 2013, 2% (2 of 11) of the students in grades 3-5 will score at or above Level 7 on the FAA in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0 of 12)	2% (2 of 11)

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of appropriate differentiated instruction to target students' academic needs	Provide modeling of best practices by the ESE specialist to target the needs of IND students	Principal, Assistant Principal, ESE Specialist	Lesson plans will be reviewed and monthly snapshots will be conducted	Classroom observation logs

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:	In grades 3-5, 74% (214 of 292) of the students made learning gains on the FCAT 2.0 in reading. By June 2013, 77% (205 of 266) of the students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains on the FCAT 2.0 in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
74% (214 of 292)	77% (205 of 266)

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 need to use a variety of strategies to increase higher level thinking skills	The Reading Coach will develop a monthly schedule to provide modeling of strategies in the classrooms for teachers identified based on needs assessment  Grade levels will incorporate Common Core State Standards	Principal and Assistant Principal	Monthly data chats to give feedback to teachers who received modeling support from the Reading Coach  Administration will meet with each grade level on a monthly basis to conduct Data Chats  Teachers and students will meet monthly to discuss student data	Data collected from iObservation specifically from the Teacher Instruction section

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:	In grades 3-5, 31% (2 of 7) of the students made learning gains on the FAA in reading. By June 2013, 32% (3 of 8) of the students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains on the FAA in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
31% (2 of 7)	32% (3 of 8)

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 appropriate differentiated instruction to target students' academic needs	Provide modeling of best practices by the ESE specialist to target the needs of IND students	ESE Specialist	Lesson plans will be reviewed and monthly snapshots will be conducted	Classroom observation logs

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:	70% (39 of 56) of grade 3-5 students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading. By June 2013, 73% (42 of 58) of grades 3-5 students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on the FCAT 2.0 in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
70% (39 of 56)	73% (42 of 58)

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 need to use a variety of strategies to increase higher level thinking skills provided through the use of interventions from the Struggling Readers Chart	Reading Coach will model the use of supplementary resources such as FCAT Explorer and Destination Reading Success  Grade levels will incorporate Common Core State Standards	Reading Coach and SAI Resource Teacher	Monthly Data Chats with teachers to discuss effectiveness of interventions being used for targeted students	Formative and Summative Assessment Data

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal #					
	By 2016-2017, 89% of our students will be reading at/above grade level in reading.					
5A :						
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	77%	82%	84%	86%	88%	

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:	In June 2012, the following student subgroups did not make satisfactory progress in reading: White 18% (39 of 215), Black 44% (31 of 71), Hispanic 20% (18 of 90), Asian 9% (3 of 32) and Indian 50% (1 of 2).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 82% (176), Black: 56% (40), Hispanic: 88% (72), Asian: 91% (29), and American Indian: 50% (1)	White: 84%, Black: 58%, Hispanic: 90%, Asian: 93% and American Indian: 52%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Students need to use a variety of intervention	Use DRA's to determine reading gaps and provide	Reading Coach	Monitor student growth based on DRA levels	Developmental Reading

1	strategies to increase higher level thinking skills	appropriate interventions from the Struggling Readers Chart		Administration will meet with each grade level on a monthly basis to conduct Data Chats  Teachers and students will meet monthly to discuss student data	Assessment levels for identified students
2	Students need to use a variety of strategies to increase higher level thinking skills	Utilize supplementary resources such as FCAT Explorer and Destination Reading Success	Reading Coach and SAI Resource Teacher	Review the results of the mid-year DRA's. Discuss with teachers the mini BAT data. Monthly data chats: teachers to students and administrators to teachers	DRA data, Mini BAT data

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.  Reading Goal #5C:	In June 2012, 33% (1 of 3) of ELL students in grades 3-5 did not make satisfactory progress in reading on the 2011 FCAT 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67% (2 of 3)	69% (10 of 15)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students have difficulty transitioning between home language and English.	Provide a bilingual staff member to conduct pull-out support.	Classroom teacher, administrators, reading coach	ongoing progress monitoring of students	IPT, CELLA, DAR, DRA
2	Lack of ELL support by bilingual staff member	Provide small group intervention strategies with the ELL support paraprofessional	ESOL Coordinator	Compare baseline and mid-year BAT results	Baseline and mid-year BAT assessment data, CELLA

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:	In June 2012, 46% (48 of 88) of students with disabilities did not make satisfactory progress on the FCAT 2.0 in reading. In June 2013, 68% of the students with disabilities will make satisfactory progress on the FCAT 2.0 in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
54% (48 of 88)	68%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Students ability levels	Differentiated instruction	ESE Specialist,	Ongoing assessments	Formative and

1	are more than 1-2 years below grade level	implemented in classrooms  Use evidence based intervention materials	classroom teachers	Monthly data chats to discuss effectiveness of interventions being used for targeted students	Summative Assessment Data
2	Students need to increase use and understanding of a variety of strategies to increase higher level thinking skills	Grade levels will share best practices using higher level comprehension skills among teams and teachers will incorporate the use of these strategies into their daily lessons	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, ESE Specialist	Lesson plans will be reviewed and monthly classroom observations will be conducted	Classroom observation logs and mini BAT test preparation material

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:	In June 2012, 33% (42 of 127) of Economically Disadvantaged students in grades 3-5 did not make satisfactory progress in reading on the 2011 FCAT 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67% (85 of 127)	70%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students need to increase use and understanding of a variety of strategies to increase higher level thinking skills	Grade levels will share best practices using higher level comprehension skills among teams and teachers will incorporate the use of these strategies into their daily lessons	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach	Lesson plans will be reviewed and monthly classroom observations will be conducted	iObservation reports and mini BAT test preparation material

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
"The Cafe" (Comprehension, Main Idea, Purpose, Word Accuracy, Fluency, and Vocabulary)	K-5	Nina Deboo Jamie Quintero Jinky Anderson Kristi Gilroy Susan Crowther	34 Teachers in Grades K-5/ 63% of our instructional staff	9/2012-4/2013	PLC Monthly discussions and classroom visits	Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach
					Team agenda and sign-	

Common Core State Standards PLC	K-5	Kathy Kuhns Team Leaders	All K-5 teachers	9/2012 - 5/2013	in sheets, monthly discussions, teachers will implement strategies discussed during PLCs	Principal, Assistant Principal, CCSS Team
---------------------------------	-----	--------------------------	------------------	-----------------	--	---

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
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Reading Goals

## Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal # 1:		In June 2012, 16% (15 of 93) of the ELL students in grades K-5 scored proficient on the speaking/listening subtest of the CELLA. By June 2013, 20% of the ELLs will score proficient on the speaking/listening subtest of CELLA.			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
16% (15 of 93)					
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 ELL support for various languages spoken	Provide small group intervention strategies with the ELL support paraprofessional	ESOL Coordinator	Compare baseline and mid-year BAT results	CELLA, BAT data

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:			In June 2012, 6% (6 of 93) of the ELL students in grades K-5 scored proficient on the reading subtest of the CELLA. By June 2013, 20% of the ELLs will score proficient on the reading subtest of CELLA.		
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:					
6% (6 of 93)					
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 ELL support for various languages spoken	Provide small group intervention strategies with the ELL support paraprofessional	ESOL Coordinator	Compare baseline and mid-year BAT results	CELLA, BAT data

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:			In June 2012, 5% (5 of 93) of the ELL students in grades K-5 scored proficient on the writing subtest of the CELLA. By June 2013, 10% of the ELLs will score proficient on the writing subtest of CELLA.		
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:					
5% (5 of 93)					
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 bilingual support for ELL students who speak various languages	Provide small group intervention strategies with the ELL support paraprofessional	ESOL Coordinator	Compare baseline BAT data and mid-year BAT data	CELLA results

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
<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 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:	In grades 3-5, 25% (106 of 423) of the students scored at Level 3 on the Math FCAT 2.0. By June 2013, 28% (109 of 391) of the students in grades 3-5 will score at Level 3 on the Math FCAT 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
25% (106 of 423)	28% (109 of 391)

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Providing differentiation by the classroom teacher	Utilize CCSS monthly math calendars and pacing charts that emphasize differentiated instruction in Go Math	Principal and Assistant Principal	Compare BAT 1 and 2, classroom visits and review of math plans, monthly data chats: teacher to students and administrators to teachers	BAT 1 and 2 and Go Math Assessments
2	Lack of utilization of assessment data to inform instruction	Use PLC to train teachers in the effective use of data analysis to inform instruction	Principal and Assistant Principal	Classroom visits and review of math plans, monthly data chats: teacher to students and administrators to teachers	BAT 1 and 2 and Go Math 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:	In grades 3-5, 25% (3 of 12) of the students scored at Levels 4, 5, and 6 FAA Assessment in math. By June 2013, 28% (4 of 11) of the students in grades 3-5 will score at Levels 4, 5 and 6 on the math FAA.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
25% (3 of 12)	28% (4 of 11)

### 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 appropriate differentiated instruction to target students' academic needs	Provide modeling of best practices by the ESE specialist to target the needs of IND students	ESE Specialist	Lesson plans will be reviewed and monthly snapshots will be conducted	Classroom observation logs

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:		In grades 3-5, 54% (229 of 423) of the students scored at or above Level 4 on the Math FCAT 2.0. By June 2013, 57% (223 of 391) of the students in grades 3-5 will score at or above Level 4 on the Math FCAT 2.0.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
54% (229 of 423)		57% (223 of 391)			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Providing differentiation by the classroom teacher	Utilize CCSS monthly math calendars and pacing charts that emphasize differentiated instruction in Go Math	Principal and Assistant Principal	Compare BAT 1 and 2, classroom visits and review of math plans, Monthly data chats: teacher to students and administrators to teachers	BAT 1 and 2 and Go Math 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:		In grades 3-5, 0% (0 of 12) of the students scored at or above Level 7 on the 2012 FAA Assessment in math. By June 2013, 2% (2 of 11) of the students in grades 3-5 will score at or above Level 7 on the FAA in math.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
0% (0 of 12)		2% ( 2 of 11)			
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 ability levels are more than 1-2 years below grade level	Use manipulatives, visuals, and assistive technology to teach math concepts	ESE Specialist, Administrators	Lesson plans will be reviewed and monthly snapshots will be conducted	Classroom observation logs

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:		In grades 3-5, 75% (219 of 291) of the students made learning gains on the FCAT 2.0 Math. By June 2013, 78% (207 of 266) of the students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains on the FCAT 2.0 Math.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
75% (219 of 291)		78% (207 of 266)			
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	Differentiating instruction via use of small groups within the classroom	Provide instruction for students utilizing small math groups based on student needs and available technology (i.e. Destination Math and FCAT Explorer)	Principal and Assistant Principal	Compare BAT 1 and 2, classroom visits and review of math plans monthly data chats: teacher to students and administrators to teachers	BAT 1 and 2 and Go Math 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:

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #3b:	In grades 3-5, 0% (0 of 7) of the students made learning gains on the 2012 FAA Assessment in math. By June 2013, 2% (2 of 8) of the students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains on the FAA in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0 of 7)	2% (2 of 8)

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 appropriate differentiated instruction to target students' academic needs	Provide modeling of best practices by the ESE specialist to target the needs of IND students	ESE Specialist	Lesson plans will be reviewed and monthly snapshots will be conducted	Classroom observation logs

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:	In grades 3-5, 71% (44 of 62) of the students in the lowest 25% made learning gains on the FCAT 2.0 math. By June 2013, 74% (41 of 56) of the students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on the FCAT 2.0 math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71% (44 of 62)	74% (41 of 56)

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	Ongoing professional development on the GO Math Intervention for teachers who request additional training	During weekly grade level meetings, team leaders will share at least one best practice using Go Math Intervention strategies	Principal and Assistant Principal	Snapshots and observations that showcase best practices in Teacher Instruction, monthly data chats: teacher to students and administrators to teachers	BAT 1 & BAT 2, GO Math Assessments and mini BAT's

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 #					
	By 2016 - 2017, 89% of our students will be at/above grade level in math.					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	78%	82%	84%	86%	88%	

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:	In June 2012, the following student subgroups did not make satisfactory progress in math: White 15% (32 of 215), Black 41% (29 of 71), Hispanic 26% (23 of 90), Asian 6% (2 of 32) and Indian 50% (1 of 2).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 85% (183), Black: 59% (42), Hispanic: 74% (67), Asian: 93% (30), and American Indian: 50% (1 of 2)	White: 87%, Black: 61%, Hispanic: 76%, Asian: 95%, and American Indian: 53%

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 differentiation by the classroom teacher	Monthly PLC by 4th grade teacher (Kathy Kuhns) that focuses on a variety of effective math strategies to target differentiation	Principal and Assistant Principal	Compare BAT 1 and 2, classroom visits, monthly data chats with teachers	BAT 1 and 2, GO Math 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:	In June 2012, 33% (1 of 3) of ELL students in grades 3-5 did not make satisfactory progress in math on the 2011 FCAT 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67% (2 of 3)	70% (10 of 15)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Providing differentiation by the classroom teacher	Utilize CCSS monthly math calendars and pacing charts that emphasize differentiated instruction in Go Math	Principal and Assistant Principal	Compare BAT 1 and 2, classroom visits and review of math plans, monthly data chats: teacher to students and	BAT 1 and 2 and Go Math Assessments

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	In June 2012, 42% (37 of 88) of the students in the Students With Disabilities did not make satisfactory progress in math. By June 2013, 77% (83) of the students will achieve math proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
58% (51 of 88)	60% (83)

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 ability levels are more than 1-2 years below grade level	Differentiated instruction implemented in classrooms  Use evidence based intervention materials	ESE Specialist, classroom teachers	Ongoing assessments  Monthly data chats to discuss effectiveness of interventions being used for targeted students	Formative and Summative Assessment Data
2	Provide differentiation by the classroom teacher	Monthly PLC led by 4th grade teacher (Kathy Kuhns) that focuses on a variety of effective math strategies to target differentiation	Principal and Assistant Principal	Compare BAT 1 and 2, classroom visits, Monthly data chats	BAT 1 and 2, GO Math 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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	In June 2012, 36% (46 of 127) of Economically Disadvantaged students in grades 3-5 did not make satisfactory progress in math on the 2012 FCAT 2.0.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
64% (81)	66%

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 intensive intervention by the classroom teacher	Monthly PLC by 4th grade teacher (Kathy Kuhns) that focuses on a variety of effective math strategies to target differentiation	Principal and Assistant Principal	Compare BAT 1 and 2, classroom observations to look specifically at teacher instruction, monthly data chats	BAT 1 and 2, GO Math Assessments, iObservation

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core State Standards PLC	K-5	Kathy Kuhns Team Leaders	All K-5 teachers	9/2012 - 5/2013	Team meeting agenda and sign-in sheets, Monthly discussions, Teachers will implement strategies discussed during PLCs	Principal, Assistant Principal, CCSS Team

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:	In June 2012, 41% (66 of 162) of the students in grade 5 scored at Level 3 on FCAT Science. In June 2013, 44% (60 of 137) of the students in grade 5 will score at Level 3 or higher on the FCAT 2.0 Science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41% (66 of 162)	44% (60 of 137)
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	
	Person or Process Used to

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack knowledge in the application of science process skills	Increase emphasis on science process skills using IFCs to pace instruction	Science Resource Teacher/Reading Coach	Classroom observations and review of science lesson plans	Science BAT and mini BAT (3-5)

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:

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.  Science Goal #1b:	In grades 3-5, 50% (2 of 4) of the students scored at Levels 4, 5, and 6 on the 2012 FAA Assessment in Science. By June 2013, 75% (3 of 4) of the students in grades 3-5 will score at Levels 4, 5, and 6 on the FAA in Science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (2 of 4)	75% (3 of 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 appropriate differentiated instruction to target students' academic needs	Provide modeling of best practices by the ESE specialist to target the needs of IND students	ESE Specialist	Lesson plans will be reviewed and monthly snapshots will be conducted	Classroom observation logs

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:	In June 2012, 28% (45 of 162) of grade 5 students scored at or above Level 4 on FCAT Science. By June 2013, 31% (42 of 137) of grade 5 students will score at or above Level 4 on FCAT 2.0 Science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28% (45 of 162)	31% (42 of 137)

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	Enrichment of real-world applications using additional hands-on inquiry based investigations	Use project based learning experiences and technology integration to improve problem solving and critical thinking skills	Science Resource Teacher/ Reading Coach	Classroom observations and review of science lesson plans	Science Fair Projects, Observation data

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science.	In grades 3-5, 0% (0 of 4) of the students scored at or above Level 7 on the 2012 FAA Assessment in Science. By June 2013, 25% (1 of 4) of the students in grades
---	---



Science Goal #2b:	3-5 will score at or above Level 7 on the FAA in Science.				
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
0% (0 of 4)	25% (1 of 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	Students lack knowledge in the application of science process skills	Increase emphasis on science process skills using IFCs to pace instruction	Science Resource Teacher/Reading Coach	Classroom observations and review of science lesson plans	Science BAT and mini BAT (3-5)

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

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

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

Science Budget:

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

## 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:	In June 2012, 89% (127 of 142) of grade 4 students scored a 4.0 or higher on the Florida Writes. By June 2013, at least 92% (118 of 129) grade 4 students will score a 4.0 or higher on the FCAT Writes.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
89% (127 of 142)	92% (118 of 129)

### 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	Instruction on writing conventions and use of supporting details	FLDOE anchor papers and student work samples will be used as teaching tools to promote understanding of the writing components	4th grade Team Leader/ Team Leaders	Analysis of student work samples/prompts	District Writing baseline assessment, in-house writing prompts, and FCAT Writes

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:	In grade 4, 33% (1 of 3) of the students scored at Level 4 or higher on the 2012 FAA Assessment in writing. By June 2013, 50% (2 of 4) of the students in grade 4 will score at or above Level 4 on the FAA in writing.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33% (1 of 3)	50% (2 of 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	Instruction on writing conventions and use of supporting details	FLDOE anchor papers and student work samples will be used as teaching tools to promote understanding of the writing components	4th grade Team Leader	Analysis of student work samples/prompts	District writing baseline assessment, in-house writing prompts, and FCAT Writes

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
Preparing for FCAT 4.4	4th Grade	District Training	4th grade teacher (Scalici-Young)	1 day training	Train the trainer model will be used to inservice the 4th grade team	4th grade Team Leader

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:	During the 2011-2012 school year, our attendance rate was 96%. By June 2013, 98% of the students will be in attendance on a daily basis.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
96%	98%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)

12 students	10 students
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
125 students	50 students

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Parents and students not understanding the critical importance of being in school	Creating and developing motivational strategies that will help increase daily attendance	Assistant Principal/Guidance Counselor	Monitor weekly attendance reports	Quarterly attendance 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

## 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:	Based on data from the 2011-2012 school year, 1 student was suspended either in-school or out of school. By June 2013, we will reduce the amount of suspensions by 50%.				
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions				
1	1				
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School				
1	1				
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions				
1	1				
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School				
1	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
1	Training to accommodate staff members who are in need of behavior management techniques	Provide training opportunities to the staff in behavior management strategies and positive behavior strategies	Assistant Principal	Classroom observations, reduction in the number of referrals written	Discipline Management System/decrease in the number of suspensions both in-school and out of school

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

*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:		25% of the parents attended a parent involvement training during the 2011-2012 school year. 50% of the parents will attend at least one parent workshop during the 2012-13 school year.			
<i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>					
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:		2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:			
25% (203)		50% (449)			
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	Scheduling both morning and evening sessions to accommodate parents	Schedule a parenting workshop to target best practices for homework support	Louise Stuart/Anglea Scalici-Young	Collection of sign-in sheets	Collection of sign-in sheets
2	Parents lack of experience with online tools and resources to assist students at home	Provide Techbusters parent training to orient parents with the available online resources and tools (BEEP, online textbooks, FCAT Explorer, Destination Success, etc.)	Keri Plattner	Collection of sign-in sheets	Sign-in sheets

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
Academic Fair	Professional Development	Accountability	\$1,500.00
			Subtotal: \$1,500.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$1,500.00

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:		Teachers will be able to use current digital devices and resources to improve student achievement in core curriculum areas.			
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	Antiquated teacher laptops prevent the use of current technology software in the classrooms to enhance instruction	Purchase current laptops for classroom use	Media Specialist Assistant Principal (TLC)	documentation of teachers using technology in the classrooms/ iObservation	Classroom Snapshots

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
Purchase 4 Apple Mac laptops for teacher use to improve student achievement	Teachers will be able to use laptops to incorporate current software	Accountability	\$5,200.00
			Subtotal: \$5,200.00
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: \$5,200.00

*End of STEM Goal(s)*

---

## Additional Goal(s)

NA Goal:

---



---

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						

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 NA Goal(s)

# FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Parent Involvement	Academic Fair	Professional Development	Accountability	\$1,500.00
STEM	Purchase 4 Apple Mac laptops for teacher use to improve student achievement	Teachers will be able to use laptops to incorporate current software	Accountability	\$5,200.00
				Subtotal: \$6,700.00
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: \$6,700.00

## Differentiated Accountability

### School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school:  Yes  No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/19/2012)

## School Advisory Council

### School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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



# AYP DATA

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

## SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Broward School District COUNTRY HILLS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	92%	92%	95%	73%	352	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	80%	72%			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?	72% (YES)	72% (YES)			144	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					648	
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 COUNTRY HILLS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	87%	93%	89%	69%	338	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	71%	72%			143	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	66% (YES)	81% (YES)			147	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					628	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested