

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: DOLPHIN BAY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Broward

Principal: Sandra Nelson

SAC Chair: Veronica Sclafani and Suzan Demeo

Superintendent: Robert Runcie

Date of School Board Approval: December 4, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/18/2012

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 | Sandra Nelson | Masters | 8 | 8 | 2012 GRADE A READING MASTERY 71% MATH MASTERY 68% WRITING MASTERY 94% SCIENCE MASTERY 70% AMO Targets for Reading and Math All Students were met. AMO Target for Reading SWD was not met AMO Targets for Math Hispanic, SWD, and ED were not met 2011: GRADE A 77% OF AYP CRITERIA WAS MET READING MASTERY: 80% MATH MASTERY: 83% WRITING MASTERY: 93% SCIENCE MASTERY: 61% 2010: GRADE A BLACKS AND STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES DID NOT MEET AYP IN BOTH READING AND MATH READING MASTERY: 85% MATH MASTERY: 86% WRITING MASTERY: 95% SCIENCE MASTERY: 58% |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|--------------|---------|---|----|--|
| | | | | | <p>2009: GRADE A ALL STUDENTS MET AYP CRITERIA READING MASTERY: 85% SCIENCE MASTERY: 59% MATH MASTERY: 87% WRITING MASTERY: 96%</p> <p>2008: GRADE A ALL STUDENTS MET AYP CRITERIA READING MASTERY: 80% SCIENCE MASTERY: 47% MATH MASTERY: 83% WRITING MASTERY: 89%</p> <p>2007: GRADE A ALL STUDENTS MET AYP CRITERIA READING MASTERY: 79% SCIENCE MASTERY: 50% MATH MASTERY: 85% WRITING MASTERY: 93%</p> |
| Assis Principal | Brad Schmidt | Masters | 3 | 15 | <p>2012 GRADE A READING MASTERY 71% MATH MASTERY 68% WRITING MASTERY 94% SCIENCE MASTERY 70% AMO Targets for Reading and Math All Students were met. AMO Target for Reading SWD was not met AMO Targets for Math Hispanic, SWD, and ED were not met</p> <p>2011: GRADE A 2011: GRADE A 77% OF AYP CRITERIA WAS MET READING MASTERY: 80% MATH MASTERY: 83% WRITING MASTERY: 93% SCIENCE MASTERY: 61% Assistant Principal of Lanier-James Education Center 2008-09, Rating: Declining Reading Mastery: 14% Math Mastery: 15% Writing Mastery: 85% Science Mastery: AYP: 90% criteria met. Economically disadvantaged did not make AYP in reading or math. Assistant Principal at Walter C. Young Middle School. School maintained a continuous "A" grade on FCAT. Met all areas of AYP with the exception of ESE Math 1997-2008 W.C.Young % High Stand in Read 67-74% % High Stand. in Math 71-79% % High Stand. in Writ. 92-98% %Learn Gains Read 65-73% %Learn Gains Math 73-79% Low 25% Read Gains 58-79% Low 25% Math Gains 66-67%</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 | Barbara Wells | Masters | 8 | 3 | <p>2012 GRADE A READING MASTERY 71% MATH MASTERY 68% WRITING MASTERY 94% SCIENCE MASTERY 70% AMO Targets for Reading and Math All Students were met. AMO Target for Reading SWD was not met AMO Targets for Math Hispanic, SWD, and ED were not met</p> <p>2011: GRADE A 77% OF AYP CRITERIA WAS MET READING MASTERY: 80% MATH MASTERY: 83% WRITING MASTERY: 93% SCIENCE MASTERY: 61%</p> |

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

| | Description of Strategy | Person Responsible | Projected Completion Date | Not Applicable (If not, please explain why) |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| 1 | Only highly qualified teachers are hired at Dolphin Bay Elementary. Teachers must be certified in the grade and any specialty that they are to teach. | Administration with the input of teaching staff. | Ongoing as needs arise / presently complete for current school year. | |
| 2 | Recommendations of teachers, administrators, and district personnel are involved in the selection of highly qualified candidates for our staff. | Administration | Ongoing / presently complete for current school year. | |
| 3 | Retention of teachers involves multiple approaches: providing the teaching staff with modern technological tools is required and celebrating successes such as maintaining an "A" grade since the school opened. In addition, the student body is made aware of their accomplishments and the role their teachers played in their success. | Administration, Teachers, Students and all members of the school community and stakeholders. | There is no completion date for this item as it is a continuous and ongoing project. | |
| 4 | Keeping the staff at a highly effective level requires ongoing training of teachers in classroom management, teaching techniques, analyzing and implementing the use of data to accelerate the learning gains of all students, and monitoring of classroom practices through the observations of administration and team leaders. | Administration, teachers, county level resources and educational opportunities for staff. | There is no completion date for this item as it is a continuous and ongoing project. | |

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 |
|---|---|
| There are presently no members of our staff that are teaching out of field or who are not highly effective. | Staff is trained and given support on an ongoing basis. School based Professional Learning Communities (PLC) keep teachers up to date on all trends, legal requirements, and strategies to be used in the classroom. District support is also available to staff through educational classes. |

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 |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 47 | 8.5%(4) | 8.5%(4) | 57.4%(27) | 27.7%(13) | 27.7%(13) | 100.0%(47) | 10.6%(5) | 6.4%(3) | 87.2%(41) |

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

Please describe the school's teacher mentoring program/plan by including the names of mentors, the name(s) of mentees, rationale for the pairing, and the planned mentoring activities.

| Mentor Name | Mentee Assigned | Rationale for Pairing | Planned Mentoring Activities |
|---|--|--|---|
| Michelle Kappelman Barbara Wells Lucy Kitcher Carmen Alvarez | Cypris Hankerson Alexis Moll Alicia Gomez Daniel Quintana | Teachers with no prior teaching experience | The team leaders will meet with all new teacher monthly or as needed. Periodic review of lesson plans with follow up classroom visitations and observations by administration. Additional training will be provided to meet the educational needs of the teacher. |
| Ana Franco Ana Franco Jennifer Bavuso Deborah Sarrion | Terry Canavan Jackie Lopez Susan Teller Cristine Lobo | These teachers are new to their grade level but have been employees of the school. Their team leaders from their respective grade levels will mentor on grade level expectations, activities, objectives, etc. | The team leaders will meet with all new teachers to the grade level on a bi-weekly basis to review grade level expectations, instructional focus, grade level activities, etc. |

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

Not applicable

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Not applicable

Title I, Part D

Not applicable

Title II

Not applicable

Title III

Not applicable

Title X- Homeless

Not applicable

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Not applicable

Violence Prevention Programs

Not applicable

Nutrition Programs

Not applicable

Housing Programs

Not applicable

Head Start

Not applicable

Adult Education

Not applicable

Career and Technical Education

Not applicable

Job Training

Not applicable

Other

Not applicable

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Sandra Nelson, Principal
Brad Schmidt, Assistant Principal
Lisette Plaskett, Guidance Counselor and RtI Coordinator
Zuzel Rodriguez, ESE Specialist
Barbara Wells, Reading Coach
Kurt Wasser, School Psychologist
Antoinette Smith-Doughty, School Social Worker
Alan Sakowitz, Speech/Language Pathologist
Classroom Teachers involved with the student

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?

All members of the MTSS and RtI will attend training. RtI team will meet twice per month to monitor student progress on targeted interventions. Each member of the RtI team is assigned to a grade level. They meet with the grade level once a month to discuss students going through the process, analyze data, and decide on next steps. The MTSS/RtI team will meet with teachers to implement interventions and decide which students will move from Tier 1 to Tier 2 and Tier 3. The MTSS/RtI team will evaluate data and make recommendations for further testing and evaluation. The MTSS/RtI team will provide training for general education teachers on the RtI process. Students can be brought before the MTSS/RtI team by any member of the school staff for academic or behavioral concerns. The team will then decide on a plan of action and how to collect the data needed to chart the progress of each individual student. Interventions will be put in place and will be monitored for effectiveness through the collection of data which will be presented in graph form.

All students that are being tracked will be discussed by the team and progress will be monitored to determine if further interventions are needed.

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?

Differentiated instruction and interventions to meet the needs of individual learners, there will be accomplished through differentiation in grouping in the core curriculum by using a variety of formats to instruct all students. Data will be kept of intervention efforts and students' progress. All classroom teachers will meet every six weeks or sooner with the MTSS and RtI team for data chats. All student data will be reviewed and the progress of students receiving interventions will be reviewed and new measures will be implemented as needed when they are supported by data. In addition, this information will be used in reviewing and updating our SIP on an ongoing basis.

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.

All classroom teachers will meet every six weeks with the MTSS and RTI team for data chats. All student data will be reviewed. Sources of data will include iStation, Phonics for Reading, Rewards, Road to the Code, Triumphs, Go Math Reteach, Soar to Success, behavior plans. State and county testing and data points will be used as needed.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

All staff will be trained on RTI and how the MTSS and RtI implement it during pre-planning week. Grade levels will be provided with literature titled "Mentoring Minds RtI Strategies". This will be a school focus and included in monthly learning communities. Both the staff development and resources available to staff in the professional library will assist teachers with the implementation of RtI. Leadership team members will meet one-on-one with teachers as needed to insure the implementation of the interventions. The Reading Coach, Guidance Counselor, and Administrators will conduct training as needs arise. These trainings will be done through our learning communities and group meetings with teachers that need additional assistance with the process. These meetings will take place two times a month or more often if the need arises.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Ongoing support for the full implementation of MTSS is well under way with the established RtI implementation that is already in place. Staff will be trained in all new information and processes needed to operate the team effectively to improve instruction and meeting the needs of all of our students.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Sandra Nelson, Principal
Brad Schmidt, Asst. Principal
Lisette Plaskett, Guidance Counselor
Zuzel Rodriguez, ESE Specialist
Barbara Wells, Reading Coach
Kurt Wasser, School Psychologist
Antoinette Smith-Doughty, School Social Worker
Alan Sakowitz, Speech/Language Pathologist
Select General Education Teachers

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

All members of the LLT will attend training. LLT team will meet monthly to monitor student progress on targeted interventions and team literacy plans.

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

The major initiatives of the LLT this year will be to monitor achievement through data and data chats and moving students through the RtI process if needed.

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.

Not 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.

Not applicable

*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?

Not applicable

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?

Not applicable

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](#)

Not applicable

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a: | To increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in reading by 3%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In June 2012, 29% (104) of students achieved proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in reading. | By June 2013, 32% (118) students will achieve proficiency (FCAT Level 3) 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 | 1.A.1 Teachers will need additional professional development in implementing strategies with the growing ELL population. | 1.A.1 Rosetta Stone and iStation loaded on student laptops. New teachers will be trained in the use of these programs to assist their ELL students. | 1.A.1 Rtl team, Administration, Literacy Team | 1.A.1 Generate reports from technology programs and review data to monitor student progress. | 1.A.1 Mini-benchmark assessments, BAT and FCAT data |
| 2 | 1.A.2. Students do not read enough outside of the school setting. | 1.A.2. K-5 students will be encouraged to participate in Reading Across Broward and Scholastic Reading Counts. Prizes will be awarded for achieving high levels in each program. | 1.A.2. Reading Coach, Administration | 1.A.2. Reading teachers will monitor Reading Across Broward logs and Scholastic Reading Counts reports. | 1.A.2. Completed Reading Across Broward Logs and monthly Scholastic Reading Counts reports. |

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

| | |
|--|---|
| 1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b: | To increase students achieving above proficiency (FAA Levels 4 , 5 and 6) in reading by 100%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In June 2012 0% of students taking the Alternative Assessment scored at this level. | By June 2013, 1 of 2 students will reach this level, a 100% increase. |

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 |
|--|---------------------------|-------------------------|---|---|--------------------|
| | 1B.1. Lack of focus while | 1B.1. Students will use | 1B.1. ESE | 1B.1 Administrative | 1B.1. FAA Practice |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| 1 | reading longer passages. | graphic organizers and thinking maps to stay focused. The length of passages will be increased throughout the year to improve the endurance of students for testing. | Specialist, Administration | observations, on-going formative assessments and student teacher data chats will be used to provide feedback and encouragement. | Assessments, weekly assessments on specialized programs |
| 2 | 1B.2. Lack of differentiated activities | 1B.2. Extend the curriculum through a variety of leveled materials and genres in small group classroom activities. In addition, students will be involved in extensive pull out programs to remediate their reading skills. | 1B.2 Administration and ESE Specialist. | 1B.2. Team Meetings to collaborate on which programs are being effective and implement strategies that are found to be most effective. | 1B.2. Meeting minutes, classroom walk-throughs, lesson plans |

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

| | |
|---|--|
| 2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a: | To increase students achieving above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in reading by 3%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In June 2012, 42% (151) students achieved above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in reading. | By June 2013, 45% (156) of students will achieve above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) 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 | 2A.1 Lack of focus while reading longer passages. | 2A.1. Students will use graphic organizers and thinking maps to stay focused. The length of passages will be increased throughout the year to improve the endurance of students for testing. | 2A.1 Reading Coach, Administration | 2A.1 Administrative observations, on-going formative assessments and student teacher data chats will be used to provide feedback and encouragement. | 2A.1 Mini BATs, BAT Assessment, weekly assessments, FCAT. |
| 2 | 2A.2. Lack of enrichment activities | 2A.2. Extend the curriculum through a variety of leveled materials and genres in small group classroom activities. Assign projects based on novels and/or trade books. | 2A.2. Administration and Reading Coach | 2A.2. Team Meetings to collaborate on which programs are being effective and implement strategies that are found to be most effective | 2A.2. Meeting minutes, classroom walk-throughs, lesson plans |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| 2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b: | To increase students achieving at or above level 7 by 100%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

| | |
|---|---|
| In June of 2012, 0 of 1 students reached this level of proficiency. | By June of 2013, 1 of 2 will reach this level of proficiency. |
|---|---|

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 2B.1 Lack of focus while reading longer passages. | 2B.1 Students will use graphic organizers and thinking maps to stay focused. The length of passages will be increased throughout the year to improve the endurance of students for testing. | 2B.1 ESE Specialist, Administration | 2B.1 Administrative observations, on-going formative assessments and student teacher data chats will be used to provide feedback and encouragement. | 2B.1 FAA Practice Assessments, weekly assessments on specialized programs |
| 2 | 2B.2 Lack of differentiated activities | 2B.2. Extend the curriculum through a variety of leveled materials and genres in small group classroom activities. In addition, students will be involved in extensive pull out programs to remediate their reading skills. | 2B.2 Administration and ESE Specialist | 2B.2. Team Meetings to collaborate on which programs are being effective and implement strategies that are found to be most effective. | 2B.2. Meeting minutes, classroom walk-throughs, lesson plans |

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

| | |
|---|--|
| 3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a: | To increase percentage of students making learning gains in reading by 3%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In June 2012, 78% (181) students made learning gains in reading. | In June 2013, 81% (187) students will make learning gains in reading. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 3A.1. Loss of Reading pull-out program | 3A.1. Reading teachers will provide interventions specific to student deficits, based on data collected, during small group instruction. Students will also use Riverdeep and Compass Learning Odyssey as remediation of skills. | 3A.1 Administration, RtI team, Reading Coach, ESE Specialist | 3A.1. Data from informal assessments and district assessments will be reviewed and interventions put in place for individual student enrichment. Individual Reports from Riverdeep and Compass Learning Odyssey will be analyzed. | 3A.1. Mini assessments, BAT 1 and BAT 2. |

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

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

| | |
|---|--|
| reading. Reading Goal #3b: | To maintain learning gains for all students |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In June 2012, 100% (1) students made learning gains in reading. | By June 2013, 100% (2) students will make learning gains in reading. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| 1 | 3B.1 Varied approaches are needed for Individual IEPs. | 3B.1. Students will receive individualized instruction according to their needs. | 3B.1. Administration and ESE Specialist | 3B.1. Data from informal assessments and district assessments will be reviewed and interventions put in place for individual student remediation. | 3B.1. Mini-assessments, BAT 1 and BAT 2, grades, FAA Practice Assessments, weekly assessments on specialized programs |
| 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:

| | |
|---|--|
| 4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4: | To increase the percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in reading by 3%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In June 2012, 73% (44) of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading. | By June 2013, 76% (46) of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains in reading. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| 1 | 4A.1 Loss of Reading pull-out program | 4A.1. Reading teachers will provide interventions specific to student deficits, based on the data collected, during small group instruction. Students will also use Riverdeep and Compass Learning Odyssey as remediation of skills. | 4A.1. Administration, RTI team, Reading Coach, ESE Specialist | 4A.1. Data from informal assessments and district assessments will be reviewed and interventions put in place for individual student remediation. Individual Reports from Riverdeep and Compass Learning Odyssey will be analyzed. | 4A.1. Mini assessments, BAT 1 and BAT 2. |
| 2 | 4A.2 Lack of understanding of the reading benchmarks and strategies by | 4A.2 An FCAT parent night will be offered so parents become aware of the | 4A.2 Administration, Reading Coach | 4A.2 Formative Assessments will be given to students and scores will be | 4A.2 Mini Assessments, BAT 1 and 2 |

| | | |
|----------|-------------------------------|----------|
| parents. | expectations of the students. | analyzed |
|----------|-------------------------------|----------|

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

| | | | | | | |
|--|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. | Reading Goal # | | | | | |
| | By June 2017, the percentage of students not proficient will decrease to 18%. | | | | | |
| 5A : | | | | | | |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | 29% | 29% | 28% | 25% | 22% | |

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: | Students not making satisfactory progress will drop by 3% in all subgroups. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In June 2012 the following percentage of students did not make satisfactory progress in reading White: 21.4% Black: 41.7% Hispanic: 28% Asian: 13.5% American Indian: 100% | By June of 2013 the percentage of students not making satisfactory progress will be White: 18% Black: 38% Hispanic: 25% Asian: 10% American Indian: 50% |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 5B.1. Lack of practice and application of reading skills | 5B.1. Students and parents will participate in a Literacy "Make and Take" Night to obtain materials and strategies that can be used at home. | 5B.1. Reading Coach, Administration | 5B.1 Data from informal assessments and district assessments will be reviewed. | 5B.1. Mini-assessments, BAT 1 and BAT 2, grades. |
| 2 | 5B.2. Loss of reading pull out program | 5B.2. Students needs will be assessed and monitored through the RtI process | 5B.2. Reading Coach, Administration | 5B.2. Data from informal assessments and district assessments will be reviewed and interventions put in place. | 5B.2. Mini-assessments, BAT 1 and BAT 2, grades. |

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: | The percentage of ELL students not making satisfactory progress will decrease by 3%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| | |

| In June of 2012 47% of ELL students did not make satisfactory progress. | | | By June of 2013 44% of ELL students will not make satisfactory progress. | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 5C.1. Lack of practice and application of reading skills | 5C.1. Students and parents will participate in a Literacy "Make and Take" Night to obtain materials and strategies that can be used at home. | 5C.1. Reading Coach, Administration | 5C.1 Data from informal assessments and district assessments will be reviewed. | 5C.1. Mini-assessments, BAT 1 and BAT 2, grades. |
| 2 | 5C.2 Teachers will need additional professional development in implementing strategies with the growing ELL population. | 5C.2 Rosetta Stone and iStation loaded on student laptops. New teachers will be trained in the use of these programs to assist their ELL students. | 5C.2 RtI team, Administration, Literacy Team | 5C.2 Generate reports from technology programs and review data to monitor student progress. | 5C.2 Completed Reading Across Broward Logs and monthly Scholastic Reading Counts reports. |

| | |
|---|--|
| Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup: | |
| 5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D: | The number of SWD students not making satisfactory progress will decrease by 3%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In June of 2012 69% of SWD students did not make satisfactory progress. | By June of 2013 66% of SWD students will not make satisfactory progress. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 5D.1. Lack of practice and application of reading skills | 5D.1. Students and parents will participate in a Literacy "Make and Take" Night to obtain materials and strategies that can be used at home. | 5D.1. Reading Coach, Administration | 5D.1 Data from informal assessments and district assessments will be reviewed. | 5D.1. Mini-assessments, BAT 1 and BAT 2, grades. |
| 2 | 5D.2. These students need additional time on task reading to improve their scores. | 5D.2. Students will receive additional small group assistance through a pull out program with ESE teachers. | 5D.2. Reading Coach, Administration and ESE Specialist | 5D.2. Data from informal assessments and district assessments will be reviewed and interventions put in place for individual student remediation. | 5D.2. Mini-assessments, BAT 1 and BAT 2, grades. |

| | |
|---|--|
| 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. | The number of ED students not making satisfactory progress |

| | |
|--|--|
| Reading Goal #5E: | will decrease by 3%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In June of 2012 37% of ED students did not make satisfactory progress. | By June 2013 34% of ED students will not make satisfactory progress. |

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 | 5E.1. Lack of practice and application of reading skills | 5E.1. Students and parents will participate in a Literacy "Make and Take" Night to obtain materials and strategies that can be used at home. | 5E.1. Reading Coach, Administration | 5E.1 Data from informal assessments and district assessments will be reviewed. | 5E.1 Mini-assessments, BAT 1 and BAT 2, grades. |

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 |
|--|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| Core Connections | K-4 | Reading Coach, Team Leaders | K-4 teachers | October 2, 2012; November 16, 2012; February 7, 2013; February 8, 2013 and weekly team PLCs for planning | Teachers will incorporate strategies and Common Core into lessons | Administration, Reading Coach, Team Leaders |
| Odyssey/RiverDeep/iStation/Rosetta Stone | K-5 | Cathy Del-Rio, Technology | New teachers to Dolphin Bay will meet with the technology specialist for a training. | Fall 2012 | Teachers will implement technology in their classrooms | Administration, Team Leaders |
| Common Core Standards | K-5 | Select classroom Teachers | Grade level PLC's will be conducted on a school wide basis. | September 27, 2012; October 26, 2012; January 18, 2013; March 22, 2013; May 24, 2013 | Teachers will incorporate Common Core Standards into lessons. | Administration |

Reading Budget:

| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
|--|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Materials for reading interventions | STARS/CARS | Accountability | \$1,000.00 |
| Materials for double dose reading groups | Wilson/Fundations workbooks | Accountability/Inservice | \$1,000.00 |
| Materials to implement Common Core | Books | Accountability and Media | \$3,000.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$5,000.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| I-Station | Online reading resource | Provided through the ESOL Department | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Core Connections Training | Training for K-4 teachers to implement Common Core | PTA, Accountability | \$4,000.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$4,000.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$9,000.00 |

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. | | Increase the percentage of students proficient in listening and speaking to 35%. | | | |
| CELLA Goal #1: | | | | | |
| 2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking: | | | | | |
| 32.3% | | | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 1.1. Lack of practice and application of English language skills. | 1.1 Students will receive additional small group instruction. In addition, they will be pulled out by the ELL coordinator for additional assistance. | 1.1 Reading Coach, Administration, ELL coordinator | 1.1 Data from informal assessments and district assessments will be reviewed and interventions put in place for individual student remediation. | 1.1 Rosetta Stone, grades, teacher observation. |
| 2 | 1.2 These students need additional time on task listening and speaking. | 1.2 Students will receive additional small group assistance and will be paired with students that speak the same language. | 1.2 Reading Coach, Administration and ESE Specialist | 1.2 Data from informal assessments and district assessments will be reviewed and interventions put in place for individual student remediation. | 1.2 Rosetta Stone, grades, teacher observation. |

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:

Increase the percentage of students proficient in reading to 30%

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

27%

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|--|--|---|--|
| 1 | 2.1. Lack of practice and application of reading skills | 2.1 Students will receive additional small group instruction. In addition, they will be pulled out by the ELL coordinator for additional assistance. | 2.1 Reading Coach, Administration, ELL coordinator | 2.1 Data from informal assessments and district assessments will be reviewed and interventions put in place for individual student remediation. | 2.1 Mini-assessments, BAT 1 and BAT 2, grades |
| 2 | 2.2 These students need additional time on task during reading to improve their scores. | 2.2 Students will receive additional small group assistance through a pull out program with ESE teachers. | 2.2 Reading Coach, Administration and ESE Specialist | 2.2 Data from informal assessments and district assessments will be reviewed and interventions put in place for individual student remediation. | 2.1 Mini-assessments, BAT 1 and BAT 2, grades. |

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

Increase the number of students proficient in writing to 28%

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

24.8%

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 | 3. Students pulled out from classroom during instruction of critical skills. | 3. Small group instruction will be used to offer remediation to students that miss class segments. | 3. Administration, Team Leaders, Writing Coach, Classroom Teachers | 3. Data from informal assessments and district assessments will be reviewed and interventions put in place for individual student remediation. | 3. Writing prompts, Bat testing and classroom examples |

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: | To increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in mathematics by 3%. |
|--|---|

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

| | |
|---|--|
| In June 2012, 30% (109) of students achieved proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in mathematics. | By June 2013, 33% (113) students will achieve proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in mathematics. |
|---|--|

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|--|---|--|--|
| 1 | 1A.1 Lack of student understanding of math standards and benchmarks. | 1A.1 Teachers will review standards with students at the beginning of each big idea and again on the completion of sections to check for understanding. Students that fail to reach understanding will be remediated in small group instruction. | 1A.1 Administration and SAC Math Team | 1A.1 Conduct a student needs assessment and create small group remediation for students in need. | 1A.1 Survey or pre and post instruction tests to be given by teacher to determine small groups for each concept. |
| 2 | 1A.2. Incorporating small group instruction | 1A.2. PLC's will be formed to share information and strategies on how to incorporate small group instruction. | 1A.2. Professional Development Team, Administration | 1A.2. Vertical teaming, Teacher leaders modeling for other teachers, Classroom observations | 1A.2. Administrative observations |

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: | The number of students scoring at a 4, 5 or 6 will remain 100%. |
|---|---|

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

| | |
|--|---|
| In June of 2012 100% (1) students scored at level 4, 5, or 6 | By June of 2013 100% (2) students will score a level 4, 5, or 6 |
|--|---|

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| 1 | 1B.1 Lack of student understanding of math standards and benchmarks. | 1B.1. Teachers will review standards with students at the beginning of each big idea and again on the completion of sections to | 1B.1. Administration, Math Coach, SAC Math Team | 1B.1. Conduct a student needs assessment and create small group remediation for students in need. | 1B.1. Survey or pre and post instruction tests to be given by teacher to determine small |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|-------------------------|--|--|
| | | check for understanding. Students that fail to reach understanding will be remediated in small group instruction. | | | groups for each concept. |
| 2 | 1B.2. Students need additional kinesthetic opportunities to enhance their educational experiences. | 1B.2 Students will receive instruction including, but not limited to, using base ten materials, geometric solids, versatile, and other math manipulatives. | 1B.2. Administration | 1B.2. Conduct a student needs assessment and create small group remediation for students in need. | 1B.2. Survey or pre and post instruction tests to be given by teacher to determine small groups for each concept. |

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: | To increase students achieving above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in mathematics by 3%. To increase students achieving above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in mathematics by 3%. To increase students achieving above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in mathematics by 3%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In June 2012, 38% (135) students achieved above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in mathematics. | By June 2013, 41% (139) of students will achieve above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in mathematics. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2A.1. Lack of student understanding of math standards and benchmarks. | 2A.1. Teachers will review standards with students at the beginning of each big idea and again on the completion of sections to check for understanding. Students that fail to reach understanding will be remediated in small group instruction. | 2A.1. Administration, Math Coach, SAC Math Team | 2A.1. Conduct a student needs assessment and create small group remediation for students in need. | 2A.1. Survey or pre and post instruction tests to be given by teacher to determine small groups for each concept. |
| 2 | 2A.2. Students need additional kinesthetic opportunities to enhance their educational experiences. | 2A.2. Students will receive instruction including, but not limited to using base ten materials, geometric solids, versatile, and other math manipulatives. | 2A.2. Administration | 2A.2. Weekly review | 2A.2. Administrative observation, Go Math Chapter 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: | The number of students scoring at level 7 will increase by 50% to 1 of 2 students. |
|--|--|

| | |
|---|--|
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In June of 2012 0% (0 of 1) students scored at level 7. | By June of 2013 50% or 1 of 2 students will score a level 7. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| 1 | 2B.1 Lack of student understanding of math standards and benchmarks. | 2B.1. Teachers will review standards with students at the beginning of each big idea and again on the completion of sections to check for understanding. Students that fail to reach understanding will be remediated in small group instruction. | 2B.1. Administration, Math Coach, SAC Math Team | 2B.1. Conduct a student needs assessment and create small group remediation for students in need. | 2B.1. Survey or pre and post instruction tests to be given by teacher to determine small groups for each concept. |

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: | To increase percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics by 3%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In June 2012, 73% (169) students made learning gains in mathematics. | In June 2013, 76% (174) students will make learning gains in mathematics. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 3A.1. Lack of student understanding of math standards and benchmarks. | 3A.1. Teachers will review standards with students at the beginning of each big idea and again on the completion of sections to check for understanding. Students that fail to reach understanding will be remediated in small group instruction. | 3A.1. Administration, Math Coach, SAC Math Team | 3A.1. . Conduct a student needs assessment and create small group remediation for students in need. | 3A.1. Survey or pre and post instruction tests to be given by teacher to determine small groups for each concept. |
| 2 | 3A.2. Student Motivation | 3A.2. Students will participate in a family math night at Winn Dixie. | 3A.2. RTI Team, Administration | 3A.2. Collaborative Problem Solving Process | 3A.2. BAT, Classroom Assessments, Administrative observations |

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: | The percentage of students taking the Florida Alternative Assessment will continue to be 100%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In June of 2012 100% of students taking the alternative assessment made learning gains. | By June of 2013 100% of students taking the alternative assessment will make learning gains. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|
| 1 | 3B.1 Lack of student understanding of math standards and benchmarks. | 3B.1. Teachers will review standards with students at the beginning of each big idea and again on the completion of sections to check for understanding. Students that fail to reach understanding will be remediated in small group instruction. | 3B.1. Administration, SAC Math Team and ESE teachers | 3B.1. Conduct a student needs assessment and create small group remediation for students in need. | 3B.1. Survey or pre and post instruction tests to be given by teacher to determine small groups for each concept. |

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: | To increase the percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics by 8%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In June 2012, 58% (37) of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in mathematics. | By June 2013, 66% (42) of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains in mathematics. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 4A.1. Lack of student understanding of math standards and benchmarks. | 4A.1. Teachers will review standards with students at the beginning of each big idea and again on the completion of sections to check for understanding. Students that fail to reach understanding will be remediated in small group instruction. | 4A.1. Administration, Math Coach, SAC Math Team | 4A.1. Conduct a student needs assessment and create small group remediation for students in need. | 4A.1. Survey or pre and post instruction tests to be given by teacher to determine small groups for each concept. |
| 2 | 4A.2. Delivering differentiated instruction to close the gap and meet the needs of various learning styles and abilities. | 4A.2. Students will receive differentiated instruction based on student need(s). | 4A.2. Administration, Math Coach | 4A.2. Teachers will observe students during their Math block, Centers, Small Groups. | 4A.2. Go Math Chapter assessments, Classroom Walkthroughs, BAT |

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 June 2017, the percentage of students not proficient will decrease to 18%. | | | | |
| Baseline data 2010-2011 | 2011-2012 | 2012-2013 | 2013-2014 | 2014-2015 | 2015-2016 | 2016-2017 |
| | 32% | 30% | 27% | 24% | 21% | |

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: | The percentage of subgroup students not making satisfactory process in mathematics will decrease by 3% in all subgroups. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In June of 2012 the students in each subgroup did not make satisfactory progress. White: 21.4% Black: 45% Hispanic: 32.7% Asian: 16.2% American Indian: 100% | By June of 2013 the students not making satisfactory progress will decrease by 3%. White: 18% Black: 42% Hispanic: 29% Asian: 13% American Indian: 97% |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|--|--|--|---|
| 1 | 5B.1 Lack of student understanding of math standards and benchmarks. | 5B.1. Teachers will review standards with students at the beginning of each big idea and again on the completion of sections to check for understanding. Students that fail to reach understanding will be remediated in small group instruction. | 5B.1. Administration, Math Coach, SAC Math Team | 5B.1. Conduct a student needs assessment and create small group remediation for students in need. | 5B.1 Survey or pre and post instruction tests to be given by teacher to determine small groups for each concept. |
| 2 | 5B.2. Student Motivation | 5B.2. Students will participate in a family math night at Winn Dixie. | 5B.2. RTI Team, Administration | 5B.2. Collaborative Problem Solving Process | 5B.2. BAT, Classroom Assessments, Administrative observations |

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: | The percentage of ELL students not making satisfactory progress will decrease by 3%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In June of 2012 52.6% of ELL students did not make satisfactory progress. | By June of 2013 49% of ELL students will not make satisfactory progress. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 5C.1 Lack of student understanding of math standards and benchmarks. | 5C.1. Teachers will review standards with students at the beginning of each big idea and again on the completion of sections to check for understanding. Students that fail to reach understanding will be remediated in small group instruction. | 5C.1. Administration, Math Coach, SAC Math Team | 5C.1. Conduct a student needs assessment and create small group remediation for students in need. | 5C.1. Survey or pre and post instruction tests to be given by teacher to determine small groups for each concept. |
| 2 | 5C.2 Student Motivation | 5C.2 Students will participate in a family math night at Winn Dixie. | 5C.2. RTI Team, Administration | 5C.2 Collaborative Problem Solving Process | 5C.2 BAT, Classroom Assessments, Administrative observations |

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: | The percentage of SWD students not making satisfactory progress will reduce by 3%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In June of 2012 70.4% of SWD students did not make satisfactory progress in math. | By June 2013 67% of SWD students will not make satisfactory progress in math. |

| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|---|
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 5D.1 Lack of student understanding of math standards and benchmarks. | 5D.1. Teachers will review standards with students at the beginning of each big idea and again on the completion of sections to check for understanding. Students that fail to reach understanding will be remediated in small group instruction. | 5D.1. Administration, SAC Math Team and ESE specialist. | 5D1. Conduct a student needs assessment and create small group remediation for students in need. | 5D.1 Survey or pre and post instruction tests to be given by teacher to determine small groups for each concept. |
| 2 | 5D.2 Student Motivation | 5D.2 Students will participate in a family math night at Winn Dixie. | 5D.2 RTI Team, Administration | 5D.2 Collaborative Problem Solving Process | 5D.2 BAT, Classroom Assessments, Administrative observations |

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. | The percentage of ED students that do not make |
|--|--|

| | |
|--|---|
| Mathematics Goal #5E: | satisfactory progress in math will reduce by 3%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In June of 2012 42.3% of ED students did not make satisfactory progress in math. | By June of 2013 39% of ED students will not make satisfactory progress in math. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| 1 | 5E.1 Student Motivation | 5E.1 Students will participate in a family math night at Winn Dixie. | 5E.1 RTI Team, Administration | 5E.1 Collaborative Problem Solving Process | 5E.1 BAT, Classroom Assessments, Administrative observations |
| 2 | 5E.2 Lack of student understanding of math standards and benchmarks | 5E.2 Teachers will review standards with students at the beginning of each big idea and again on the completion of sections to check for understanding. Students that fail to reach understanding will be remediated in small group instruction. | 5E.2 Administration, Math Coach, SAC Math Team | 5E.2 Conduct a student needs assessment and create small group remediation for students in need. | 5E.2 Survey or pre and post instruction tests to be given by teacher to determine small groups for each concept. |

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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| Project Based Learning | All | Classroom Teachers | All | 2 hours monthly | Student work, Administrative observations | Administration, PLC Facilitators |
| Hands-on Activities | All | Classroom Teachers | ALL | 2 hours monthly | Student work, Administrative observations | Administration, PLC Facilitators |
| Student-led discussions | All | Classroom Teachers | All | 2 hours monthly | Administrative observations | Administration, PLC Facilitators |
| Common Core | All | Classroom Teachers | All | 2 hours monthly | Student work, Administrative observations | Administration, PLC Facilitators |

Mathematics Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|----------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Assessment Strategies | FCAT Math Assessment Workbooks | School Budget | \$1,800.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$1,800.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |

| | | | |
|---|---|----------------|--------------------------------|
| FCAT Explorer/Riverdeep/SOAR to Success | FCAT Explorer/Riverdeep/SOAR to Success Software | None | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| CCSS Inservice | Teachers will attend trainings to improve their knowledge of Common Core State Standards. | Inservice | \$500.00 |
| GEM Training | Teachers will attend GEM trainings to improve the enrichment activities for all students. | Inservice | \$500.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$1,000.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$2,800.00 |

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: | | To increase the percentage of students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in science by 3%. | | | |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: | | | |
| In June 2012, 45% (51) of students achieved proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in science. | | By June 2013, 48% (55) students will achieve proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in science. | | | |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 1A.1. Students are pulled out of classrooms for double-dose, ESE, and ESOL classes causing them to miss class time on task. | 1A.1. Small group instruction will be used to offer remediation to students that miss class segments. | 1A.1. Administration, Science Teachers, ESE Specialist, ESE teachers | 1A.1. Review data from Tier 3 interventions and adjust if necessary based on individual needs. Additional small group instruction with checks for comprehension through mini assessments. | 1A.1. BAT 1 and 2, Mini-Assessments |
| 2 | 1A.2. Students not completing homework. | 1A.2. Increase communication with parents via school website, parent-link, teacher conferences, and parent workshops. | 1A.2. Administration, Science Teachers | 1A.2. Conduct needs assessment and provide parent science workshops where they can conduct hands-on activities stressing the importance of homework and offering them strategies to assist their students. | 1A.2. Conference forms, sign-in sheets and monitoring numbers of missed homework assignments. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|----------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|
| 3 | 1A.3. Not enough Science focus in lower grade levels (K-4). | 1A.3. Provide students with the opportunity to create a science project to be displayed during "Night at the Museum" Family Night. | 1A.3. Teachers and Science Coach | 1A.3. Review projects submitted and provide feedback as necessary. | 1A.3. Rubric to evaluate projects. |
|---|---|--|----------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|

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: | The percentage of students taking the alternative assessment will increase from 0 to 50%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In June of 2012 the percentage of students taking the alternative assessment and scoring at levels 4, 5 and 6 was 0% (1 student). | By June of 2013 the percentage of students taking the alternative assessment and scoring at levels 4, 5 and 6 will increase to 50% (1 of 2 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 | 1B.1. Students not completing homework. | 1B.1. Increase communication with parents via school website, parent-link, teacher conferences, and parent workshops | 1B.1 Administration, Science Teachers, ESE Specialist, ESE teachers | 1B.1 Conduct needs assessment and provide parent science workshops where they can conduct hands-on activities stressing the importance of homework and offering them strategies to assist their students. | 1B.1 Conference forms, sign-in sheets and monitoring numbers of missed homework assignments |
| 2 | 1B.2. Science focus in lower grade levels (K-4). | 1B.2. Provide students with the opportunity to create a science project to be displayed during "Night at the Museum" Family Night. | 1B.2. Teachers and Science Coach | 1B.2. Review projects submitted and provide feedback as necessary. | 1B.2. Rubric to evaluate projects. |

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: | To increase students achieving above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in science by 3%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In June 2012, 25% (29) students achieved above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in science. | By June 2013, 28% (32) of students will achieve above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in science. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|------------------------|--|---|
| 1 | 2A.1. Students' lack of scientific vocabulary. | 2A.1. Students will create a vocabulary notebook that will move with them from one grade level to the next and be used as a continuous resource. | 2A.1. Science Teachers | 2A.1. Review data from chapter assessments to identify areas of improvement. | 2A.1. Chapter Assessments, BAT I & II, FCAT 2.0 |
|---|--|--|------------------------|--|---|

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: | The percentage of students scoring a level 7 on the alternative assessment will increase from 0 to 50% |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In June of 2012 the percentage of students taking the alternative assessment and scoring at level 7 was 0% (1 student). | By June of 2013 the percentage of students taking the alternative assessment and scoring at level 7 will increase to 50% (1 of 2 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 | 2B.1. Students' lack of scientific vocabulary. | 2B.1. Students will create a vocabulary notebook that will move with them from one grade level to the next and be used as a continuous resource. | 2B.1. Science Teachers | 2B.1. Review data from chapter assessments to identify areas of improvement. | 2B.1. Chapter Assessments, BAT I & II, FCAT 2.0 |

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 |
|---|---------------------|---|---|--|--|--|
| PLC's will discuss strategies that have resulted in higher test scores with our students. | K-5 | Administration and 4th and 5th grade science teachers | School wide | September 30, 2012 with ongoing review. | Administrative observations, team meetings | Administration, team leaders, science teachers |
| Core Connections Training | K-4 | Reading Coach, Team Leaders | K-4 Teachers | October 2, 2012; November 16, 2012; February 7, 2013; February 8, 2013; and weekly team PLC's for planning | Teachers will incorporate strategies and Common Core into lessons. | Administration, Reading Coach, Team Leaders |

| | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|---|--|---|----------------|
| Common Core Standards | K-5 | Select Classroom Teachers | Grade Level PLC's will be conducted on a school wide basis. | September 27, 2012; October 26, 2012; January 18, 2013; March 22, 2013; May 24, 2013 | Teachers will incorporate Common Core Standards into lessons. | Administration |
|-----------------------|-----|---------------------------|---|--|---|----------------|

Science Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|---|--|------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Science Hands-On Kits | Replace materials for science kits | School Budget | \$2,000.00 |
| High Touch High Tech Field Trips | Hands on Student Workshops | Student Funded | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$2,000.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Daily use of Microscopes, Promethean Board, iPods, Balances, and other Scientific Tools | Maintain and preserve current tools | None | \$0.00 |
| Empty classroom will be used as a Science Lab. | Teachers will be able to conduct science hands-on experiments in this lab. | None | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| STEM Science Workshops | Teachers will participate in STEM trainings to improve enrichment strategies for all students. | Inservice | \$500.00 |
| Core Connections Training | Teachers in K-4 will attend training on implementation strategies for the Common Core State Standards. | PTA and Accountability | \$4,000.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$4,500.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$6,500.00 |

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: | To increase students achieving proficiency (FCAT Level 3.0 and above) in writing by 3%. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In June 2012, 94% (127) students achieved proficiency (FCAT Level 3.0 and higher) in writing. | By June 2013, 97% (132) of students will achieve proficiency (FCAT Level 3.0 and higher) in writing. |
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | |

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| 1 | 1A.1. Students pulled out from classroom during instruction of critical skills. | 1A.1. Small group instruction will be used to offer remediation to students that miss class segments. | 1A.1. Administration, Team Leaders, Writing Coach, Classroom Teachers | 1A.1. Review Data from September writing BAT and adjust instructional focus as needed. Move students through TIERS based on progress in class. | 1A.1. September and November BAT Scores, classroom writing samples |

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: | 100% of students taking the alternative will score a passing score. |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| In June of 2012 100% of students taking the alternative assessment received a passing score. | By June of 2013 100% of students taking the alternative assessment will receive a passing score. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| 1 | 1B.1. Students pulled out from classroom during instruction of critical skills. | 1B.1. Small group instruction will be used to offer remediation to students that miss class segments. | 1B.1. Administration, Writing Coach, ESE Specialist | 1B.1. Review writing samples to identify areas that need improvement | 1B.1. Classroom writing samples, Rubrics |

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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|--|---|--|--|---|
| Core Connections Training | K-4 | Grade Level Team Leader; Reading Coach | All K-4 classroom teachers | October 2, 2012; November 16, 2012; February 7, 2013; February 8, 2013; and weekly team PLC's for planning | Teachers will incorporate strategies and Common Core into lessons. | Administration, Reading Coach, Team Leaders |
| Common Core State Standards | K-5 | Select classroom teachers | Grade level PLC's will be conducted on a school wide basis. | September 27, 2012; October 26, 2012; January 18, 2013; March 23, 2012; May 23, 2012 | Teachers will incorporate Common Core Standards into lessons. | Administration |

Writing Budget:

| Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s) | | | |
|--|--|------------------------|-------------------------|
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Development of writing resource binder | "Razzle Dazzle" and "Writing Superstars Resources, Scholastic's "Trait Crate," and Mary Lewis Expository and Narrative Benchmarks | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Technology | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Odyssey Writer | Students compose essays and submit to teachers for review as additional practice | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Writing binder implementation by grade-level | New teachers in each grade level will be trained by a designated teacher on the use and implementation of the writing binder in order to improve writing skills across the primary grade levels. | N/A | \$0.00 |
| Core Connections Training | Teachers in K-4 will attend training on implementation strategies for the Common Core State Standards. | PTA and Accountability | \$4,000.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$4,000.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$4,000.00 |

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: | Continued monitoring of tardies and absences to assure continuity of instruction and educational growth. |
| 2012 Current Attendance Rate: | 2013 Expected Attendance Rate: |
| In June of 2012 the attendance rate was 96.1% | The By June of 2013 the attendance rate will be 97%. |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more) |
| In June of 2012 the total number of students with excessive absences was 20. | By June of 2013 the total number of students with excessive absences will be 15. |
| 2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) | 2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more) |
| In June of 2012 the total number of students with | By June of 2013 the total number of students with |

| excessive tardies was 150. | | excessive tardies will be 125. | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement | | | | | |
| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
| 1 | 1.1. Lack of parental involvement in school | 1.1. To increase parental involvement in school activities before, during and after school through improved communication, and the use of Parent Link messages. | 1.1. Classroom teachers, Administration, PTA, Guidance Counselor | 1.1. Review parent survey results and provide parental involvement workshops to meet their needs. | 1.1. Conference forms, sign-in sheets |
| 2 | 1.2. Inadequate communication with parents | 1.2. Increase frequency of phone contacts with parents who have children showing a pattern of non-attendance or excessive tardies. | 1.2. Classroom teachers, Administration, PTA, Guidance Counselor | 1.2. Review of attendance patterns on a 4 week basis. | 1.2. Attendance data from quarterly report cards. |

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 |
|--|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|---|---|
| Broward County Attendance Policy Inservice | K-5 | Guidance Counselor | School-wide | Fall 2012 | Teachers will monitor attendance through Pinnacle | Administrators, Team Leaders |

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: | Through quarterly discipline meetings there will be an overall reduction in suspensions by 10% |
| 2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions |
| In June of 2012 the total number of in school suspensions was 9. | By June of 2013 the total number of in school suspensions will be 7. |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School |
| In June of 2012 the total number of students suspended in school was 7. | By June of 2013 the total number of students suspended in school will be 5. |
| 2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions | 2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions |
| In June of 2012 the total number of out of school suspensions was 4. | By June of 2013 the total number of out of school suspensions will be 3. |
| 2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School | 2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School |
| In June of 2012 the total number of students suspended out of school was 4. | By June of 2013 the total number of students suspended out of school will be 3. |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|--|--|--|---|-----------------------------------|
| 1 | 1.1. As we currently have an extremely low suspension rate, further reduction will be difficult. | 1.1. All students that exhibit behaviors that may lead to suspension, will be required to meet with the guidance counselor. They will participate in a behavior group to give them strategies to replace unacceptable behaviors with acceptable ones. | 1.1. Assistant Principal and the Discipline SAC Committee | 1.1. Assistant principal will monitor data on the number of suspensions and report back to the SAC Committee on a monthly basis. | 1.1. Discipline Management System |
| | 1.2. The Broward County Discipline Matrix requires suspension for certain offenses. If a suspendable offense is committed the student must be suspended. | 1.2. Four discipline meetings will be held with all grade levels to reinforce the students knowledge of suspendable offenses; students will participate | 1.2. Assistant Principal, Guidance Counselor and the Discipline SAC Committee. | 1.2. Assistant principal will monitor data on the number of suspensions and report back to the SAC Committee on a monthly basis. | 1.2. Discipline Management System |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2 | | in a "Bucket-filling" program to improve anti-bullying behaviors; A new cafeteria incentive program will be implemented to improve cafeteria behavior. | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|

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 |
|------------------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| CHAMPS Training | K-5 | Discipline Committee | Select K-5 Teachers | Fall 2012 | Classroom walkthroughs | Administration, Team Leaders |

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 |
| CHAMPS Training | Select teachers will attend training to effectively implement the CHAMP strategies. | Accountability | \$500.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$500.00 |
| Other | | | |
| Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| No Data | No Data | No Data | \$0.00 |
| | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| | | | Grand Total: \$500.00 |

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

1. Parent Involvement

| | |
|---|--|
| Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i> | By June 2013 55% (413) of our parents will participate in a school sponsored activity. |
|---|--|

| | |
|---|--|
| 2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement: | 2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement: |
|---|--|

| | |
|--|--|
| In 2012, 49% (431) of our parents participated in a school sponsored activity. | By June 2013 55% (413) of our parents will participate in a school sponsored activity. |
|--|--|

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

| | Anticipated Barrier | Strategy | Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring | Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy | Evaluation Tool |
|---|---|--|---|--|-------------------------------------|
| 1 | 1.1. Offering activities to all parents that meet the complex work schedules and interests of our families. | 1.1. Activities will be offered at various times of the day. | 1.1. Administration; Staff | 1.1. Review results from parent survey and needs assessment and adjust communication methods with parents as needed. | Parent survey, Sign-in sheets. |
| 2 | 1.2. Lack of communication with parents. | 1.2. Information will be posted on our school website, school marquee, via parent link and written in student agendas. Personal phone calls will be made to invite parents of struggling student to increase the parental involvement at workshops that will assist their students in achieving AYP. | 1.2. Administration, school staff | 1.2. Review results from parent survey and needs assessment and adjust communication methods with parents as needed. | 1.2. Parent survey, 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 |
| 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 | Materials for reading interventions | STARS/CARS | Accountability | \$1,000.00 |
| Reading | Materials for double dose reading groups | Wilson/Fundations workbooks | Accountability/Inservice | \$1,000.00 |
| Reading | Materials to implement Common Core | Books | Accountability and Media | \$3,000.00 |
| Mathematics | Assessment Strategies | FCAT Math Assessment Workbooks | School Budget | \$1,800.00 |
| Science | Science Hands-On Kits | Replace materials for science kits | School Budget | \$2,000.00 |
| Science | High Touch High Tech Field Trips | Hands on Student Workshops | Student Funded | \$0.00 |
| Writing | Development of writing resource binder | "Razzle Dazzle" and "Writing Superstars Resources, Scholastic's "Trait Crate," and Mary Lewis Expository and Narrative Benchmarks | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$8,800.00 |
| Technology | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | I-Station | Online reading resource | Provided through the ESOL Department | \$0.00 |
| Mathematics | FCAT Explorer/Riverdeep/SOAR to Success | FCAT Explorer/Riverdeep/SOAR to Success Software | None | \$0.00 |
| Science | Daily use of Microscopes, Promethean Board, iPods, Balances, and other Scientific Tools | Maintain and preserve current tools | None | \$0.00 |
| Science | Empty classroom will be used as a Science Lab. | Teachers will be able to conduct science hands-on experiments in this lab. | None | \$0.00 |
| Writing | Odyssey Writer | Students compose essays and submit to teachers for review as additional practice | N/A | \$0.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$0.00 |
| Professional Development | | | | |
| Goal | Strategy | Description of Resources | Funding Source | Available Amount |
| Reading | Core Connections Training | Training for K-4 teachers to implement Common Core | PTA, Accountability | \$4,000.00 |
| Mathematics | CCSS Inservice | Teachers will attend trainings to improve their knowledge of Common Core State Standards. | Inservice | \$500.00 |
| Mathematics | GEM Training | Teachers will attend GEM trainings to improve the enrichment activities for all students. | Inservice | \$500.00 |
| Science | STEM Science Workshops | Teachers will participate in STEM trainings to improve enrichment strategies for all students. | Inservice | \$500.00 |
| Science | Core Connections Training | Teachers in K-4 will attend training on implementation strategies for the Common Core State Standards. | PTA and Accountability | \$4,000.00 |
| Writing | Writing binder implementation by | New teachers in each grade level will be trained by a designated teacher on the use and implementation of the | N/A | \$0.00 |

| | | | | |
|------------|---------------------------|--|------------------------|--------------------------|
| | grade-level | writing binder in order to improve writing skills across the primary grade levels. | | |
| Writing | Core Connections Training | Teachers in K-4 will attend training on implementation strategies for the Common Core State Standards. | PTA and Accountability | \$4,000.00 |
| Suspension | CHAMPs Training | Select teachers will attend training to effectively implement the CHAMP strategies. | Accountability | \$500.00 |
| | | | | Subtotal: \$14,000.00 |
| 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: \$22,800.00 |

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 9/7/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

| Projected use of SAC Funds | Amount |
|---|------------|
| Accountability money will be used to purchase materials for reading intervention in order to double dose students to close achievement gaps. We will also be using accountability money to train teachers in the transition to common core. | \$3,123.00 |

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

SAC will meet monthly to ensure the implementation of the SIP. Beginning in January we will look at the different content areas to revise our strategies for the following school year and continue to look at the needs of the school and addressing them as needed.

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 DOLPHIN BAY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011 | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------|---|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 80% | 83% | 93% | 61% | 317 | 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 | 64% | 62% | | | 126 | 3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School? | 51% (YES) | 68% (YES) | | | 119 | 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 | | | | | 562 | |
| 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 DOLPHIN BAY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010 | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------|---------|---------|---------------------|---|
| | Reading | Math | Writing | Science | Grade Points Earned | |
| % Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above) | 85% | 86% | 95% | 58% | 324 | 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 | 67% | 61% | | | 128 | 3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2 |
| Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School? | 56% (YES) | 51% (YES) | | | 107 | 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 | | | | | 559 | |
| Percent Tested = 100% | | | | | | Percent of eligible students tested |
| School Grade* | | | | | A | Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested |