

# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

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

School Name: EVERGLADES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Broward

Principal: Eliot Tillinger

SAC Chair: Joyce Brewton, Susan Hines

Superintendent: Robert Runcie

Date of School Board Approval: December 4, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/24/2012

## PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

### STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

### ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Assis Principal	Rita DePasquale	Educational Leadership K-12; Elementary Education 1-6; Reading Endorsed K-12; Gifted Endorsed; ESOL Endorsed	2	2	Mrs. DePasquale has begun her third year as an Assistant Principal. Everglades is an A school again and has met AYP this past year.
Principal	Eliot Tillinger	School Principal all levels, SLD, K-12	14	16	With exception of two years, Everglades has always had a school grade of A and has attained AYP every year with the exception of 2008-2009. The school has also been a recipient of Five Star for 5 years. During the 2005-2006 school year, Everglades was in the top 100 high performing schools in Florida.

### 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 Coach	Lori Stolzenberg	Elementary Education 1-6; ESE K-12; Educational; Gifted Endorsed; Educational Leadership	9	9	With the exception of two years, Everglades has always had a school grade of A and has attained AYP every year with the exception of 2008-2009. The school has also been a recipient of Five Star for 5 years. During the 2005-2006 school year, Everglades was in the top 100 high performing schools in Florida.
Autism	Pillar Tellez	ESE	4	2	With the exception of two years, Everglades has always had a school grade of A and has attained AYP every year with the exception of 2008-2009. The school has also been a recipient of Five Star for 5 years. During the 2005-2006 school year, Everglades was in the top 100 high performing schools in Florida.

### EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1. Partnering teachers new to the grade level with a veteran teacher.	NESS Liaison	Ongoing	

### Non-Highly Effective Instructors

Provide the number of instructional staff and paraprofessionals that are teaching out-of-field and/or who received less than an effective rating (instructional staff only).

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
0	N/A

### 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
65	6.2%(4)	15.4%(10)	61.5%(40)	16.9%(11)	32.3%(21)	100.0%(65)	15.4%(10)	9.2%(6)	98.5%(64)

### 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
			They will meet weekly to

Martha Machado	Nicole Andrade	First year teacher	plan lessons and discuss progress of students. Discuss effective teaching strategies.
Myra Lieberman	Patricia Dedeschi	First year teacher	They will meet weekly to plan lessons and discuss progress of students. Discuss effective teaching strategies.
Marcia Martin	Jacqueline Savage	First year teacher	They will meet weekly to plan lessons and discuss progress of students. Discuss effective teaching strategies.
Pilar Tellez	Gabriela Koster	First year teacher	They will meet weekly to plan lessons and discuss progress of students. Discuss effective teaching strategies.

## ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

### Coordination and Integration

**Note: For Title I schools only**

Please describe how federal, state, and local services and programs will be coordinated and integrated in the school. Include other Title programs, Migrant and Homeless, Supplemental Academic Instruction funds, as well as violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, career and technical education, and/or job training, as applicable.

Title I, Part A

NA

Title I, Part C- Migrant

NA

Title I, Part D

NA

Title II

NA

Title III

NA

Title X- Homeless

NA

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

NA

Violence Prevention Programs

NA

Nutrition Programs

NA

Housing Programs

NA

Head Start

NA

Adult Education

NA

Career and Technical Education

NA

Job Training

NA

Other

NA

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

### School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team. The school based MTSS leadership team consists of the following school personnel: Guidance Counselor; ESE Specialist, Reading/Curriculum Coach, School Psychologist, Resource Teacher, Team Leaders

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?

Teacher and Team Leaders identify students at risk, the child study team which includes Guidance Counselor; ESE Specialist, School Psychologist and teacher, meet to discuss the students needs, tier level, intervention program and progress. Provide supportive data.

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

The RtI Leadership Team was involved in subject area meetings to analyze data and write action steps in order to meet the SIP goals. The RtI Team will continue to evaluate the progress of the students who are at risk.

### 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.

Based on the findings of the RtI team the information is provided to the plan to provide services to our struggling students.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Benchmark assessments, end of year test, FCAT scores, Rigby , classroom assessments and daily behavior plans, and teacher logs are used to collect data to monitor track students progress.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The team trains the Team Leaders, who will work one on one with teachers.

## Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

### School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The Literacy Leadership Team consists of the Reading Coach, Team Leaders K-5, ESE Specialist, Guidance Counselor, Resource Teacher.

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

The LLT meets at least once a month to discuss the students who are on PMPs, scored below level on the FCAT, Benchmark, End of Year Test and weekly assessments in reading and are struggling.

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

All struggling students will receive additional instruction daily using research based material and resources. Their progress will be monitored and shared with their parents.

## Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification  
No Attachment

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

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

NA

### \*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

NA

### \*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?

NA

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?

NA

## 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](#)

NA

## 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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment indicated that 23% of students achieved proficiency (Level 3).  The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading assessment indicated that 23% of students achieved proficiency (Level 3). Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving (Level 3) by 2 percentage points to 25%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
23% (499)	25% (542)

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading and 2011 Benchmark Assessment Test was in the area of Reading Application.	<p>Emphasize school-wide reading programs such as Daily 5, Book It!, Daily Reading Logs.</p> <p>Use ILS such as Riverdeep, Istation, and FCAT Explorer.</p> <p>Provide Differentiated Instruction through small group activities that emphasize Reading Application skills. Teachers will identify the students who scored a level 3 and determine their area of weakness. Instruction will be given to this group of students using research based materials.</p>	Administrators, Reading Coach, Classroom Teachers	Following the FCIM model, the reading coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.	<p>Formative: FAIR, Basal Weekly Assessments, and ILS reports from Riverdeep, iStation, and FCAT Explorer.</p> <p>Summative: 2012 Benchmark Assessment and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test</p>
2	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading and 2011 Benchmark Assessment Test was in the area of Literary Analysis.	<p>Emphasize school-wide reading programs such as Daily 5, Book It!, Daily Reading Logs.</p> <p>Implement Book Talks that utilize Buzz About It books.</p> <p>Use ILS such as Riverdeep, Istation, and FCAT Explorer.</p> <p>Provide Differentiated Instruction through small group activities that emphasize Literary Analysis skills.</p>	Administrators, Reading Coach, Classroom Teachers	Following the FCIM model, the reading coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.	<p>Formative: FAIR, Basal Weekly Assessments, and ILS reports from Riverdeep, iStation, and FCAT Explorer.</p> <p>Summative: 2012 Benchmark Assessment and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test</p>

3	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2011 administration of the Benchmark Assessment Test in Reading was in the area of Vocabulary.	<p>Emphasize school-wide reading programs such as Daily 5, Book It!, Daily Reading Logs.</p> <p>Implement a school-wide vocabulary development program.</p> <p>Provide Differentiated Instruction through small group activities that emphasize Vocabulary skills.</p> <p>Use ILS such as Riverdeep, Istation, and FCAT Explorer.</p>	Administrators, Reading Coach, Classroom Teachers	Following the FCIM model, the reading coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.	<p>Formative: FAIR, Basal Weekly Assessments, and ILS reports from Riverdeep, iStation, and FCAT Explorer.</p> <p>Summative: 2012 Benchmark Assessment and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test</p>
---	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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:	<p>The results of the 2012 Florida Alternative Reading Assessment indicated that 38% of students achieved proficiency (Level 4, 5 and 6).</p> <p>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving (Level 4, 5 and 6) by 13 percentage points to 51%.</p>
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
38% (8)	49% (9)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading and 2011 Benchmark Assessment Test was in the area of Reading Application.	<p>Emphasize school-wide reading programs such as Daily 5, Book It!, Daily Reading Logs.</p> <p>Use ILS such as Riverdeep, Istation, and FCAT Explorer.</p> <p>Provide Differentiated Instruction through small group activities that emphasize Reading Application skills.</p>	Administrators, Reading Coach, Classroom Teachers	Following the FCIM model, the reading coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.	<p>Formative: FAIR, Basal Weekly Assessments, and ILS reports from Riverdeep, iStation, and FCAT Explorer.</p> <p>Summative: 2012 Benchmark Assessment and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test</p>
2	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading and 2011 Benchmark Assessment Test was in the area of Literary Analysis.	<p>Emphasize school-wide reading programs such as Daily 5, Book It!, Daily Reading Logs.</p> <p>Implement Book Talks that utilize Buzz About It books.</p> <p>Use ILS such as Riverdeep, Istation, and FCAT Explorer.</p> <p>Provide Differentiated Instruction through small group activities that emphasize Literary Analysis skills.</p>	Administrators, Reading Coach, Classroom Teachers	Following the FCIM model, the reading coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.	<p>Formative: FAIR, Basal Weekly Assessments, and ILS reports from Riverdeep, iStation, and FCAT Explorer.</p> <p>Summative: 2012 Benchmark Assessment and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test</p>

3	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2011 administration of the Benchmark Assessment Test in Reading was in the area of Vocabulary.	<p>Emphasize school-wide reading programs such as Daily 5, Book It!, Daily Reading Logs.</p> <p>Implement a school-wide vocabulary development program.</p> <p>Use ILS such as Riverdeep, Istation, and FCAT Explorer.</p> <p>Provide Differentiated Instruction through small group activities that emphasize Vocabulary skills.</p>	Administrators, Reading Coach, Classroom Teachers	Following the FCIM model, the reading coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.	<p>Formative: FAIR, Basal Weekly Assessments, and ILS reports from Riverdeep, iStation, and FCAT Explorer.</p> <p>Summative: 2012 Benchmark Assessment and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test</p>
---	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment indicated that 62% of students achieved proficiency (At or above Level 4).  Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving (At or above Level 4) by 3 percentage points to 65%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
62% (499)	65% (542)

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	Budget cuts will be the biggest barrier.	Continue to implement the current reading series as well as enrich the curriculum.	Curriculum Specialist	Monitor their progress by using assessments.	BAT 1; Rigby, DRA
2	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading and 2011 Benchmark Assessment Test was in the area of Reading Application.	<p>Emphasize school-wide reading programs such as Daily 5, Book It!, Daily Reading Logs.</p> <p>Use ILS such as Riverdeep, Istation, and FCAT Explorer.</p> <p>Provide Differentiated Instruction through small group activities that emphasize Reading Application skills.</p>	Administrators, Reading Coach, Classroom Teachers	Following the FCIM model, the reading coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.	<p>Formative: FAIR, Basal Weekly Assessments, and ILS reports from Riverdeep, iStation, and FCAT Explorer.</p> <p>Summative: 2012 Benchmark Assessment and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test</p>
3	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading and 2011 Benchmark Assessment Test was in the area of Literary Analysis.	<p>Emphasize school-wide reading programs such as Daily 5, Book It!, Daily Reading Logs.</p> <p>Implement Book Talks that utilize Buzz About It books.</p> <p>Use ILS such as Riverdeep, Istation, and FCAT Explorer.</p> <p>Provide Differentiated</p>	Administrators, Reading Coach, Classroom Teachers	Following the FCIM model, the reading coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.	<p>Formative: FAIR, Basal Weekly Assessments, and ILS reports from Riverdeep, iStation, and FCAT Explorer.</p> <p>Summative: 2012 Benchmark Assessment and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test</p>



		Instruction through small group activities that emphasize Literary Analysis skills.			
4	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2011 administration of the Benchmark Assessment Test in Reading was in the area of Vocabulary.	<p>Emphasize school-wide reading programs such as Daily 5, Book It!, Daily Reading Logs.</p> <p>Implement a school-wide vocabulary development program.</p> <p>Use ILS such as Riverdeep, Istation, and FCAT Explorer.</p> <p>Provide Differentiated Instruction through small group activities that emphasize Vocabulary skills.</p>	Administrators, Reading Coach, Classroom Teachers	Following the FCIM model, the reading coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed	<p>Formative: FAIR, Basal Weekly Assessments, and ILS reports from Riverdeep, iStation, and FCAT Explorer.</p> <p>Summative: 2012 Benchmark Assessment and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test</p>

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:	The results of the 2012 Florida Alternative Reading Assessment indicated that 13% of students achieved proficiency (At or above Level 7).  Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving (At or above Level 7) by 13 percentage points to 26%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
13% (8)	24% (9)

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading and 2011 Benchmark Assessment Test was in the area of Reading Application.	<p>Emphasize school-wide reading programs such as Daily 5, Book It!, Daily Reading Logs.</p> <p>Use ILS such as Riverdeep, Istation, and FCAT Explorer.</p> <p>Provide Differentiated Instruction through small group activities that emphasize Reading Application skills.</p>	Administrators, Reading Coach, Classroom Teachers	Following the FCIM model, the reading coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.	<p>Formative: FAIR, Basal Weekly Assessments, and ILS reports from Riverdeep, iStation, and FCAT Explorer.</p> <p>Summative: 2012 Benchmark Assessment and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test</p>
2	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading and 2011 Benchmark Assessment Test was in the area of Literary Analysis.	<p>Emphasize school-wide reading programs such as Daily 5, Book It!, Daily Reading Logs.</p> <p>Implement Book Talks that utilize Buzz About It books.</p> <p>Use ILS such as Riverdeep, Istation, and FCAT Explorer.</p>	Administrators, Reading Coach, Classroom Teachers	Following the FCIM model, the reading coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.	<p>Formative: FAIR, Basal Weekly Assessments, and ILS reports from Riverdeep, iStation, and FCAT Explorer.</p> <p>Summative: 2012 Benchmark Assessment and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test</p>

		Provide Differentiated Instruction through small group activities that emphasize Literary Analysis skills			
3	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2011 administration of the Benchmark Assessment Test in Reading was in the area of Vocabulary.	<p>Emphasize school-wide reading programs such as Daily 5, Book It!, Daily Reading Logs.</p> <p>Implement a school-wide vocabulary development program.</p> <p>Use ILS such as Riverdeep, Istation, and FCAT Explorer.</p> <p>Provide Differentiated Instruction through small group activities that emphasize Vocabulary skills.</p>	Administrators, Reading Coach, Classroom Teachers	Following the FCIM model, the reading coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed	<p>Formative: FAIR, Basal Weekly Assessments, and ILS reports from Riverdeep, iStation, and FCAT Explorer.</p> <p>Summative: 2012 Benchmark Assessment and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test</p>

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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment indicated that 82% of students made learning gains in reading.  Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains 3 percentage points to 85%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
82% (327)	85% (358)

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	Budget cuts will be the biggest barrier.	Each teacher received a list of struggling students based on FCAT scores and in-house assessments. The students received remediation daily.	Curriculum Coach	Ongoing assessments will be given to monitor the students' progress	Results from informal and formal assessments.
2	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading and 2011 Benchmark Assessment Test was in the area of Literary Analysis.	<p>Emphasize school-wide reading programs such as Daily 5, Book It!, Daily Reading Logs.</p> <p>Provide additional support for AIP students such as Reading Pull-out, After School Tutorials and Double Dosing using intervention skills.</p> <p>Use ILS such as Riverdeep, Istation, and FCAT Explorer.</p> <p>Provide Differentiated Instruction through small group activities that emphasize Reading</p>	Administrators, Reading Coach, Classroom Teachers	<p>Following the FCIM model, the reading coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.</p> <p>The RTI team will review data weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.</p>	<p>Formative: FAIR, Basal Weekly Assessments, and ILS reports from Riverdeep, iStation, and FCAT Explorer.</p> <p>Summative: 2012 Benchmark Assessment and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test</p>

		Application skills.			
3	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading and 2011 Benchmark Assessment Test was in the area of Literary Analysis.	<p>Emphasize school-wide reading programs such as Daily 5, Book It!, Daily Reading Logs.</p> <p>Implement Book Talks that utilize Buzz About It books.</p> <p>Provide additional support for AIP students such as Reading Pull-out, After School Tutorials and Double Dosing using intervention skills.</p> <p>Use ILS such as Riverdeep, Istation, and FCAT Explorer.</p> <p>Provide Differentiated Instruction through small group activities that emphasize Literary Analysis skills.</p>	Administrators, Reading Coach, Classroom Teachers	<p>Following the FCIM model, the reading coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.</p> <p>The RTI team will review data weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.</p>	<p>Formative: FAIR, Basal Weekly Assessments, and ILS reports from Riverdeep, iStation, and FCAT Explorer.</p> <p>Summative: 2012 Benchmark Assessment and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test</p>
4	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2011 administration of the Benchmark Assessment Test in Reading was in the area of Vocabulary.	<p>Emphasize school-wide reading programs such as Daily 5, Book It!, Daily Reading Logs.</p> <p>Provide additional support for AIP students such as Reading Pull-out, After School Tutorials and Double Dosing using intervention skills.</p> <p>Implement a school-wide vocabulary development program.</p> <p>Use ILS such as Riverdeep, Istation, and FCAT Explorer.</p> <p>Provide Differentiated Instruction through small group activities that emphasize Vocabulary skills.</p>	Administrators, Reading Coach, Classroom Teachers	<p>Following the FCIM model, the reading coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.</p> <p>The RTI team will review data weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.</p>	<p>Formative: FAIR, Basal Weekly Assessments, and ILS reports from Riverdeep, iStation, and FCAT Explorer.</p> <p>Summative: 2012 Benchmark Assessment and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test</p>

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:	The results of the 2012 Florida Alternative Assessment indicated that 29% of students made learning gains in reading.  Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains 14 percentage points to 53%.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
29% (8)	40% (9)			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of	Evaluation Tool

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading and 2011 Benchmark Assessment Test was in the area of Literary Analysis.	<p>Emphasize school-wide reading programs such as Daily 5, Book It!, Daily Reading Logs.</p> <p>Provide additional support for AIP students such as Reading Pull-out, After School Tutorials and Double Dosing using intervention skills.</p> <p>Use ILS such as Riverdeep, Istation, and FCAT Explorer.</p> <p>Provide Differentiated Instruction through small group activities that emphasize Reading Application skills.</p>	Administrators, Reading Coach, Classroom Teachers	<p>Following the FCIM model, the reading coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.</p> <p>The RTI team will review data weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.</p>	<p>Formative: FAIR, Basal Weekly Assessments, and ILS reports from Riverdeep, iStation, and FCAT Explorer.</p> <p>Summative: 2012 Benchmark Assessment and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test</p>
2	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading and 2011 Benchmark Assessment Test was in the area of Literary Analysis.	<p>Emphasize school-wide reading programs such as Daily 5, Book It!, Daily Reading Logs.</p> <p>Implement Book Talks that utilize Buzz About It books.</p> <p>Provide additional support for AIP students such as Reading Pull-out, After School Tutorials and Double Dosing using intervention skills.</p> <p>Use ILS such as Riverdeep, Istation, and FCAT Explorer.</p> <p>Provide Differentiated Instruction through small group activities that emphasize Literary Analysis skills</p>	Administrators, Reading Coach, Classroom Teachers	<p>Following the FCIM model, the reading coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.</p> <p>The RTI team will review data weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.</p>	<p>Formative: FAIR, Basal Weekly Assessments, and ILS reports from Riverdeep, iStation, and FCAT Explorer.</p> <p>Summative: 2012 Benchmark Assessment and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test</p>
3	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2011 administration of the Benchmark Assessment Test in Reading was in the area of Vocabulary.	<p>Emphasize school-wide reading programs such as Daily 5, Book It!, Daily Reading Logs.</p> <p>Provide additional support for AIP students such as Reading Pull-out, After School Tutorials and Double Dosing using intervention skills.</p> <p>Implement a school-wide vocabulary development program.</p> <p>Use ILS such as Riverdeep, Istation, and FCAT Explorer.</p> <p>Provide Differentiated Instruction through small group activities that emphasize Vocabulary skills.</p>	Administrators, Reading Coach, Classroom Teachers	<p>Following the FCIM model, the reading coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.</p> <p>The RTI team will review data weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.</p>	<p>Formative: FAIR, Basal Weekly Assessments, and ILS reports from Riverdeep, iStation, and FCAT Explorer.</p> <p>Summative: 2012 Benchmark Assessment and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test</p>

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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment indicated that 85% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading.  Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains 3 percentage points to 88%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
85% (66)	88% (66)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Budget cuts will be the biggest barrier	Students will receive a double dose of instruction in their area of need. In addition, they will have the opportunity to participate in an after school tutorial program.	Curriculum Specialist	Assessments will be given to monitor progress.	Mini BATs, formal and informal assessments
2	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading and 2011 Benchmark Assessment Test was in the area of Literary Analysis.	Emphasize school-wide reading programs such as Daily 5, Book It!, Daily Reading Logs.  Provide additional support for AIP students such as Reading Pull-out, After School Tutorials and Double Dosing using intervention skills.  Use ILS such as Riverdeep, Istation, and FCAT Explorer.  Provide Differentiated Instruction through small group activities that emphasize Reading Application skills.	Administrators, Reading Coach, Classroom Teachers	Following the FCIM model, the reading coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.  The RTI team will review data weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.	Formative: FAIR, Basal Weekly Assessments, and ILS reports from Riverdeep, iStation, and FCAT Explorer.  Summative: 2012 Benchmark Assessment and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test
3	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading and 2011 Benchmark Assessment Test was in the area of Literary Analysis.	Emphasize school-wide reading programs such as Daily 5, Book It!, Daily Reading Logs.  Implement Book Talks that utilize Buzz About It books.  Provide additional support for AIP students such as Reading Pull-out, After School Tutorials and Double Dosing using intervention skills.  Use ILS such as Riverdeep, Istation, and FCAT Explorer.  Provide Differentiated Instruction through small group activities that emphasize Literary Analysis skills.	Administrators, Reading Coach, Classroom Teachers	Following the FCIM model, the reading coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.  The RTI team will review data weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.	Formative: FAIR, Basal Weekly Assessments, and ILS reports from Riverdeep, iStation, and FCAT Explorer.  Summative: 2012 Benchmark Assessment and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test
	An area of deficiency as	Emphasize school-wide	Administrators,	Following the FCIM	Formative:

4	noted on the 2011 administration of the Benchmark Assessment Test in Reading was in the area of Vocabulary.	<p>reading programs such as Daily 5, Book It!, Daily Reading Logs.</p> <p>Provide additional support for AIP students such as Reading Pull-out, After School Tutorials and Double Dosing using intervention skills.</p> <p>Implement a school-wide vocabulary development program.</p> <p>Use ILS such as Riverdeep, Istation, and FCAT Explorer.</p> <p>Provide Differentiated Instruction through small group activities that emphasize Vocabulary skills.</p>	Reading Coach, Classroom Teachers	<p>model, the reading coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.</p> <p>The RTI team will review data weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.</p>	<p>FAIR, Basal Weekly Assessments, and ILS reports from Riverdeep, iStation, and FCAT Explorer.</p> <p>Summative: 2012 Benchmark Assessment and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test</p>
---	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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 # The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment indicated that 56% of ELL did not make satisfactory progress in reading. 5A :					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	Emphasize sch	Emphasize sch	Emphasize sch	Emphasize sch	Emphasize sch	

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:	NA				
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
NA	NA				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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:

The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment
-----------------------------------------------------

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.  Reading Goal #5C:	indicated that 56% of ELL did not make satisfactory progress in reading.  Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of ELL students making satisfactory progress by 4 percentage points to 60%
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

56% (25)	60% (25)
----------	----------

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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
2	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading and 2011 Benchmark Assessment Test was in the area of Reading Application.	<p>Emphasize school-wide reading programs such as Daily 5, Book It!, Daily Reading Logs.</p> <p>Provide additional support for ELL students such as ESOL Bilingual Teacher Assist Push-in Model and Double Dosing using intervention skills.</p> <p>Use ILS such as Riverdeep, Istation, and FCAT Explorer.</p> <p>Provide Differentiated Instruction through small group activities that emphasize Reading Application skills.</p>	Administrators, Reading Coach, Classroom Teachers	<p>Following the FCIM model, the reading coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.</p> <p>The RTI team will review data weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.</p>	<p>Formative: FAIR, Basal Weekly Assessments, and ILS reports from Riverdeep, iStation, and FCAT Explorer.</p> <p>Summative: 2012 Benchmark Assessment and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test</p>
3	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading and 2011 Benchmark Assessment Test was in the area of Literary Analysis.	<p>Emphasize school-wide reading programs such as Daily 5, Book It!, Daily Reading Logs.</p> <p>Implement Book Talks that utilize Buzz About It books.</p> <p>Provide additional support for ELL students such as ESOL Bilingual Teacher Assist Push-in Model and Double Dosing using intervention skills.</p> <p>Use ILS such as Riverdeep, Istation, and FCAT Explorer.</p> <p>Provide Differentiated Instruction through small group activities that emphasize Literary Analysis skills.</p>	Administrators, Reading Coach, Classroom Teachers	<p>Following the FCIM model, the reading coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.</p> <p>The RTI team will review data weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.</p>	<p>Formative: FAIR, Basal Weekly Assessments, and ILS reports from Riverdeep, iStation, and FCAT Explorer.</p> <p>Summative: 2012 Benchmark Assessment and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test</p>
	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2011 administration of the Benchmark Assessment Test in Reading was in the area of Vocabulary.	<p>Emphasize school-wide reading programs such as Daily 5, Book It!, Daily Reading Logs.</p> <p>Provide additional support</p>	Administrators, Reading Coach, Classroom Teachers	Following the FCIM model, the reading coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: FAIR, Basal Weekly Assessments, and ILS reports from Riverdeep, iStation, and FCAT

4	<p>for ELL students such as ESOL Bilingual Teacher Assist Push-in Model and Double Dosing using intervention skills.</p> <p>Implement a school-wide vocabulary development program.</p> <p>Use ILS such as Riverdeep, Istation, and FCAT Explorer.</p> <p>Provide Differentiated Instruction through small group activities that emphasize Vocabulary skills.</p>	<p>The RTI team will review data weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.</p>	<p>Explorer.</p> <p>Summative: 2012 Benchmark Assessment and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test</p>
---	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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.		NA			
Reading Goal #5D:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
NA		NA			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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.		NA			
Reading Goal #5E:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
NA		NA			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA



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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core Vocabulary Acquisition and Use	K-5	Stephanie Baumann	School-wide	Early Release/Workday	Develop and implement a lesson using Common Core Standards.	Reading Coach
Implementing Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy	K-5	Marcia Martin	School-wide	Early Release/Workday	Develop and implement a lesson using Common Core Standards.	Reading Coach
Common Core Craft and Structure of Literature and Informational Text	K-5	Stephanie Baumann	School-wide	Early Release/Workday	Develop and implement a lesson using Common Core Standards.	Reading Coach

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

# Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	The results of the 2012 CELLA Assessment indicated that 61% of students scored proficient in listening/speaking.  Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring proficient 3 percentage points to 64%.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:

61% (131)

## 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	The area of deficiency is the ability to speak and understand the English language.	<p>Emphasize school-wide reading programs such as Daily 5, Book It!, Daily Reading Logs.</p> <p>Provide additional support for ELL students such as ESOL Bilingual Teacher Assist Push-in Model and Double Dosing using intervention skills.</p> <p>Use ILS such as Riverdeep and Istation.</p> <p>Provide Differentiated Instruction through small group activities that emphasize Reading Application skills.</p>	Administrators, Reading Coach, Classroom Teachers	<p>Following the FCIM model, the reading coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.</p> <p>The RTI team will review data weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.</p>	<p>Formative: FAIR, Basal Weekly Assessments, and ILS reports from Riverdeep and iStation</p> <p>Summative: 2013 CELLA Assessment</p>

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:	The results of the 2012 CELLA Assessment indicated that 50% of students scored proficient in reading.  Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring proficient 3 percentage points to 53%.
--------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

50% (131)

## 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
	The area of deficiency	Emphasize school-wide	Administrators,	Following the FCIM	Formative:

1	is the ability to speak and understand the English language.	reading programs such as Daily 5, Book It!, Daily Reading Logs.  Provide additional support for ELL students such as ESOL Bilingual Teacher Assist Push-in Model and Double Dosing using intervention skills.  Use ILS such as Riverdeep and Istation.  Provide Differentiated Instruction through small group activities that emphasize Reading Application skills.	Reading Coach, Classroom Teachers	model, the reading coach and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.  The RTI team will review data weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.	FAIR, Basal Weekly Assessments, and ILS reports from Riverdeep and IStation  Summative: 2013 CELLA Assessment
---	--------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.  CELLA Goal #3:	The results of the 2012 CELLA Assessment indicated that 44% of students scored proficient in writing.  Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students scoring proficient 3 percentage points to 47%.
------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

44% (131)

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	The area of deficiency is the ability to speak and understand the English language.	Implement a school-wide daily writing program that focuses on convention skills.  Teachers will model the writing process utilizing the 6 Traits of Writing.	Administrators and classroom teachers.	Following the FCIM model and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: In-house Writing Prompts/Projects  Summative: CELLA Assessment

CELLA Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00

Subtotal: \$0.00

**Professional Development**

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00

**Other**

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics assessment indicated that 23% of students achieved proficiency (Level 3).  Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving (Level 3) by 2 percentage points to 25%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
23% (499)	25% (542)

## Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was in the area of Number: Operations and Problems.	Use ILS such as Soar to Success, Riverdeep and FCAT Explorer.  Teachers will integrate Go Math online tools into their daily instruction.  Provide Differentiated Instruction through small group activities including the use of manipulatives that emphasize Number: Operations and Problems skills.	Administrators and classroom teachers.	Following the FCIM model, teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Go Math Assessments, and ILS reports from Soar to Success, Riverdeep and FCAT Explorer.  Summative: 2012 Benchmark Assessment and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test
2	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was in the area of Number: Base Ten and Fractions.	Use ILS such as Soar to Success, Riverdeep and FCAT Explorer.  Teachers will integrate Go Math online tools into their daily instruction.  Provide Differentiated Instruction through small group activities including the use of manipulatives that emphasize Number: Base Ten and Fractions skills.	Administrators and classroom teachers.	Following the FCIM model, teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Go Math Assessments, and ILS reports from Soar to Success, Riverdeep and FCAT Explorer.  Summative: 2012 Benchmark Assessment and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test

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 results of the 2012 Florida Alternative Mathematics Assessment indicated that 63% of students achieved proficiency (Level 4, 5 and 6).  Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving (Level 4, 5 and 6) by 13 percentage points to 76%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

63% (8)			74% (9)		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was in the area of Number: Operations and Problems.	Use ILS such as Soar to Success, Riverdeep and FCAT Explorer.  Teachers will integrate Go Math online tools into their daily instruction.  Provide Differentiated Instruction through small group activities including the use of manipulatives that emphasize Number: Operations and Problems skills.	Administrators and classroom teachers.	Following the FCIM model, teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Go Math Assessments, and ILS reports from Soar to Success, Riverdeep and FCAT Explorer.  Summative: 2012 Benchmark Assessment and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test
2	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was in the area of Number: Base Ten and Fractions.	Use ILS such as Soar to Success, Riverdeep and FCAT Explorer.  Teachers will integrate Go Math online tools into their daily instruction.  Provide Differentiated Instruction through small group activities including the use of manipulatives that emphasize Number: Base Ten and Fractions skills.	Administrators and classroom teachers.	Following the FCIM model, teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Go Math Assessments, and ILS reports from Soar to Success, Riverdeep and FCAT Explorer.  Summative: 2012 Benchmark Assessment and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test

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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment indicated that 64% of students achieved proficiency (At or above Level 4).  Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving (At or above Level 4) by 3 percentage points to 67%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
64% (499)	67% (542)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was in the area of Number: Operations and Problems.	Use ILS such as Soar to Success, Riverdeep and FCAT Explorer.  Teachers will integrate Go Math online tools into their daily instruction.  Provide Differentiated	Administrators and classroom teachers.	Following the FCIM model, teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Go Math Assessments, and ILS reports from Soar to Success, Riverdeep and FCAT Explorer.  Summative:

		Instruction through small group activities including the use of manipulatives that emphasize Number: Operations and Problems skills.			2012 Benchmark Assessment and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test
2	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was in the area of Number: Base Ten and Fractions.	Use ILS such as Soar to Success, Riverdeep and FCAT Explorer.  Teachers will integrate Go Math online tools into their daily instruction.  Provide Differentiated Instruction through small group activities including the use of manipulatives that emphasize Number: Base Ten and Fractions skills.	Administrators and classroom teachers.	Following the FCIM model, teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Go Math Assessments, and ILS reports from Soar to Success, Riverdeep and FCAT Explorer.  Summative: 2012 Benchmark Assessment and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test

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 results of the 2012 Florida Alternative Mathematics Assessment indicated that 0% of students achieved proficiency (At or above Level 7)  Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is maintain our current level of performance.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (8)	11% (9)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was in the area of Number: Operations and Problems.	Use ILS such as Soar to Success, Riverdeep and FCAT Explorer.  Teachers will integrate Go Math online tools into their daily instruction.  Provide Differentiated Instruction through small group activities including the use of manipulatives that emphasize Number: Operations and Problems skills.	Administrators and classroom teachers.	Following the FCIM model, teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Go Math Assessments, and ILS reports from Soar to Success, Riverdeep and FCAT Explorer.  Summative: 2012 Benchmark Assessment and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test
2	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was in the area of Number: Base Ten and Fractions.	Use ILS such as Soar to Success, Riverdeep and FCAT Explorer.  Teachers will integrate Go Math online tools into their daily instruction.  Provide Differentiated Instruction through small group activities including the use of manipulatives that emphasize Number: Base Ten and Fractions	Administrators and classroom teachers.	Following the FCIM model, teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Go Math Assessments, and ILS reports from Soar to Success, Riverdeep and FCAT Explorer.  Summative: 2012 Benchmark Assessment and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test

skills.

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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment indicated that 82% of students made learning gains in Mathematics.  Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains 3 percentage points to 85%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
82%(327)	85% (358)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was in the area of Number: Operations and Problems.	Use ILS such as Soar to Success, Riverdeep and FCAT Explorer.  Provide additional support for AIP students After School Tutorials and Double Dosing using intervention skills.  Teachers will integrate Go Math online tools into their daily instruction.  Provide Differentiated Instruction through small group activities including the use of manipulatives that emphasize Number: Operations and Problems skills.	Administrators and classroom teachers.	Following the FCIM model, teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.  The RTI team will review data weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.	Formative: Go Math Assessments, and ILS reports from Soar to Success, Riverdeep and FCAT Explorer.  Summative: 2012 Benchmark Assessment and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test
2	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was in the area of Number: Base Ten and Fractions.	Use ILS such as Soar to Success, Riverdeep and FCAT Explorer.  Provide additional support for AIP students After School Tutorials and Double Dosing using intervention skills.  Teachers will integrate Go Math online tools into their daily instruction.  Provide Differentiated Instruction through small group activities including the use of manipulatives that emphasize Number: Base Ten and Fractions skills.	Administrators and classroom teachers.	Following the FCIM model, teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.  The RTI team will review data weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.	Formative: Go Math Assessments, and ILS reports from Soar to Success, Riverdeep and FCAT Explorer.  Summative: 2012 Benchmark Assessment and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test

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 results of the 2012 Florida Alternative Mathematics Assessment indicated that 29% of students made learning gains in mathematics.  Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains 14 percentage points to 43%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29%(8)	40% (9)

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was in the area of Number: Operations and Problems.	Use ILS such as Soar to Success, Riverdeep and FCAT Explorer.  Provide additional support for AIP students After School Tutorials and Double Dosing using intervention skills.  Teachers will integrate Go Math online tools into their daily instruction.  Provide Differentiated Instruction through small group activities including the use of manipulatives that emphasize Number: Operations and Problems skills.	Administrators and classroom teachers.	Following the FCIM model, teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.  The RTI team will review data weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.	Formative: Go Math Assessments, and ILS reports from Soar to Success, Riverdeep and FCAT Explorer.  Summative: 2012 Benchmark Assessment and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test
2	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was in the area of Number: Base Ten and Fractions.	Use ILS such as Soar to Success, Riverdeep and FCAT Explorer.  Provide additional support for AIP students After School Tutorials and Double Dosing using intervention skills.  Teachers will integrate Go Math online tools into their daily instruction.  Provide Differentiated Instruction through small group activities including the use of manipulatives that emphasize Number: Base Ten and Fractions skills.	Administrators and classroom teachers.	Following the FCIM model, teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.  The RTI team will review data weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.	Formative: Go Math Assessments, and ILS reports from Soar to Success, Riverdeep and FCAT Explorer.  Summative: 2012 Benchmark Assessment and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test

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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment indicated that 85% of students made learning gains in mathematics.  Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students making learning gains 3 percentage points to 88%.
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
85%(66)	87% (66)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was in the area of Number: Operations and Problems.	Use ILS such as Soar to Success, Riverdeep and FCAT Explorer.  Provide additional support for AIP students After School Tutorials and Double Dosing using intervention skills.  Teachers will integrate Go Math online tools into their daily instruction.  Provide Differentiated Instruction through small group activities including the use of manipulatives that emphasize Number: Operations and Problems skills.	Administrators and classroom teachers.	Following the FCIM model, teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.  The RTI team will review data weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.	Formative: Go Math Assessments, and ILS reports from Soar to Success, Riverdeep and FCAT Explorer.  Summative: 2012 Benchmark Assessment and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test
2	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was in the area of Number: Base Ten and Fractions.	Use ILS such as Soar to Success, Riverdeep and FCAT Explorer.  Provide additional support for AIP students After School Tutorials and Double Dosing using intervention skills.  Teachers will integrate Go Math online tools into their daily instruction.  Provide Differentiated Instruction through small group activities including the use of manipulatives that emphasize Number: Base Ten	Administrators and classroom teachers.	Following the FCIM model, teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.  The RTI team will review data weekly and make recommendations based on needs assessment.	Formative: Go Math Assessments, and ILS reports from Soar to Success, Riverdeep and FCAT Explorer.  Summative: 2012 Benchmark Assessment and 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test

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 # N/A				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	

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:		NA			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
NA		NA			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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:		NA			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
NA		NA			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #5D:		NA			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
NA		NA			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
---	----	----	----	----	----

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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
Integrating Online Teacher Tools	K-5	Susan Hines	School-wide	Early Release/Workday	Develop and implement a lesson using online teacher tools.	Reading Coach
Implementing Common Core Across the Content	K-5	Susan Hines	School-wide	Early Release/Workday	Develop and implement a lesson using Common Core Standards.	Reading Coach

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00

			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

*End of Mathematics Goals*

## Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.		The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science assessment indicated that 40% of students achieved proficiency (Level 3).			
Science Goal #1a:		Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving (Level 3) by 3 percentage points to 43%.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
40% (178)		43% (193)			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Science Test was in the area of Earth and Space.	Implement a hands-on Science Lab taught by our Science Specialist.  Teachers will integrate Florida Science Fusion Digital Lessons and Labs into their Daily Curriculum.  Review on previous grades skills through mini benchmark assessments.  Students will participate in Science based field trips.	Administrators, Science Specialist and classroom teachers.	Following the FCIM model, Science Specialist and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.	Following the FCIM model, Science Specialist and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.  Formative: Florida Science Fusion Assessments and ILS reports from FCAT Explorer.  Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Test
	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Science Test was in the area of Physical Science.	Implement a hands-on Science Lab taught by our Science Specialist.  Teachers will integrate Florida Science Fusion Digital Lessons and Labs into their Daily	Administrators, Science Specialist and classroom teachers.	Following the FCIM model, Science Specialist and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Florida Science Fusion Assessments and ILS reports from FCAT Explorer.  Summative:

2	Curriculum.  Review on previous grades skills through mini benchmark assessments.  Students will participate in Science based field trips.			2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Test
---	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--	----------------------------

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 results of the 2012 Florida Alternative Science Assessment indicated that 67% of students achieved proficiency (Level 4, 5 and 6).  Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain our current level of performance.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
67% (3)	67% (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	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Science Test was in the area of Earth and Space.	Implement a hands-on Science Lab taught by our Science Specialist.  Teachers will integrate Florida Science Fusion Digital Lessons and Labs into their Daily Curriculum.  Review on previous grades skills through mini benchmark assessments.  Students will participate in Science based field trips.	Administrators, Science Specialist and classroom teachers.	Following the FCIM model, Science Specialist and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Florida Science Fusion Assessments and ILS reports from FCAT Explorer.  Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Test
2	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Science Test was in the area of Physical Science.	Implement a hands-on Science Lab taught by our Science Specialist.  Teachers will integrate Florida Science Fusion Digital Lessons and Labs into their Daily Curriculum.  Review on previous grades skills through mini benchmark assessments.  Students will participate in Science based field trips.	Administrators, Science Specialist and classroom teachers.	Following the FCIM model, Science Specialist and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Florida Science Fusion Assessments and ILS reports from FCAT Explorer.  Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Test

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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science assessment indicated that 41% of students achieved proficiency (At or above Level 4).  Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving (At or above Level 4)) by 3 percentage points to 44%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41% (178)	44% (193)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Science Test was in the area of Earth and Space.	Implement a hands-on Science Lab taught by our Science Specialist.  Teachers will integrate Florida Science Fusion Digital Lessons and Labs into their Daily Curriculum.  Review on previous grades skills through mini benchmark assessments.  Students will participate in Science based field trips.	Administrators, Science Specialist and classroom teachers.	Following the FCIM model, Science Specialist and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Florida Science Fusion Assessments and ILS reports from FCAT Explorer.  Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Test
2	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Science Test was in the area of Physical Science.	Implement a hands-on Science Lab taught by our Science Specialist.  Teachers will integrate Florida Science Fusion Digital Lessons and Labs into their Daily Curriculum.  Review on previous grades skills through mini benchmark assessments.  Students will participate in Science based field trips.	Administrators, Science Specialist and classroom teachers.	Following the FCIM model, Science Specialist and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Florida Science Fusion Assessments and ILS reports from FCAT Explorer.  Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Test

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 results of the 2012 Florida Alternative Science Assessment indicated that 0% of students achieved proficiency (At or above Level 7).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (3)	0% (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	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Science Test was in the area of Earth and Space.	Implement a hands-on Science Lab taught by our Science Specialist. Teachers will integrate Florida Science Fusion Digital Lessons and Labs into their Daily Curriculum.  Review on previous grades skills through mini benchmark assessments.  Students will participate in Science based field trips.	Administrators, Science Specialist and classroom teachers.	Following the FCIM model, Science Specialist and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Florida Science Fusion Assessments and ILS reports from FCAT Explorer.  Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Test
2	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Science Test was in the area of Physical Science.	Implement a hands-on Science Lab taught by our Science Specialist. Teachers will integrate Florida Science Fusion Digital Lessons and Labs into their Daily Curriculum.  Review on previous grades skills through mini benchmark assessments.  Students will participate in Science based field trips.	Administrators, Science Specialist and classroom teachers.	Following the FCIM model, Science Specialist and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: Florida Science Fusion Assessments and ILS reports from FCAT Explorer.  Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Test

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
Integrating Online Teacher Tools	K-5	Susan Hines	School-wide	Early Release/Workdays	Develop and implement a lesson using online teacher tools.	Reading Coach
Implementing Common Core Across the Content	K-5	Susan Hines	School-wide	Early Release/Workdays	Develop and implement a lesson using Common Core Standards.	Reading Coach

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)



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

End of 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:	The results of the 2012 FCAT Writing assessment indicated that 98% of students achieved proficiency (At or above Level  Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to maintain our current level of performance.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
98% (172)	98% (165)

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Writing Test was in the area of conventions.	Implement a school-wide daily writing program that focuses on convention skills.  Teachers will model the writing process utilizing the 6 Traits of Writing.  Fourth grade teachers will conduct an in-school writing camp during January and February.	Administrators and classroom teachers.	Following the FCIM model and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.	Formative: In-house Writing Prompts  Summative: 2013 FCAT Writing Test

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:	N/A				
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
N/A	N/A				
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	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core Conventions of Standard English/All Faculty	K-5	Shari Fuhrman	School-wide	Early Release/Workdays	Develop and implement a lesson using Common Core Standards.	Reading Coach

Writing Budget:

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

## Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	During the 2011-2012 school year 95.9% of student attended school regularly.  Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students 1.1 percentage points to 97%.				
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:				
95.9%	97%				
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)				
4	2				
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)				
96	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	Language and culture are barriers due to the high ESOL population.	To instill the importance of attending school daily. Calling when students are absent. Sending letters in various languages.	Classroom Teachers	Check attendance records	Observations

## 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
Pinnacle	K-5	Susan Hines	School-wide	Workday	Attendance completed using Pinnacle.	Jayne Terramoccia

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:	NA
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
0	0
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
0	0
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
0	0
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
0	0
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	None	Implement school-wide discipline plan.	Classroom Teacher	List of students in detention.	DWH report
2	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

1. Parent Involvement

Parent Involvement Goal # 1:

*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.		N/A			
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:		2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:			
N/A		N/A			
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	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

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

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

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

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

## 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:		Based on school data, students in Grade 5 are weak in problem solving and research skills. Our goal is to improve these skills in Grade 5 students through the use of the STEM curriculum.			
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	Areas of deficiency as noted on school data was problem solving and research skills.	Teachers in Grade 5 will implement lessons using the STEM Curriculum.  Students will attend a hands-on science lab.  Students will conduct research projects during Media.	Administrators, Classroom Teachers, Media Specialist, and Science Specialist	Following the FCIM model, Science Specialist and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.	Portfolios and rubric assessments of student projects.
2	Teachers are at the beginning stages of integrating Common Core Standards into the daily curriculum.	Teachers will attend staff developments.	Classroom Teachers, Media Specialist, and Science Specialist	Following the FCIM model, Science Specialist and teachers will review assessment data weekly and adjust instruction as needed.	Teachers will develop and implement lessons using the STEM curriculum.

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core	5	Stephanie Baumann	Grade 5 Team	Team Meetings	Teachers will develop and implement lessons using the STEM curriculum.	Administrator
STEM	5	Stephanie Baumenn	Grade 5	Team Meetings	Teachers will develop and implement lessons using the STEM curriculum.	Administrator

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				\$0.00
CELLA				\$0.00
Mathematics				\$0.00
Science	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
Writing	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
Attendance	No data	No data	No data	\$0.00
Suspension	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
Parent Involvement	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
STEM	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading				\$0.00
CELLA				\$0.00
Mathematics				\$0.00
Science	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
Writing	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
Attendance	No data	No data	No data	\$0.00
Suspension	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
Parent Involvement	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
STEM	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading				\$0.00
CELLA				\$0.00
Mathematics				\$0.00
Science	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
Writing	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
Attendance	No data	No data	No data	\$0.00
Suspension	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
Parent Involvement	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
STEM	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading				\$0.00
CELLA				\$0.00
Mathematics				\$0.00
Science	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
Writing	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
Attendance	No data	No data	No data	\$0.00
Suspension	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
Parent Involvement	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
STEM	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
				Grand Total: \$0.00

# Differentiated Accountability

## School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school:  Yes  No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/19/2012)

## School Advisory Council

### School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
The School Advisory Council will meet to discuss the following: Roles and responsibilities, A+ Money, School Improvement Plan, Accountability Money, Technology	\$5,000.00

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

# AYP DATA

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

## SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Broward School District EVERGLADES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	94%	97%	100%	79%	370	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	76%	78%			154	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?	74% (YES)	87% (YES)			161	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					685	
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 EVERGLADES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	93%	94%	97%	74%	358	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	78%	74%			152	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	67% (YES)	70% (YES)			137	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					647	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested