FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: C. ROBERT MARKHAM ELEMENTARY

District Name: Broward

Principal: Thaddeus E. Smith, Jr.

SAC Chair: Eyvonda Cooper-Moye, Chairperson

Superintendent: Robert Runcie

Date of School Board Approval: 12/4/2012

Last Modified on: 10/31/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Thaddeus E. Smith, Jr	BA- Bethune Cookman University Elementary Education (1-6) MS- Educational Leadership	2	6	C. Robert Markham Elementary, Principal 2011-2012 School Grade: C Reading Mastery: 33% Math Mastery: 33% Science Mastery: 23% Writing Mastery: 92% Reading Learning Gains: 57% Math Learning Gains: 41% Reading Lowest 25%: 56% Math Lowest 25%: 44% Castle Hill Elementary, Assistant Principal 2010-2011 School Grade: B Reading Mastery: 56% Math Mastery: 63% Science Mastery: 29% Writing Mastery: 94% Reading Learning Gains: 61% Math Learning Gains: 72% Reading Lowest 25%: 57%

Position	Name	Degree(s)/Certification(s)	# Years at Current School	# Years as Administrator	Prior Performance Record
		Certifications: State of Florida Educational Leadership, and Elementary Education (1-6)			Math Lowest 25%: 74% AYP: 92%; Economically Disadvantaged and Black subgroups did not make AYP in Reading. AYP was met in Math through Safe Harbor Castle Hill Elementary, Assistant Principal 2009-2010 School Grade: C Reading Mastery: 57% Math Mastery: 54% Science Mastery: 21% Writing Mastery: 88% Reading Learning Gains: 61% Math Learning Gains: 63% Reading Lowest 25%: 62% Math Lowest 25%: 65% AYP: 85%; Economically Disadvantaged and Black subgroups did not make AYP in Reading and Math.
Assis Principal	Lina Palacios	BA-St. Thomas Elementary Education (1-6) MS- St Thomas University Educational Leadership Certifications: State of Florida Educational Leadership, Elementary Education (1-6), and ESOL	4	4	C. Robert Markham Elementary, Assistant Principal 2011-2012 School Grade: C Reading Mastery: 33% Math Mastery: 33% Science Mastery: 23% Writing Mastery: 92% Reading Learning Gains: 57% Math Learning Gains: 41% Reading Lowest 25%: 56% Math Lowest 25%: 44% C. Robert Markham Elementary, Assistant Principal 2010-2011 School Grade: B Reading Mastery: 61% Math Mastery: 66% Science Mastery: 39% Writing Mastery: 94% Reading Learning Gains: 66% Math Learning Gains: 68% Reading Lowest 25%: 67% Math Lowest 25%: 50% AYP: 77%; Economically Disadvantaged, English Language Learners, Hispanic, and Black subgroups did not make AYP in Reading. Economically Disadvantaged, English Language Learners, and Hispanics did not make AYP in Math. C. Robert Markham Elementary, Assistant Principal 2009-2010 School Grade: B Reading Mastery: 66% Math Mastery: 63% Science Mastery: 40% Writing Mastery: 88% Reading Learning Gains: 68% Math Learning Gains: 61% Reading Lowest 25%: 53% Math Lowest 25%: 57% AYP: 79%; Economically Disadvantaged, English Language Learners and Black subgroups did not make AYP in Reading and Math.

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)
Writing	Gail Pluchino	National Board Certified (Middle Grades Generalist), Elementary Education, Special	22	8	School Grade 2011-2012: C Writing Mastery: 92% School Grade 2010-2011: B Writing Mastery: 94% All subgroups met Writing AYP.

		Education, Special Education,ESOL endorsement			School Grade 2009-2010: B Writing Mastery: 88% All subgroups met Writing AYP.
Reading	Nicholas Brown	National Board Certified (Middle Grades Generalist), Elementary Education, Reading K-12, Educational Leadership,ESOL and Gifted endorsements	9	1	School Grade 2011-2012: C 5th Grade Reading Teacher Reading Mastery: 32% Reading Learning Gains:57% Reading Lowest 25%: 56% School Grade 2010-2011: B 5th Grade Reading Teacher Reading Mastery: 75% Reading Learning Gains: 78% Reading Lowest 25%: 67% AYP: 77%; Economically Disadvantaged, English Language Learners, Hispanic, and Black subgroups did not make AYP in Reading. School Grade 2009-2010: B 5th Grade Reading Teacher Reading Mastery: 77% Reading Learning Gains: 64% Reading Lowest 25%: 53% AYP: 79%; Economically Disadvantaged, English Language Learners and Black subgroups did not make AYP.
Math	Sandra Ruise	National Board Certified (Literacy Learning),Highly Qualified HOUSSE ElementaryEd., Biology (6-12), Chemistry (6-12).	27	4	School Grade 2011-2012: C Math Mastery: 33% Math Learning Gains: 41% Math Lowest 25%: 44% School Grade 2010-2011: B Math Mastery: 66% Math Learning Gains:68% Math Lowest 25%: 50% AYP: 77%; Economically Disadvantaged, English Language Learners, and Hispanics did not make AYP in Math. School Grade 2009-2010: B Math Mastery: 63% Math Learning Gains: 61% Math Lowest 25%: 57% AYP: 79%; Economically Disadvantaged, English Language Learners and Black subgroups did not make AYP.

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. NESS	Gail Pluchino	On-going throughout the school year	
2	2. New Teacher Buddy	Eileen Higgs, Jeanna Hatcher, Gail Kawas, Eyvonda Cooper-Moye,Trisha Teelucksingh, Sandra Ruise, and Nicholas Brown	On-going throughout the school year	
3	3. Attend monthly professional development meetings	Thaddeus Smith Jr., Lina Palacios	On-going throughout the school year	
4	4. Aspiring Leaders of Tomorrow (ALOT) monthly meetings	Thaddeus Smith Jr., Lina Palacios	On-going throughout the school year	

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
None	All staff was deemed effective pending outcome of students' performance on FCAT and factoring it into final evaluation.

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
40	7.5%(3)	37.5%(15)	20.0%(8)	35.0%(14)	30.0%(12)	92.5%(37)	17.5%(7)	17.5%(7)	87.5%(35)

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
Eileen Higgs	Lori Bardwell	Ms. Lori Bardwell is transferring from another work location. Mentoring by a veteran teacher will ensure that the mentee and thus the students are provided with maximum opportunities for growth and best practices are in place from the first day of school.	Allocation of time for collaborative lesson planning Familiarization of evidence-based best practices Classroom management techniques for primary grade level.
Gail Kawas	Robert Dome	Mr. Dome is transferring from another work location. Mentoring by a veteran teacher will ensure that the mentee and thus the students are provided with maximum opportunities for growth and best practices are in place from the first day of school.	Allocation of time for collaborative lesson planning Familiarization of evidence-based best practices Classroom management techniques for primary grade level.
		Ms. McIntosh is transitioning from Kindergarten to 4th Grade.	

Jeanna Hatcher	Sherronne McIntosh	Mentoring by a veteran teacher will ensure that the mentee and thus the students are provided with maximum opportunities for growth and best practices are in place from the first day of school.	Allocation of time for collaborative lesson planning Familiarization of evidence-based best practices Classroom management techniques for primary grade level.
Nicholas Brown	Rachel Music	Ms. Music is transitioning from 2nd Grade into 4th Grade. Mentoring by a veteran teacher will ensure that the mentee and thus the students are provided with maximum opportunities for growth and best practices are in place from the first day of school.	Allocation of time for collaborative lesson planning Familiarization of evidence-based best practices Classroom management techniques for primary grade level.
Sandra Ruise	Elizabeth Greene	Ms. Greene is transferring from another work location. Mentoring by a veteran teacher will ensure that the mentee and thus the students are provided with maximum opportunities for growth and best practices are in place from the first day of school.	Allocation of time for collaborative lesson planning Familiarization of evidence-based best practices Classroom management techniques for primary grade level.
Eyvonda Cooper-Moye	Marchard Desire Kelly McMahon Andrew Molinari	Ms. Desire is a brand new teacher Ms. McMahon and Mr. Molinari have prior teaching experiences. Mentoring by a veteran teacher will ensure that the mentee and thus the students are provided with maximum opportunities for growth and best practices are in place from the first day of school.	Allocation of time for collaborative lesson planning Familiarization of evidence-based best practices Classroom management techniques for primary grade level.
		Ms. Joesph is a brand new teacher in Kindergarten. Mentoring by	

Trisha Teelucksingh	Martine Joesph	a veteran teacher will ensure that the mentee and thus the students are provided with maximum opportunities for growth and best practices are in place from the first day of school	Allocation of time for collaborative lesson planning Familiarization of evidence-based best practices Classroom management techniques for primary grade level.

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

Services are provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through after-school programs or summer school. The District coordinates with Title II and Title III ensuring staff development needs are provided. Curriculum coaches develop, lead, and evaluate school core content standards and programs; identify and analyze existing literature on scientifically based curriculum and behavior assessment and intervention approaches. They identify systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assist with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for "at-risk" learners; assist in the design and implementation of progress monitoring; data collection and data analysis; participate in the design and delivery of professional development; and provide support for assessment and implementation monitoring. Other components that are integrated into the school-wide program include monthly Parent Trainings, Supplemental Educational Services (SES), and special support services to special needs populations such as homeless, migrant, and neglected and deliquent students. Title 1 funding is also utilized to support teacher salaries, Parental Involvement initiatives through monthly parent trainings, and staff professional development activities.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

The Title 1 Migrant Education allocation supports salaries and provides services to students and parents. The Migrant liaison communicates with Pre-K migrant teachers to ensure that a comprehensive needs assessment of migrant students to ensure that the unique needs of migrant students are being met. Students are also provided extended learning opportunities after school by Title 1, Part C Migrant Education Program.

Title I, Part D

N/A

Title II

The district uses supplemental funds for improving basic education as follows: Training for add-on endorsement programs such as ESOL, Reading and Gifted Education; Training and substitute release time for staff professional development of instructional staff members.

Title III

Title III funds are used to supplement and enhance the programs for English Language Learners (ELL's). Funding also supplements curriculum and implement tutorial programs in reading, math, and science. This tutoring will include in-school small group pullouts, after school camps and Saturday Camp. In addition, parent outreach activities are funded and supplemental instructional materials for students are provided. The outreach activities will include inviting parents to morning and evening meetings to explain report cards, interim progress reports and how to become active participants in their children's education. Supplemental materials and training in their usage will take place. Materials will include vocabulary programs in all content areas.

Title X- Homeless

N/A

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Funding for Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI) is provided as a part of the Florida Education Finance Program (FEEP) allocation for students in Grades 3-5 to receive instruction in both reading and math by a National Board Certified Teacher who is also certified in Drop-Out Prevention.

Violence Prevention Programs

Markham Elementary implements the Kids of Character program school-wide through the Guidance Department. Small groups are recommended and serviced by the school counselor which supports school violence prevention initiatives.

Nutrition Programs

The school adheres to and implements the nutrition requirements as stated in the District Wellness Policy. The School Food Service Program, school breakfast and lunch, aftercare snacks and Saturday Camp Programs follow the Healthy Food and Beverage guidelines as adopted in the District's Wellness Policy. Nutrition education, as per state statue is taught through health education as an interdisciplinary subject.

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

Head Start programs are located in several Title 1 schools and communities. Joint activities including summer professional development and transition processes are shared. Through affiliating agreements, the Summer VPK program is provided at Head Start sites.

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

Job Training

N/A

Other

C.Robert Markham Elementary is a magnet school of computers and high technology. The magnet program addresses the theme of Global Communication. It is school wide. All students are provided with opportunities for the enhancement of skills in science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) though the magnet. Students use technology for research and presentation. The school has a high tech school news studio which beams the morning news to all classrooms daily. There is project based learning which is accomplished through research using the resources provided through the school's media program. This program uses various texts such as divergent and twin to enhance students' critical thinking skills. Students are exposed to careers through research. Students are taken on virtual field trips via the technology. Students participate in interactive instruction via the technology used in C. Robert Markham's smart classrooms. Hands-on Science is taught in the Science classrooms and by the science teacher. Student projects such as building bridges and cars combine mathematics and technology.

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The school based MTSS/RtI Leadership Team consists of the administrators (Principal and Assistant Principal), Teacher of the student referred to the Collaborative Problem Solving (CPS) team, guidance counselor, school psychologist, school social worker, reading coach (for all cases involving reading problems, math coach (for all cases involving math problems).

Supplemental Members: Speech/Language Pathologist, Social Worker, School Psychologist, ESOL contact (when necessary).

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

The RTI Leadership Team meets weekly to discuss struggling students and the implementation of effective intervention strategies. The staff is trained in the role of MTSS/RTI in insuring that all students are rendered services that are prescriptive to their needs. This training is facilitated by Mrs. Lina Palacios, the Assistant Principal during pre-planning. An in-depth knowledge of the role of MTSS/RtI and the flow of the MTSS process is provided during this training. Paperwork is explained

and the need for follow through by staff is emphasized. The members of the MTSS/RtI team are introduced and their roles in the process are also explained. Time is allotted for questions and answers. The Guidance Counselor is the case manager for MTSS/RTI. As the case manager the Guidance Counselor follows up on services provided to teachers such as sharing strategies and techniques to get struggling students to reach the level of proficiency. She schedules meetings and follow-ups for the team on student referrals. And, if needed, she is the first line of contact for parents. The RtI team reviews and analyzes the results of assessments, which will include FAIR, to ensure that instruction is data driven and prescriptive to the needs of the students served. By combining the curriculum and support teams, the plans and strategies implemented for struggling students address the whole child instead of focusing on just academics or just behavior and by looking at grade level results and talking with grade levels in the creation of collaborative plans for struggling students, trends in both behavior and academics can be spotted and dealt with proactively.

The MTSS/RtI Team also schedules weekly meetings with grade levels. If the need arises, individual members of the RtI team will meet with and model lessons for individual teachers. They will focus their meetings around meeting the needs of struggling students.

Data sources used for students on tier 2 and 3 are the intervention records and progress monitoring graphs generated for individual students.

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 role of the MTSS/RTI Leadership Team is to provide input in the decision-making process for all sections of the SIP. The evaluation process entails examining current data and strategies to evaluate the overall effectiveness. The MTSS/RTI Leadership Team is charged with the responsibility of progress monitoring of SIP goals and making recommendations to adjust delivery models within support services.

MTSS Implementation

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

Baseline data: 2012 FCAT Results Data, District Benchmark Assessment Test (September Administration), Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Diagnostic Assessment of Reading (DAR), and Oral Reading Fluency (ORF).

Progress Monitoring data: District Mini-Benchmark Assessments, FAIR (AP1), Go Math! Benchmark Tests, Riverdeep (Smart Tutorials) and iStations.

Mid-year data: District Benchmark Assessment 2 (December Administration), FAIR (AP2), Diagnostic Assessment for Reading (DAR) as needed, FCAT Simulated Assessments,

End of year data: FAIR (AP3), 2013 FCAT results, 2013 Q-BAT results, End of Year Assessments in Reading and Math.

Frequency of Data Days: Bi-weekly for data analysis

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional development on the MTSS process for classroom teachers will be held on August 16, 2012. A technology component will ensure that all teachers can appropriately utilize Excel files and create progress monitoring graphs to record and track student goal progress. Further training will take place in department meetings throughout the school year.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The MTSS/RTI will be supported by administration, instructional coaches, ESE Specialist and the Guidance Counselor to ensure students academic and social needs are being met. Administration and the support team will continuously educate teachers on the MTSS/RTI process in order for them to understand the importance of the process. Ultimately, teachers will refer students in need of the MTSS/RTI and follow through the process until students' needs have been met.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The school-based literacy leadership team is comprised of the Principal, Assistant Principal, Media Specialist, Curriculum

Facilitator, Reading and Math Coaches,ESE Specialist, and teachers. Nicholas Brown is a National Board Certified Teacher (NBCT) and the reading coach. He is able to diagnose reading problems, create prescriptive remediation programs, and implement them. Sandra Ruise is a NBCT and the math resource specialist. She has demonstrated ability in working with students to enhance proficiency levels. Vernita Edmondson is a NBCT and the media specialist. She evaluates and selects reading materials needed to meet both the curricular and individual needs of students and teachers. The guidance counselor and his/her ability to understand all aspects of student development will positively impact student learning. Cherryl Stewart is the ESE specialist. She demonstrates expertise in standards and the legalese of ESE placement, reevaluations, and the creation of IEPs makes her a valuable member of the team. Both the principal and the assistant principal are instructional leaders and facilitators of the LLT.

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

The Literacy Leadership Team(LLT)will meet bi-weekly on Fridays to disaggregate reading data from in house assessments by individual benchmarks and reading categories (I-IV)in kindergarten through grade five. In addition, the LLT will analyze data from district and state assessments such as the Benchmark Assessment Test and the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test. The implementation of lesson plans and goals will be monitored by formal and informal observations by administrators and/or LLT members. These observations include but are not limited to: Classroom Walk-Throughs, Reading Classroom Checklists, and the District's Scale of Effective Practices.

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

The LLT will establish a school-wide Instructional Focus Literary Calendar which will prescribe primary and secondary benchmarks. Each week the primary benchmark will highlight one of the fifteen reading benchmarks. The primary benchmark will revolve in a continuous cycle throughout the year across subject areas. The secondary benchmark will be grade level specific. Each grade level will focus on reading benchmarks which through student results have demonstrated the weakest performance on standardized or formative assessments. During weekly grade level meetings after careful data analysis, teachers will convene to discuss the duration in which the secondary benchmark.

LLT will support teachers in strengthening the implementation during the instructional block. Teachers will align various forms of data with skill based lessons and assessments. During small group instruction, teachers will tailor skill based lessons to be deployed through various activities (Phonemic Awareness/Orthographic Development, Fluency, Word Analysis, Vocabulary, and Comprehension). Students who are identified as English Language Learners (ELL) will be serviced through the Multi-Tiered System of Support (MTSS). These students will be specifically targeted during the literacy block, interventions, and extended learning opportunities. School wide reports will be generated to closely monitor the data to continuously adjust interventions to the specific need.

The LLT will seek to foster literary connections in content area specific and special area classes by hosting read-in's with "celebrity" staff readers for students. Furthermore the LLT will coordinate on-going advertisement of surprise "celebrity" readers with take home book give-aways for students.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
View uploaded file (Uploaded on 9/5/2012)

*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.

The teachers in the preschool program meet with the teachers on the kindergarten team to participate in vertical articulation. The kindergarten teachers provide the preschool teachers with information on the skills that are necessary for the academic and social readiness of students upon entering kindergarten. There is also communication with preschool centers in the surrounding area that provide services to the school community. Parents of the preschool students at Markham and at preschool centers in the surrounding community are invited via flyers, parent link, and school marquee to attend the annual Kindergarten Roundup in the spring. It provides parents with information on shcool readiness skills as well as an question/answer session. Parents also receive pertinent information on approved registration dates and times and personal documents required.

*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.

N/A

*High Schools Only

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

N/A

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?

N/A

Postsecondary Transition

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report

N/A

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:	Data analysis shows that overall 19% (38) of all students in Grades 3-5 scored level 3 on the 2012 administration for FCAT Reading. The analysis of test results demonstrates that the greatest areas of weakness are in the following categories: Vocabulary, Reading Application, and Informational Text/ Research Process.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
Data analysis demonstrates that overall 19% (38) of all students in Grades 3-5 scored level 3 on the 2012 administration for FCAT Reading.	The expected level of performance for the 2013 school year is 40%(79 students) will score level three. This is a 21% (41 more students) increase.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1 Lack of mastery and understanding of informational text/research process.	1.1 Students will be exposed to and utilize real-world documents such as how-to articles, brochures, fliers, newspapers, applications, and websites that use text features to locate, interpret, and organize information.	1.1 Mrs. Lina Palacios (Assistant Principal) Mr. Nicholas Brown (Reading Coach) Ms. Vernita Edmondson (Media Specialist) Cherryl Stewart (ESE Specialist)	1.1 On-going classroom assessments focusing on students' ability to identify, interpret, and organize informational text and text features. Analysis of bi-weekly assessments by grade levels with literacy and RtI teams and grade level teachers.	1.1 Formative: Weekly Mini Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessments
2	1.2 Lack of mastery and understanding of the reading application category.	1.2 Increase direct instruction of reading application benchmarks (main idea, cause and effect, author's purpose) through small and whole group instruction. As well as homework that will target those benchmarks to ensure firm mastery through practice.	1.2 Mrs. Lina Palacios (Assistant Principal) Mr. Nicholas Brown (Reading Coach) Ms. Cherryl Stewart (ESE Specialist)	1.2 Analysis of bi-weekly assessments by grade levels with literacy and RtI teams and grade level teachers. Implementation of a continuous cycle of instruction, assessment, re-teaching/reinforcement and/or enrichment to ensure that teaching is aligned to the prescriptive needs of the students.	1.2 Formative: Weekly Mini Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Asessments
	1.3 Lack of grade and age appropriate vocabulary.	1.3 During small or whole group instruction teachers will focus half the lesson on vocabulary development.Utilizing word walls, leveled readers, and authentic vocabulary development activities daily, which will build students' knowledge of word meaning, relationships, and context clues strategies. 1.3b. Teachers will use a word of the day. This	1.3 Mrs. Lina Palacios (Assistant Principal) Mr. Nicholas Brown (reading Coach) Ms. Cherryl Stewart (ESE Specialist) 1.3b Mrs. Lina Palacios (Assistant Principal) Mr. Nicholas Brown (Reading Coach) Cherryl Stewart (ESE Specialist)	1.3a On-going classroom assessments focusing on students' knowledge of word meanings, word relationships, structural analysis, and context clues. Analysis of bi-weekly assessments by grade levels with literacy and RtI teams and grade level teachers. 1.3b. On-going classroom assessments focusing on	1.3a On-going classroom assessments focusing on students' knowledge of word meanings, word relationships, structural analysis, and context clues. Analysis of bi-weekly assessments by grade levels with literacy and RtI

3		word will be across content areas and incorporated into daily instruction.	LLT	students' knowledge of word meanings, word relationships, structural analysis, and context clues. Analysis of bi-weekly assessments by grade levels with literacy and RtI teams and grade level teachers.	teams and grade level teachers. 1.3b On-going classroom assessments focusing on students' knowledge of word meanings, word relationships, structural analysis, and context clues. Analysis of bi-weekly assessments by grade levels with literacy and RtI teams and grade level teachers.
4	1.4 Lack of adequate capacity building within the site of teachers knowledge in the delivery of reading instruction across the content areas.	1.4 Nicholas Brown will demonstrate model lessons which will be observed by other teachers via classroom visits or the viewing of videotapes of the lessons.	1.4 Administration Reading Coach Nicholas Brown	1.4 A PLC will be created for the purpose of Lesson Studies of the observation or viewing of the videotaped lessons. Analysis and reflection upon the techniques used will occur as a result of the Lesson Study.	1.4 The results of the Lesson Study. Comparison of assessment prior to and after the modeling and Lesson Study.
5	1.5 Students inability to comprehend complex text.	1.5 During whole and small group, students will be exposed to graphic organizers to assist with scaffolding complex text. 1.5b Teachers will be trained on how to use graphic organizer effectively in order to scaffold more complex text.	1.5 Mrs. Lina Palacios (Assistant Principal) Mr. Nicholas Brown (Reading Coach) 1.5b Mr. Nicholas Brown (Reading Coach)	1.5 On-going classroom assessments focusing on students' ability to comprehend more complex text. Analysis of bi-weekly assessments by grade levels with literacy and RtI teams and grade level teachers. 1.5b Classroom walkthroughs and student work samples.	1.5 Formative: Weekly Mini Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Asessments 1.5b Formative: Weekly Mini Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Asessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	Those students taking the alternative assessment scored higher than level 6.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% of those students taking the alternative assessment scored at or above level 7 in reading.	100% of students will continue to score at or above level 7.

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	Overall, the percentage of students scoring levels 4 and 5 on the 2012 FCAT was 13% (27 students). This is a 11% decrease when compared to the number of students scoring level 4 or 5 in 2011. These students have demonstrated mastery of the concepts. Therefore, they will need to be provided with opportunities for enrichment activities.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Overall, the percentage of students scoring levels 4 and 5 on the 2012 FCAT was 13% (27 students).	The expected 2013 level of performance for students scoring level 4 or 5 next year is 15% (30 students).

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1 Teachers not familiar with providing learning opportunities through project based learning as a means of differentiating instruction.	2.1 Teachers will have this strategy modeled and receive training and lesson plans to facilitate its implementation	2.1 Lina Palacios (Assistant Principal) Mr. Nicholas Brown, Reading Coach LLT	2.1 Classroom walk-throughs,Review, grading of final student projects and products analysis of rubrics.	2.1 Formative: Rubrics from Project-Based Assessment. Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessments
2	2.2 Students lack exposure to higher complexity text that will foster higher order thinking skills thus accelerating learning.	2.2 All teachers will be provided with information that will facilitate the use of lexile levels and higher complexity text during their extended planning time. All teachers' classroom libraries will be expanded to include books of higher complexity based on the lexile levels of their students.	2.2 Ms. Lina Palacios, Assistant Principal Mr. Nicholas Brown, Reading Coach LLT	Classroom walkthroughs, review of lesson plans, check of classroom libraries	Formative: Progress monitoring tools for FCAT preparedness and proficiency Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessments

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	100% of the students scored at or above a level 7 in reading
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (2) of the students scored a level 7 on the Florida Alternate Assessment.	100% of students will continue to score at or above level 7.

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	Overall 57% (69) of students made learning gains on the 2012 FCAT. As a result, there was a decrease of 9% from the 2011 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Overall 57% (69) of students made learning gains on the 2012 FCAT.	The expected level of performance for learning gains for the 2013 school year is 66% (80).

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Lack of student participation in extended learning opportunities because of lack of daycare for younger students.</td><td>Render services to these students by providing activities for younger siblings in the classroom.</td><td>Classroom teachers employed for extended day.</td><td>Monitoring of attendance of students.</td><td>Tracking of attendance of students the services have been offered to.</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>Deficiency in age and grade appropriate vocabulary and word analysis skills.</td><td>Increased explicit instruction in vocabulary skills and development, oral reading, instruction in word analysis skills for determining context usage of words,exposure to age and grade appropriate literature.</td><td>Assistant Principal Reading Resource Specialist LLT</td><td>Bi-weekly grade level meetings with team and RtI and Literacy team to analyze scores then use analysis to determine effectiveness of instruction and inform future instruction</td><td>Formative: Bi-weekly assessments, Results of instruction and testing using integrated learning systems.

Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessments</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>Oral reading fluency below grade level expectations.</td><td>During the extended reading hours, the reading interventionist will target students who have deficiencies with reading fluently. The reading interventionist will use Quick Reads to improve students ORF rates.</td><td>Assistant Principal Reading Coach LLT</td><td>Tracking students ORF rates on a weekly basis to determine the effectiveness of program and instruction.</td><td>Formative: Weekly ORF assessments results.

Summative:2013 FCAT Assessments</td></tr>
</table>

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:	100% (1) will continue to make learning gains in reading
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (1) made learning gains in reading	100% (1) will make learning gains in reading on the Florida Alternate Assessment

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	56% (19) of all students scoring in the lowest quartile made learning gains on the 2012 FCAT reading assessment. This is a 11% decrease when compared to the previous year. The weakest areas for these students are one or more of the six components of reading (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, oral language, vocabulary, and comprehension).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
56% (19) of all students scoring in the lowest quartile made learning gains on the 2012 FCAT reading assessment.	The expected level of performance for 2013 Reading FCAT is 64% (21) students. This is an increase of 8% (2 students).

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
---	---	---	---	---	---
1	4.1 Lack of vocabulary development	4.1 All teachers will be refreshed or in-serviced on strategies for teaching vocabulary and phrases in context, school-wide contests on vocabulary and vocabulary usage. The reading resource specialist will model vocabulary lessons and strategies. Also, teachers will share best practices during monthly reading Professional Learning Community meetings.	4.1 Lina Palacios (Assistant Principal) Nicholas Brown (Reading Resource Specialist) LLT	4.1 Continuous cycle of teaching, assessing, reteaching/remediating and/or enrichment	4.1 Formative: Benchmark Assessments, classroom walkthroughs Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessments
2	4.2 Lacking strategies to answer comprehension questions	4.2 - Students will learn how to effectively answer comprehension questions based on the question-answer-relationship strategy (Super QAR)	4.2 Lina Palacios (Assistant Principal) Nicholas Brown (Reading Resource Specialist) LLT	4.2 Utilize assessment data to guide instruction, monitor progress, and reteach comprehension skills/strategies to students who still demonstrate weaknesses.	4.2 Formative: Core Reading Program Intervention Assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessment
3	4.3 Oral reading fluency below grade level expectations	4.3 During the extended reading hours, the reading interventinist will target students who have deficences with reading fluently. The reading interventionist will use Quick Reads to improve students' ORF rates.	4.3 Lina Palacios (Assistant Principal) Nicholas Brown (Reading Resource Specialist) LLT	4.3 Tracking students ORF rates on weekly basis to determine the effectiveness of program and instruction	4.3 Formative: Weekly ORF assessments results Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessments
4	4.4 Deficiencies in word analysis skills	4.4 Teachers will provide students with prescriptive lessons that will target their areas of weakness.	4.4 Lina Palacios (Assistant Principal) Nicholas Brown	4.4 Continuous cycle of teaching, assessing, and reteaching/remediating	Formative: classroom walkthroughs Summative: 2013

		(Reading Resource Specialist) LLT	FCAT Assessments

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 # Students in grades 3-5 will demonstrate an increase of at least 7% annually to reduce the achievement gap by 50% in six years. 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	33%	40%	47%	54%	61%	

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:	71% (110) of Black students were not making satisfactory progress in reading. This was a 22 percentage point decrease from the previous year. 60% (22) of Hispanic students were not making satisfactory progress in reading. This was a 17 percentage points decrease from the previous year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The current level of performance for Black students not making satisfactory progress in reading is 71% (110). The current level of performance for Hispanics students not making satisfactory progress in reading is 60% (22).	The expected level of performance for Black students making progress on the 2013 FCAT is 50% (78). This would be a 21% (32) increase of students making progress. The expected level of performance for Hispanic students making satisfactory progress is 59% (22). This would be a 19%(7) increase of students making progress.

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of support at home for homework.	Provide homework assistance before school.	Curriculum and classroom teachers.	Tracking of attendance. Periodic review of homework assigned to students.	Tracking of homework turned in. Comparison of assessment results of those students attending before school homework assistance program with those not attending.
2	5A.1 Lack of age and grade appropriate vocabulary development	5A.1 Intense direct instruction in vocabulary both in context and isolation, vocabulary drills, lessons on affixes and root words, read alouds and discussions	5A.1 Mrs. Lina Palacios (Assistant Principal) Mr. Nicholas Brown (Reading Resource Specialist)	5A.1 Bi-weekly analysis of benchmark assessments, oral reviews by RtI, Literacy team and grade levels. Continuous cycle of instruction and assessment followed by re-teaching/reinforcement and/or enrichment Analysis and if neccessary changes to instructional focus calendars based on data	5A.1Teacher created and textbook and district Assessments both oral and written

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	67% (36)of the English Language Learners did not make satisfactory progress on FCAT Reading. This was a decrease of 16% from the previous year's proficiency of 49%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The current level of performance for ELL students not making satisfactory progress in reading is 67% (36).	The expected level of performance for the ELL students not making satisfactory progress in 46% (25). This would be a 21% (II students less) increase of students making satisfactory progress.

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Vocabulary not commensurate with grade level.	Use Rosetta Stone, provide explicit direct instruction in vocabulary for all content areas Provide opportunities to use new vocabulary.	Administration, Curriculm	Assessment of reading and writing prompts, problem solving in math	Analysis of assessments, tracking of progress of ELL in reading, math, and writing
2	5B.1 Lack of academic vocabulary	5B.1 Increased use of Realia,visuals, interactive word walls, and audio versions of core literature as a step in background building and as strategies to enhance students' connection to what is read.	5B.1 Lina Palacios (Asst Principal) Nicholas Brown (Reading Resource Specialist) Gail Pluchino (ESOL Specialist) LLT	5B.1 Analysis of assessments by RtI, Literacy Team and grade levels to determine the effectiveness of instruction in the continuous cycle of instruction, assessment and remediation/enrichment	5B.1 Formative: Weekly Benchmark assessments, oral exams, student work samples. Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessments
3	5B.2 Lack of reading comprehension skills due to language barriers	5B.2 Increased the use of before, during, and after reading strategies such as building background knowledge, graphic organizers, note-taking,and summarizing. At the primary levels, ELL students will be provided with instruction in sheltered classes taught by teachers either certified in ESOL or ESOL endorsed to insure effective instruction and learning of age and grade appropriate vocabulary. Instruction in intermediate classes will be delivered by instructors who have obtained the ESOL endorsement to insure effective teaching and learning. Also, staff members fluent in the students' languages and trained to assist are available to help in basic subject area, especially the acquisition of age and grade appropriate vocabulary using effective ESOL strategies and techniques, as well as communication with parents and caregivers.	5B.2 Lina Palacios (Asst Principal) Nicholas Brown (Reading Resource Specialist) Gail Pluchino (ESOL Specialist) LLT	5B.2 Analysis of assessments by RtI, Literacy Team and grade levels to determine the effectiveness of instruction in the continuous cycle of instruction, assessment and remediation/enrichment Analysis of assessments by RtI, Literacy Team and grade levels to determine the effectiveness of instruction in the continuous cycle of instruction, assessment and remediation/enrichment	5B.2 Formative: Weekly Benchmark assessments, oral exams, student work samples. Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessments

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	The current level of performance for students with disabilities not making progress in reading is 87% (20).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The current level of performance for students with disabilities not making progress in reading is 87% (20)	The expected level of performance for students making satisfactory progress on the 2013 FCAT is 52% (12). This will be a 39% (9) increase.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
2	lack of rigor with instructional materials	Teachers will utilize materials that are prescriptive for each students' instructional needs. In addition to exposing students to more rigorous content.	ESE Specialist ESE Teacher Reading Coach	Continuous cycle of instruction and assessment followed by re-teaching/reinforcement and/or enrichment.	Formative: End of Selection assessments and Mini Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessments
3	deficient in comprehension skills	Teachers will use the Super QAR strategies and curriculum to enhance students comprehension skills.	ESE Teacher Reading Coach	Continuous cycle of instruction and assessment followed by re-teaching/reinforcement.	Formative: End of Selection assessments and Mini Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessments

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	The current level of performance of economically students not making satisfactory progress in reading is 67% (130). This is a 14% decrease from the previous year. The greatest area of concerns for these students are vocabulary and reading application.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The current level of performance of economically students not making satisfactory progress in reading is 67% (130).	The expected level of performance for students on the 2013 FCAT is 50% (97).

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Homework support	Before school homework assistance	Curriculum Classroom Teachers	Tracking of attendance and homework turned in. Periodic review of homework assigned to students. Comparison of assessment results of those students attending before school homework assistance program with those not attending.	Formative assessments: Biweekly benchmark assessments. Summative Assessments: FCAT 2013

2	5D.2 Lack of Academic Language Acquisition	5D.2 Content Area reading workshops for all teachers Workshops on teaching content area vocabulary. The reading coach and curriculum speciaslist will model strategies for the content area reading vocabulary words and teachers will share best practices during the monthly subject specific professional learning communities.	5D.2 Reading Coach Curriculum Specialist Assistant Principal	5D.2 Continuous cycle of teaching, assessment, remediation/reteaching/enrichment, analysis of assessment results and sharing of the resultant information with grade levels	5D.2 Teacher made, district level and textbook assessment, student products, oral reviews
3	5D.3 Lack of exposure to grade and age appropriate vocabulary through literature	5D.3 Read A-louds and discussions, practice in determining context usage of words and phrases in grade level literature using the reciprocal teaching method, parent and student awareness of the effect of time spent reading on test scores followed by the sending home of reading books on a consistent basis, parents will be informed by newsletter and the parent link phone network, book reports on books read with incentives given, Accelerated Reader and SuccessMaker as supplemental instruction	5D.3 Reading Coach ESE Specialist Assistant Principal Principal	5D.3 Continuous cycle of teaching, assessment, re-teaching and reinforcement, and enrichment, analysis of assessment results and sharing of resultant information with grade levels to determine effectiveness and revise as needed Grade levels will meet with RtI and Literacy Team for this	5D.3 Weekly benchmark assessments, teacher made, district level and textbook assessments, oral exams
4	5D.4 Lack of mastery and understanding of the reading application category.	5D.4 Increase direct instruction of reading application benchmarks (main idea, cause and effect, author's purpose) through small and whole group instruction. As well as homework that will target those benchmarks to ensure firm mastery through practice.	5D.4 Assistant Principal Reading Coach ESE Specialist LLT	5D. 4 Analysis of bi-weekly assessments by grade levels with literacy and RtI teams and grade level teachers. Implementation of a continuous cycle of instruction, assessment, re-teaching/reinforcement and/or enrichment to ensure that teaching is aligned to the prescriptive needs of the students.	5D.4 Formative: Weekly Mini Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessments

---

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Blended Implementation of the CCSS	Grades 3-5 (Reading)	Nicholas Brown (Reading Coach)	Grades 3-5	Ongoing throughout the school year	Classroom Walkthroughs	Assistant Principal Reading Coach

Reading Benchmark Refresh Trainings	Grades 3-5 (Reading)	Nicholas Brown (Reading Coach)	Grades 3-5	Ongoing throughout the school year	Classroom Walkthroughs Mini Benchmark Assessments	Assistant Principal Reading Coach
Implementation of CCSS	Grades K-2 (Reading)	Nicholas Brown (Reading Coach)	Grades K-2	Ongoing throughout the school year	Classroom Walkthroughs Treasures- Student Performance Task	Assistant Principal Reading Coach

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Super QAR	Train the trainer model, manuals	School's general fund	$1,500.00
			Subtotal: $1,500.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Use of ILS's for re-teaching, reinforcement and enrichment	computers and laptops		$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Vocabulary development strategies	Train the trainer model	General Funds	$400.00
Text Complexity	Train the Trainer model, district materials from Common Core State Standards	Inservice Funds	$400.00
Differentiation of instruction as a preventive measure and a tool for acceleration	Train the Trainer model, district materials from Common Core State Standards	Inservice Funds	$400.00
			Subtotal: $1,200.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $2,700.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	38% (64) students were proficient in listening/speaking on the 2012 CELLA.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
38% (64) students were proficient in listening/speaking on the 2012 CELLA.	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of exposure to academic vocabulary	Students will unwrap the kid friendly benchmarks to provide them with the opportunity to understand exactly what is being asked.	Lina Palacios, Gail Pluchino	Analysis of benchmark assessments	BAT I and BAT II, weekly benchmark assessments
2	Lack of exposure to mathematics language and usage	Students will use the program The Language of Mathematics	Gail Pluchino, Sandra Ruise	Analysis of written responses to question requiring usage of mathematics language to demonstrate understanding	The language of Mathematics workbooks, journals
3	Lack of grade level specific mathematics language usage	Students will use grade test item specifications to develop an understanding of the questions for grade level assessments.	Sandra Ruise	Analysis of responses to test aligned to the grade level item specifications	State's test item spec test, Leadership Test prep for mathematics

---

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:	23% (38) students were proficient in reading on the 2012 CELLA.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

23% (38) students were proficient in reading on the 2012 CELLA.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	18% (30) students were proficient in writing on the 2012 CELLA.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

18% (30) students were proficient in writing on the 2012 CELLA.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	The results of the 2011-2012 Mathematics test indicates that 20% (40) of our students achieved level 3 proficiency. This is a decrease of 18% when compared to the previous year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Data analysis shows that overall 20% (40) students in Grades 3-5 achieved proficiency at level 3 on the 2012 administration for FCAT Mathematics.	40% (80) of all students in Grades 3-5 will achieve proficiency at level 3 on the 2013 Mathematics FCAT.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1 Number Sense: Fluency of multiplication and division facts.	1.1 Provide small group differentiated instruction and daily practice for facts not mastered.	1.1 Administration, Math coach	1.1 Administrative classroom walk-throughs twice per week minimum.	1.1 Walk-through follow-up feedback report.
2	1.2 Deficiencies and gaps in learning from primary to upper grades.	1.2 Identify students in need and provide in-school pull-outs for small group, intensive instruction targeting skills not mastered on benchmark assessments.	1.2 Teachers, math coach, Administration	1.2 Teacher- Math coach articulation, student quizzes following reteach.	1.2 Reteaching assessments, progress monitoring charts

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:	50% (1) of students taking the alternative assessment for math scored at a level 4, 5, or 6.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (1) of students scored at level 4, 5, 6. 50% (1) scored at or above a level 7.	100% of students taking the alternative assessment will score at a level 7 or higher.

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	Not enough time with the Special Education Instructor receiving instruction geared to adaptive needs of students using ESE strategies.	Increase time alloted for math in the students Indiviualized Lesson Plans.	Ms. Cherryl Stewart, ESE Specialist Mrs. Ivy Riggs	Assessment of skills. Analysis of assessments.	Mini Benchmark Assessments.
2	General Education Teachers not fully aware of ESE student needs.	General Education Teachers will meet with ESE specialist to discuss	Ms. Cherryl Stewart, ESE Specialist	Observe teacher directed instruction in differentiated groups.	Mini Benchmark Assessments.

| | IEP's and become familiar with the student needs. | Mrs. Ivy Riggs | Assessment of skills. Analysis of assessments. | |

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	The results of the 2011-2012 Mathematics test indicates that 12%(25) of our students achieved level 4 or 5 proficiency. This indicates a 16% decline in achievement at this level.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Data analysis show that overall 12% (25) students in Grades 3-5 met high standards on the 2012 administration for FCAT Mathematics.	25% (51) of all students in Grades 3-5 will achieve proficiency at levels 4 and 5 on the 2013 Mathematics FCAT.

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1 Unfamiliar with resources beyond textbook.	2.1 Creation of PLC for Lesson Modeling and collaborative team planning using resources beyond the text for both horizontal and vertical teaming incorporating NGSSS facilitated by the math coach during the extended daily planning time.	2.1 Administration,Math Coach	2.1 Weekly grade level review of common assessments during learning communities. Weekly review of lesson plans to ensure that alternatives beyond textbook are used when assessment data reveals need for re-teaching.	2.1 Analysis of assessment tools, data from the Go Math! textbook series, review of final student products. Chats with the teachers on follow up that is needed up to and including additional individual training in use of available resources.
2	2.3 According to three years trend data, Measurement and Geometry content clusters are areas of deficiency.	2.3 Because this continues to be an area of concern, the staff will unwrap these benchmarks to ensure that the instruction is aligned to the standards.	2.3 Administration,Math Coach	2.3 Administrative data chats with teachers and students; October 2011, December 2011, February 2012, and May 2012.	2.3 District Benchmark Assessment 1 and 2 content cluster analysis reports.

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

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

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:	Data analysis show that overall 41% (50) of students in Grades 3 through 5 made learning gains in mathematics on the 2012 FCAT. This is a 7% decrease from the previous year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Data analysis show that overall 41% (50) of students in Grades 3 through 5 made learning gains in mathematics on the 2012 FCAT.	60% (73) of all students in grades 3 through 5 will make learning gains on the 2012 Mathematics FCAT.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of student participation in extended learning opportunities because of lack of daycare for younger students.	Render services to these students by providing activities for younger siblings in the classroom.	Classroom teachers employed for extended day.	Monitoring of attendance of students.	Tracking of attendance of students the services have been offered to.
2	3.1 Students' limited comprehension of mathematics vocabulary.	3.1 Evidenced based targeted instruction for intervention using ESOL strategies as evidenced by opening activity of math lessons.	3.1 Math Coach, Classroom teachers	3.1 Grade levels will review results of common assessments weekly.	3.1 Textbook assessments.
3	3.2 Insufficient mathematical fluency and literacy in the application of Number theories and Operations, Geometry and Measurement.	3.2 Use of Florida Continuous Improvement Model (FCIM) to identify individual academic student needs.	3.2 Thaddeus Smith, Lina Palacios, Sandra Ruise	3.2 Bi-weekly meetings of the curriculum and Leadership Team to analyze mini-benchmark results	3.2 Weekly Mini-benchmark assessments
4	3.3 Lack of exploration and manipulatives as an alternative strategy to ensure effective instruction for all modalities.	3.3 Lesson modeling which is inclusive of exploration and the use of hands-on instruction. Collaborative team planning meetings incorporating NGSSS	3.3 Lina Palacios, Sandra Ruise	3.3 Weekly grade level review of common assessments during planning time.	3.3 Analysis of assessment tools data from Go Math! textbook series, and District resources housed under BEEP's math links. Walk Throughs.

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:	100%(1) of students taking the alternative assessment in 2012 made learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (1) of students made the desired learning gains.	100% of students will continue to make learning gains.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	First year teachers not familiar with students and best adaptive strategies.	New teachers will meet with ESE staff to become familiar with students' needs and how to best meet them.	ESE Specialist, ESE Teacher	Observation, analysis of weekly assessments	Weekly benchmark assessments
2					

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	Data analysis show that overall 43% (14) of students in Grades 3 through 5 performing at the lowest quartile made adequate progress on the 2011 administration for FCAT Mathematics. This is an 11% decrease from the previous year. These students demonstrated a weakness in basic fact fluency and comprehending grade specific vocabulary terms.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Data analysis show that overall 43% (14) of students in Grades 3 through 5 performing at the lowest quartile made adequate progress on the 2011 administration for FCAT Mathematics.	60% (19) of all students in the lowest quartile in Grades 3 through 5 will make learning gains on the 2012 Mathematics FCAT.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1 Failure to retain gains needed to continue to progress.	1.1 Additional supplemental assistance during the school day to ensure their continued success.	1.1 Curriculumteam and support team.	1.1 Articulation between classroom teachers and teachers providing supplemental services. Chats with students in this group.	1.1 Assessment result analysis.
2	4.1 Insufficient mathematical fluency of basic facts in addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division.	4.1 Provide small group differentiated instruction and daily practice for facts that are not yet mastered.	4.1 Administration,Math Coach	4.1 Administrative classroom walk-throughs twice per week minimum.	4.1 Successmaker C.C.C. student data reports.
3	4.2 The areas of deficiency according to three years trend data for grades 4 & 5 were Number Operations, Geometry and Measurement, and Algebra.	4.2 Use FCIM to identify individual student needs for remediation, then provide prescriptive interventions to address areas of weakness.	4.2 Administration,Math Coach	4.2 Weekly Curriculum Leadership team meetings.	4.2 District Benchmark Assessment Test, Mini-benchmark assessments, and chapter tests.
4	4.3 Students' limited comprehension of grade specific mathematics vocabulary	4.3 Creating vocabulary development opportunities during all mathematics instruction.	4.3 Administration,math coach	4.3 Analysis of bi-weekly benchmark assessments and oral review.	4.3 Teacher-created, textbook, and district assessments, both oral and written.
5	4.4 Students do not understand what they are required to know and do.	4.4 Unwrap the benchmarks with the students to insure understanding of what is required.	4.4 Administration,math coach	4.4 Analysis of benchmark assessments and oral assessments.	4.4 Teacher-created, textbook, and district assessments, both oral and written.

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	5A : Students in grades 3-5 will demonstrate an increase of at least 7% annually to reduce the achievement gap by 50% in six years.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	34%	41%	48%	55%	62%	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	In the 2012 school year no subgroups made satisfactory progress. Overall, 68% in the three subgroups did not make adequate Percentage and number not achieving mastery Whites: 100% (1) Blacks: 71% (112) Hispanics: 51% (19) Students in all of the subgroups demonstrated a weakness in homework completion, fluency of basic facts, and mastery of the specific benchmarks needed for success in .

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Data analysis shows that overall 49%(18)of Hispanics made satisfactory progress, 29%(47) of Blacks made satisfactory progress, and there were no white students making satisfactory progress.	Data analysis shows that overall 50%(97) of our subgroups will make satisfactory progress in mathematics on the 2013 FCAT administration.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of support at home for homework.	Provide homework assistance before school.	Curriculum and classroom teachers.	Tracking of attendance. Periodic review of homework assigned to students.	Tracking of homework turned in. Comparison of assessment results of those students attending before school homework assistance program with those not attending.
2	5A.1 Fluency of basic math facts (addition, subtraction, multiplication and division).	5A.1 Provide small group, differentiated instruction that is intensive daily to give students the opportunity to practice facts not yet mastered.	5A.1 Lina Palacios, Sandra Ruise	5A.1 Administrative classroom-walk throughs twice per week minimum.	5A.1 Textbook chapter assessments teacher made tests, worksheets, oral reviews.
3	5A.2 Lack of understanding of what each benchmark requires the student to know and do.	5A.2 Fluid student grouping to target instruction in deficient benchmarks which will unwrapping of the benchmark.	5A.2 Lina Palacios, Sandra Ruise	5A.2 Math resource specialist review of small group student rosters.	5A.2 District BAT 1 and 2 cluster data reports.
4	5A.4 Previous year's trend data shows deficiencies in Vocabulary; Number Operations, Geometry and Measurement, and Algebra content clusters.	5A.4 Spiral review of all benchmarks concurrently throughout year.	5A.4 Lina Palacios, Sandra Ruise	5A.4 Administrative data chats with teachers and students; October and December 2012, February, and May 2013.	5A.4 District Benchamark Assessment 1 and 2; content cluster analysis reports.

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	Data analysis shows that overall 72% (39) of all English Language Learners in grades 3 through 5 made Adequate Yearly Progress on the 2012 Mathematics FCAT. This is a 17%(13) decrease from the previous year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
Data analysis shows that overall 72%(39) of all English Language Learners in grades 3 through 5 did not make satisfactory progress on the 2012 Mathematics FCAT.	60% (32) of all English Language Learners in grades 3 through 5 will make satisfactory progress on the 2013 Mathematics FCAT.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Vocabulary not commensurate with grade level.	Use Rosetta Stone, provide explicit direct instruction in vocabulary for all content areas Provide opportunities to use new vocabulary.	Administration, Curriculm	Assessment of reading and writing prompts, problem solving in math	Analysis of assessments, tracking of progress of ELL in reading, math, and writing
2	5B.1 Trend data shows deficiencies in Number Operations, Geometry, and Measurement, Algebra.	5B.1 Use Florida Continuous Improvement Model to identify student needs for remediation	5B.1 Lina Palacios, Sandra Ruise	5B.1 Weekly Curriculum Leadership team meetings.	5B.1 District Benchmark Assessment Test, Mini-benchmark assessments, and chapter tests.
3	5B.2 Students' limited familiarity with grade specific mathematics vocabulary.	5B.2 Collaborative planning and Incorporation of hands-on ESOL strategies in mathematics instructional practices.	5B.2 Lina Palacios, Gail Pluchinos	5B.2 Weekly grade level review of common assessments.	5B.2 Math Content Academic Vocabulary System (CAVS)
4	5B.3 Need to build background for new standards.	5B.3 Fluid student grouping to target instruction thus making it prescriptive.	5B.3 Lina Palacios, Sandra Ruise	5B.3 Math resource specialist review of small group student	5B.3 District BAT 1 and 2 cluster data
5	5B. 4 Lack of the English language impedes student growth in demonstrating and interpreting solutions to the problem solving experiences.	5B.4 Provide real life contexts for mathematical explorations through literature, and develop student understanding through the use of manipulative and graphic aids.	5B.4 Lina Palacios, Sandra Ruise	5B.4 Curriculum Leadership Team weekly review of common assessments.	5B.4 District Benchmark Assessment Test, Mini-benchmark assessments, and chapter tests.

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:	91% (21) of Students With Disabilities (SWD) did not make satisfactory progress in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
91% (21) of Students With Disabilities (SWD) did not make satisfactory progress in math.	50% (13) of Students with Disabilities (SWD) will make adequate progress in math.

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	Most effective strategies for adaptation of curriculum not known and therefore not used.	General Education teachers will meet and plan with the ESE Specialist and Teacher to devise a more effective plan that incorporates the sppropriate adative strategies	ESE Specialist, Administration	Analysis of assessments	District Benchmark Assessments and mini benchmark assessments
2	Not enough time scheduled with the ESE Teacher	Review and if needed and possible include more time for math with the ESE Teacher.	Administration, ESE Specialist and ESE Teacher	IEP Evaluations and Re-Evaluations	The students' IEP's

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal E:	Compared to 2011, Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress increased 10% to 67%(130)on the 2012 Mathematics FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Data analysis shows that overall 67% (130) of all Economically disadvantaged students in grades 3 through 5 made Adequate Yearly Progress on the 2012 Mathematics FCAT.	62% (112) of all Economically Disadvantaged students in grades 3 through 5 will make Adequate Yearly Progress on the 2012 Mathematics FCAT.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
---	---	---	---	---	---
1	Homework support	Before school homework assistance	Curriculum Classroom Teachers	Tracking of attendance and homework turned in. Periodic review of homework assigned to students. Comparison of assessment results of those students attending before school homework assistance program with those not attending.	Formative assessments: Biweekly benchmark assessments. Summative Assessments: FCAT 2013
2	5D.1 Vocabulary; Number Operations, Geometry and Measurement, and Algebra.	5D.1 Spiral review of all benchmarks concurrently throughout the school year as well as student creation of vocabulary dictionaries by the benchmarks.	5D.1 Administration,Math Coach	5D.1 Administrative data chats with teachers and students; October and December 2011, February, and May 2012	5D.1 District Benchmark Assessment 1 and 2; content cluster analysis reports.

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

The Language of Mathematics	K-5	Sandra Ruise	All teachers grades K-5	September 24-25	Classroom walkthroughs, review of journals	Administration, math coach
Embedding of ESE strategies into instructional delivery	K-5	ESE Specialist, ESE Teacher	All teachers grade K-5	October 16 and October 18	Classroom walkthroughs, review of journals	Administration, math coach, ESE Specialist
Understanding and increasing achievement through the use of current and accurate information during staffing and re-evaluations.	K-5	ESE Specialist, ESE Teacher	All teachers grade K-5	October 23 and October 25	Analysis and comparison of data with information provided for staffing or re-evaluation	Administration, math coach, ESE Specialist
Understanding and increasing achievement through the use of current and accurate information during staffing and re-evaluations.						

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Train the Trainer model used	Pay teacher trainers for prep time	School's in-service account.	$500.00
			Subtotal: $500.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $500.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	Based on the 2011 FCAT Science results, 23% (10) of students in Grade 5 achieved proficiency at level 3. There was an 1% decrease when compared to the 2010 results.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Data analysis demonstrates that overall 23% (10) students in Grade 5 achieved proficiency at level 3 on the 2011 administration for FCAT Science.	30% (18) of the students in Grade 5 will achieve proficiency at level 3 on the 2012 Science FCAT.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1 Lack of age and grade level appropriate content area vocabulary	1.1 The enrichment teachers will provide small or whole group instruction in content area reading using science fusion. . Weekly Readers/science textbooks, and authentic vocabulary development activities daily, which will build students' knowledge of word meaning, and context clues strategies.	1.1 Lina Palacios, science coach Literacy Learning Team members RtI Team	1.1 Administrative classroom Walk-throughs and on-going classroom assessments focusing on students' knowledge of word meanings, and context clues. Analysis of weekly assessments by grade levels with science coach literacy and RtI teams and grade level teachers.	1.1 Formative: Weekly Mini Benchmark Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT Assessment
2	1.2 As students progress through grade levels, the lack of collaborative efforts in grades K-5 does not yield appropriate scaffolding of Science instruction.	1.2 Develop a Professional Learning Community (PLC) with all Science personnel to insure vertical teaming. The Science PLC will research proven strategies/resources, and plan grade appropriate inquiry-based instruction.	1.2 Administration, science coach	1.2 Review and analyze assessment data across grade levels to promote student achievement regarding science standards.	1.2 Formative: Weekly Mini Benchmark Assessments, Science Journals/Experiment Logs Summative: 2013 Science FCAT Assessment Data Chats with grade level science teachers
3	1.3 Lack of familiarity with the science textbook series and ancillary resources.	1.3 District training on new text and materials Lesson modeling and collaborative team planning incorporating Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (NGSSS) science coach	1.3 Administration, Science Coach	1.3 Curriculum Leadership Team weekly review of common assessments by grade level.	1.3 Instructional Focus Calendars; analysis of assessment data tools from Science Fusion textbook series.
4	1.4 The implementation of new NGSSS science standards.	1.4 Reading Enrichment Teachers will be trained by the district. Reading Enrichment Teachers will attend PLC to understand exactly what the standards require of the students in terms of knowledge and production.	1.4 Administration, Enrichment Reading Team, Science Coach	1.4 Curriculum Leadership weekly review, classroom walkthroughs to observe standards, teacher conversations with science coach	1.4 Tracking of teacher training logs, lesson plan checks, Analysis of assessment results (both district and textbook), review of plan books
	1.5 Lack of grade level	Enrichment Teachers	Administration,	Review and walk	Analysis of Data

| 5 | content area (science) reading ability | will be provided with training and modeling of science reading skills and strategies. | Science Coach, Reading Coach | throughs, discussions during Science meetings, quarterly data chats | from assessments Data Chats with teachers, review of plan books |
| 6 | 1.6 Lack of strategies to comprehend content area reading (affixes, context usage of words)and need to change reading rate. | 1.6 1. Students will be exposed to words and affixes through looping of a slide show during lunch periods. 2.Morning openers on school's news station which culminates in a daily contest to name and define the affix, define the word used in context, tell the strategy used to figure it out and explain the sentence. The sentence will be from the content area of science. | 1.6 Administration, Curriculum Team Teacher made tests, discussions with student, science coach | 1.6 contest results Analysis of science content area reading scores. | 1.6 Tracking of student involvement in contests. The level of student involvement and increase in student achievement in science. |

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:	0% of students taking the alternative assessment scored at level 4, 5,or 6 in science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% of students taking the alternative assessment scored at level 4, 5,or 6 in science.	50% of students taking the alternative assessment will score at level 4, 5, or 6 on the Florida Alternative Assessment in science.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Science instruction not included in instruction from ESE Teacher.	ESE Teacher will work with Science coach to create reading plans that are infused with science.	Science Coach ESE Specialist	Analysis of Student benchmark assessments	District Benchmark assessments, mini benchmark assessments

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	Based on the 2012 FCAT Science results, 7%(4) of students in Grade 5 achieved proficiency at level 4 or 5. This was a 50% decrease in scores of 4 and 5 from 2011.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Data analysis shows that 7% (4) of students in Grade 5 achieved a level 4 or 5 on the 2012 administration for FCAT Science.	30% (18) of students in Grade 5 will achieve proficiency at level 4 or 5.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2.1 Lack of additional time for project-based learning.	2.1 Additional time will be allotted during enrichment group pull-out for project-based learning activities.	2.1 Administration, Science Coach	2.1 Administrative classroom walkthroughs, twice weekly minimum. Bi-weekly meetings with administration, science coach and science teachers to discuss the progress of the project-based learning activities.	2.1 Power points, slide shows completed projects, and assignment rubrics.
2	2.2 Lack of understanding of content clusters: Scientific Thinking and Life and Environmental Science	2.2 The Science Professional Learning Community will research proven strategies/resources and plan grade appropriate inquiry-based instruction for content clusters such as Scientific Thinking and Life and Environmental Science.	2.2 Administration, Science Coach Science PLC facilitator, Enrichment Reading Team	2.2 Administrative data chats with teachers and students; October 2012, December 2012, February 2013, and May 2013.	2.2 District Benchmark Assessment 1 and 2, content cluster analysis reports.
3	2.3 Readiing Enrichment Team's Lack of familiarity with the science textbook series and ancillary resources	2.3 Lesson modeling and collaborative team planning incorporating Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (NGSSS) with curriculum coaches	2.3 Administration, Science Coach	2.3 Curriculum Leadership Team weekly review of common assessments by grade level.	2.3 Instructional Focus Calendars; analysis of assessment data tools from Science Fusion textbook series.
4	2.4 Enrichment Teachers Lack of familiarity with NGSSS.	2.4 Teachers will unwrap the benchmarks as a Science PLC activity to insure that they understand what is required of the students by the benchmarks.	2.4 Administration Science Coach	2.4 Curriculum and Leadership team review of assessments and produts resulting from student projects.	Analysis of assessment results and re-structuring as needed.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

<div align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</div>

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Content Area Reading With an Emphasis on Science Vocabulary	Grades K-5	Nicholas Brown (Reading Coach) and Eyvonnda Cooper-Moye (Lead Teacher, Reading Enrichment, Science Coach	Kindergarten teachers, Reading teachers, Reading Enrichment teachers	September 26 and 27	Classroom walkthroughs, science journal (5th grade)	Administration, Science Coach, Reading Coach
Unwrapping pf Science Benchmarks to Enhance Depth of Knowledge	Grades K-5	Science Coach, Lead Teacher for Reading Enrichment Team	Reading Enrichment Team	September 19 and September 20	Data Chats, Lesson plans	Administration, Lead Teacher for Reading Enrichment Team

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Use Coach for Science	Test Preparation with emphasis on content area reading	Not yet known	$1,000.00
			Subtotal: $1,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Gaming to create engagement	Promeathean Board, Prrojector	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Workshop for Content Area Reading (Science) and science vocabulary	Science Coach, Reading Coach, Lead Teacher for Enrichment Reading Team,Materials	Inservice Funds	$600.00
			Subtotal: $600.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $1,600.00

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

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

| 1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. | 92%(49) of students achieved 3.0 or above (proficiency) in writing on the 2012 Writing FCAT. This is a 2% |

	Writing Goal #1a:		decrease which is a reflection of the increased rigor of FCAT writing.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
92% (49) of students scored 3.0 or higher.	The expected level of performance for 2013 is 95% (51 students) at level 4 or higher.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of exposure to age and grade level vocabulary, literature and learning experiences.	Provide students with virtual field trips. Increase direct instruction in vocabulary building strategies, schedule read alouds and discussions of grade level literature into reading programs to foster a reading-writing connection.	Ms. Gail Pluchino - Writing Coach Mrs. Lina Palacios Assistant Principal Mr. Nicholas Brown Reading Coach Mr. Thaddeus Smith- Principal	Classroom walkthroughs, analysis of assessments, review of the continuous cycle of instruction, student work samples	Evaluate writing samples using FCAT Writes Rubric and the 6 Traits of Writing. Formative: FCAT Writes 2013
2	Lack of exposure to writing conventions (grammar, spelling, punctuation)	Increase Writing in journals across the curriculum, five minute grammar lessons	Mr. Thaddeus Smith- Principal Ms. Gail Pluchino - Writing Coach Mrs. Lina Palacios Assistant Principal Mr. Nicholas Brown Reading Coach	Analysis of student writing samples, review of journals, walk throughs	Writing Samples, journals

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	100% (1) of students taking the Alternative Assessment scored level four or higher.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% of students scored level 4 or higher.	100% of students taking the alternative assessment scored level 4 or higher.

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	Ability to provide one on one tutorial type setting for these students.	Look at scheduling of coaches and ESE Specialist and teacher.	Administration and ESE Specialist	Analysis of progressive writing samples.	Writing Samples

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
The Writing Process	K-5	Gail Pluchino	All teachers grade K-5	Monthly	Analysis and discussion of Students' work samples	Administration, Gail Pluchino (Writing Coach)

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
The FCAT Writing Rubric	Online materials, information and samples from Florida Department of Education	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Increased student usage of technology for research and writing as a proactive step towards computer based testing.	Laptop carts	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Monthly workshops to foster Understanding and Usage of the FCAT Writing Rubric as a scoring tool and as a tool for writing. instruction	Writing Coach	Inservice funds	$400.00
			Subtotal: $400.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $400.00

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	In spite of the transient population of the school community, the school has managed to keep student attendance stable. The school community's transiency is caused by the current economic climate and job market within the community. Furthermore, the school is bordered by housing projects, which also factors into the stability of the attendance rate.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
The current year's attendance rate is 95% () students	The expected attendance rate for the 2013 school year is 98%.

	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
	The number of students with excessive absences is 57 students.	The expected number of students with excessive absences for the 2013 school year is 45.
	2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
	The current number of students with excessive tardies is 179 students.	The expected number of students with excessive tardies for the 2013 school year is 150.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of parental awareness of the lost of learning due to absences.	Classroom teachers will identify and refer students who have accrued three or more absences in a calendar month to the IMT for further monitoring. On an as needed basis, parent outreach by the school's social worker will determine the cause and if additional services are needed.	Janet Hugh Lina Palacios Mary Hamilton Benita Brown	Monitor attendance reports weekly by IMT, Office Manager, Administration	Analysis of attendance data Reports to quickly spot problems and solve them.
2	Lack of parental awareness of learning losses due to tardiness and its effect on student progress and performance.	Classroom teachers will identify and refer students who have accrued three or more absences in a calendar month to the IMT for further monitoring. On an as needed basis, parent outreach by the school's social worker will determine the cause and if additional services are needed.	Benita Brown Janet Hugh Lina Palacios Mary Hamilton	Monitor tardy reports weekly by IMT, Office Manager, Administration, and Leadership Team	Attendance/tardy data Reports to continuously compare attendance trends.

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
Teacher awareness of role as an interventionist in decreasing tardies and absences.	K-5	Lina Palacios (Assistant Principal), Janet Hugh (IMT)	All classroom teachers	September 10, 2012	Review of data on absences and tardies	Benita Brown (Office Manager)

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
Teacher Awareness of Role as an Advocate for Students facilitated by Office Manager, IMT, Social Worker	N/A	In-Service	$400.00
			Subtotal: $400.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $400.00

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:	To decrease the number of students being assigned to internal suspension for behavioral concerns from 28 to 18.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
There were 59 In-school suspensions given during the 2011-2012 school year.	The expected number of In-school suspensions for the 2012-2013 school year is 30.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
28 students were given in-school suspension during the 2011-2012 school year.	The expected number of students to be suspended is 18.
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
There were 6% (24) external suspensions	The expected number of external suspensions for the 2011-2012 school year is 4% (18).
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
17 students were given external suspensions during 2011-2012 school year.	The expected number of students being given external suspension for the 2012-2013 school year is 8 students.

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1 Students lack of character education	1.1 School-wide Character Education initiative, student anti-bullying assembly as well as small groups with the guidance counselor	1.1 Thaddeus Smith, Lina Palacios	1.1 RtI team reviews current school data related to suspensions.	1.1 Suspension data reports.
2	1.2 Students lack of interest in school	1.2 Student counseling groups, career spokespersons and mentors who will demonstrate the importance of school and the positive effect it will have in future endeavors	1.2 Thaddeus Smith, Lina Palacios	1.2 Weekly Leadership team meetings to evaluate student concerns.	1.2 Counseling logs, visitor logs

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

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

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

Suspension Budget:

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

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.*	There has been a steady increase in the level of parent involvement at this school. This upward trend is a reflection of the increased effort placed upon engaging parents through monthly, education-based trainings, and involving all stakeholders in the educational processes.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
60% (249) of all parents actively participated in parental involvement activities inclusive of parent/teacher conferences, Title 1 Parent Trainings, School Advisory Council Meetings, and other school related events.	65% (270) of all parents will actively participate in parental involvement activities inclusive of parent/teacher conferences, Title 1 Parent Trainings, School Advisory Council Meetings, and other school related events for the 2012-2013 school year.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1 Verbal Language	1.1 Use interpreters from the school to assist in parent teacher conferences, SAC, Title 1, and PTA meetings meetings.	1.1 Teachers, SAC Chair, Principal Social Worker, Guidance Counselor	1.1 Tracking of attendance and comparison to previous years.	1.1 Data base for tracking parent attendance at student conferences, parent trainings, and other school related activities.
2	1.2 Parents' lack of knowledge of Reading comprehension strategies.	1.2 Title 1 Parent Training to model strategies for finding the main idea when reading at home.	1.2 Title 1 Liaison	1.2 Oral feedback from training participants; Teacher observation of students parents that participated.	1.2 Parent survey feedback forms; Student's reading logs with parent signature
3	1.3 Lack of parent usage and familiarity of available technology tools.	1.3 Title 1 Parent Training to model pertinent access points within the B.E.E.P Portal (online textbooks, virtual counselor, research resources)	1.3 Title 1 Liaison	1.3 Oral feedback from training participants; Teacher observation of students parents that participated.	1.3 Parent survey feedback
4	1.4 Parent lack of knowledge and/or concerning FCAT testing and FCAT results.	1.4 Title 1 Parent Training to inform parents of NGSSS achievement levels in reading and math and what they mean, trainings to provide parents with understanding of what the information on the test results mean	1.4 Teachers, SAC Chair, Principal Social Worker, Guidance Counselor	1.4 Oral feedback from training participants.	1.4 Parent survey feedback forms.
5	1.5 Times for SAC/Title I trainings not aligned to parent availability	Send home surveys to find times most conducive to parents attendance	SAC Chair, Title I Liaison	Analysis of survey results	Parent Surveys

6	1.6 Lack of Parent motivation to attend SAC/Title One meetings	Schedule student performances and activities prior to SAC/Title I trainings	Grade Chairs, Sac Chair, Title One Liaison, Media Specialist	Comparison of attendance records of prior and present year	Attendance Sheets

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Student Performances	Teacher sponsored and/or created	Substitute Fund	$2,700.00
			Subtotal: $2,700.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Enhance parental knowledge of technological resources	School computers and laptops used for trainings	N/A	$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: $2,700.00

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:	Increase use of cross curricular projects (science, technology, engineering, math) for project based learning.
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of familiarity with STEM	Math PLC that incorporates the understanding of STEM and what constitutes a STEM lesson.	Math Coach, Science Coach	Creation of Stem Lesson plans.	STEM lesson plans.
2	Lack of comfort with the implementation of STEM lessons.	Provide math instructors with 2 bi-weekly STEM lessons, materials and time to practice the lesson	Math Coach	Observations, Analysis of student journals, and in some cases final products	Journals and final products
3	Lack of comfort with the implementation of STEM lessons.	Provide math instructors with 2 bi-weekly STEM lessons, materials and time to practice the lesson	Math Coach	Observations, Analysis of student journals, and in some cases final products	Journals and final products

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
What is STEM?	Grades K-5	Science/Stem Coach Math Coach	Grades K-5 Math Teachers, Reading Enrichment Teacher, Science Teacher	August 16, 2012	Classroom walkthroughs during STEM Lessons	Administration, Science/Stem Coach, Math Coach
STEM Lesson Planning	Grades K-5	Science Stem Coach	All Teachers	Monthly	Review of plan books, walk throughs	Administration, Science/Stem Coach, Math Coach

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
Students will use technology in planning, research and production of final STEM projects.	Ink for printers, printer repairs	SAC funds	$2,500.00
			Subtotal: $2,500.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Introduction to and implementation of STEM activities	Materials for Stem activities	General Funds	$800.00
			Subtotal: $800.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
		Subtotal:	$0.00
		Grand Total:	$3,300.00

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

All students in grades K-5 will be provided with opportunities for increased achievement in reading through exposure to grade level Social Studies and Science experiences and vocabulary. Goal:

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:	
1. All students in grades K-5 will be provided with opportunities for increased achievement in reading through exposure to grade level Social Studies and Science experiences and vocabulary. Goal All students in grades K-5 will be provided with opportunities for increased achievement in reading through exposure to grade level Social Studies and Science experiences and vocabulary. Goal #1:	Students in grades K-5 will be provided with an extended day that provides supplemental instruction in the six core areas of reading (phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension and oral language). The hour scheduled for enrichment teaching is preventive/interventional/enrichment dependent upon the needs of the child. This additional hour will provide intensive and thus prescriptive instruction in areas of skill deficits as evidenced by student learning plans (SLPs)as well as effective teaching of non-fiction and informational text.
2012 Current level:	2013 Expected level:
Only 34% of students in grades 3-5 are able to read and correctly respond to questions from non-fiction text.	At least 51% of students will read and respond correctly to non-fiction text.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Enrichment team's lack of skill with data analysis, placement and appropriate research based materials.	The enrichment team will participate in a PlC on data analysis and data driven instruction.	Lina Palacios (Assistant Principal) Nicholas Brown (Reading Coach), Eyvonda Cooper-Moye (Lead Teacher, Reading Enrichment Team)	Analysis of assessments to monitor preogress and therefore effectiveness of instruction and/or instructional materials.	Benchmark assessments.
2	Knowledge of effective implementation of content area reading skills.	PLC facilitated by Reading Coach (Nicholas Brown) on Content Area Reading. All Reading Enrichment Team members and reading teachers will receive strong recommendation to enroll in district's online Content Area Reading course.	Lina Palacios (Assistant Principal), Nicholas Brown (Reading Coach), Eyvonda Cooper-Moye (Lead Teacher, Reading Enrichment Team)	Analysis of assessments to monitor preogress and therefore effectiveness of instruction and/or instructional materials.	Benchmark assessments.

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
PLC	K-5 Reading	Nicholas Brown	K-5 Teachers, Reading Enrichment Team	September/October	Analysis of Lesson Plans, attendance sheets	
Reading in the Content Area	K-5 and Enrichment	District	K-5 Teachers, Reading Enrichment Team	October	Analysis of Lesson Plans, attendance sheets	Lina Palacios (Assistant Principal), Nicholas Brown (Reading Coach), Eyvonda Cooper-Moye (Lead Teacher, Reading Enrichment)

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 All students in grades K-5 will be provided with opportunities for increased achievement in reading through exposure to grade level Social Studies and Science experiences and vocabulary. Goal(s)

FINAL BUDGET

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

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Super QAR	Train the trainer model, manuals	School's general fund	$1,500.00
Science	Use Coach for Science	Test Preparation with emphasis on content area reading	Not yet known	$1,000.00
Writing	The FCAT Writing Rubric	Online materials, information and samples from Florida Department of Education	N/A	$0.00
Parent Involvement	Student Performances	Teacher sponsored and/or created	Substitute Fund	$2,700.00
				Subtotal: $5,200.00

Technology

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Use of ILS's for re-teaching, reinforcement and enrichment	computers and laptops		$0.00
Science	Gaming to create engagement	Promeathean Board, Prrojector	N/A	$0.00
Writing	Increased student usage of technology for research and writing as a proactive step towards computer based testing.	Laptop carts	N/A	$0.00
Parent Involvement	Enhance parental knowledge of technological resources	School computers and laptops used for trainings	N/A	$0.00
STEM	Students will use technology in planning, research and production of final STEM projects.	Ink for printers, printer repairs	SAC funds	$2,500.00
				Subtotal: $2,500.00

Professional Development

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Vocabulary development strategies	Train the trainer model	General Funds	$400.00
Reading	Text Complexity	Train the Trainer model, district materials from Common Core State Standards	Inservice Funds	$400.00
Reading	Differentiation of instruction as a preventive measure and a tool for acceleration	Train the Trainer model, district materials from Common Core State Standards	Inservice Funds	$400.00
Mathematics	Train the Trainer model used	Pay teacher trainers for prep time	School's in-service account.	$500.00
Science	Workshop for Content Area Reading (Science) and science vocabulary	Science Coach, Reading Coach, Lead Teacher for Enrichment Reading Team,Materials	Inservice Funds	$600.00
Writing	Monthly workshops to foster Understanding and Usage of the FCAT Writing Rubric as a scoring tool and as a tool for writing. instruction	Writing Coach	Inservice funds	$400.00
Attendance	Teacher Awareness of Role as an Advocate for Students facilitated by Office Manager, IMT, Social Worker	N/A	In-Service	$400.00

STEM	Introduction to and implementation of STEM activities	Materials for Stem activities	General Funds	$800.00
			Subtotal:	$3,900.00

Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal:	$0.00
			Grand Total:	$11,600.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

Priority	Focus	Prevent	NA

Are you a reward school: Yes   No

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

View uploaded file (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
SAC funds will be used to enhance the school's magnet theme. Maintenance and acquisition of new technology are the priorities for usage of these funds.	$3,000.00

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

*The SAC will monitor implementation of the School Improvement Plan. It will make the necessary changes when needed to insure that the plan is reflective of and responsive to the needs of the students based upon current data, thus insuring that the curriculum is data driven.
*The SAC will hold monthly meetings to insure that all stakeholders have a voice in and are aware of school's progress and changes to the School Improvement Plan and its implementation.

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Broward School District
C. ROBERT MARKHAM ELEMENTARY
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	61%	66%	94%	39%	260	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	66%	68%			134	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)	50% (YES)			117	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					511	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Broward School District
C. ROBERT MARKHAM ELEMENTARY
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	66%	63%	88%	40%	257	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	68%	61%			129	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?	53% (YES)	57% (YES)			110	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					496	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested