

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: DR. EDWARD L. WHIGHAM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Dade

Principal: Susan Lyle

SAC Chair: Kimberly Robinson

Superintendent: Alberto Carvalho

Date of School Board Approval: Pending

Last Modified on: 10/15/2012

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

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

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
Principal	Susan Lyle	Bachelor of Arts Sociology Edinboro University; Master of Science-Elementary Education, University of Miami, Educational Leadership Certification- University of Miami; Principal Certification- State of Florida	2	16	'12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade A B B A B High Standards Rdg 53 72 81 74 66 High Standards Math 54 62 77 77 71 Lrng Gains – Rdg. 72 66 70 72 63 Lrng Gains –Math 72 54 62 77 65 Gains – Rdg.-25% 77 25 68 55 61 Gains – Math - 25% 75 25 63 61 69 AMO Reading Target 54 AMO Current Performance 53 AMO Math Target 50 AMO Current Performance 52
		B.S. Elementary Education; M.S. Education; Ed.S Educational Leadership			12 '11 '10 '09 '08 School Grade NA C A A A

Assis Principal	Barbara Hernandez	ESOL Certification Gifted Endorsement	1	7	High Standards Rdg. NA 59 72 77 67 High Standards Math NA 62 62 66 65 Lrng Gains-Rdg. NA 59 66 68 67 Lrng Gains-Math NA 50 58 57 55 Gains-Rdg-25% NA 67 68 63 65 Gains-Math-25% NA 50 63 65 66
-----------------	-------------------	--	---	---	---

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading Coach	Sandra J. Lopez	Degrees: B.S. - ELEM ED, M.S. - READING, SPECIALIST- CURRICULUM & INSTRUCTION Certifications: PRIMARY ED (K-3) ELEM ED (1-6) READING (K-12), ESOL Endorsement	2	10	'12WG '12WP '12GS School Grade A A A High Standards – Rdg 53 67 53 Lrng Gains – Rdg. 72 80 72 Gains –Rdg- 25% 77 79 87 2012 – Whigham, Whispering Pines, Gulfstream Elementary Schools '11LW '11WL '10PE School Grade A A A High Standards – Rdg. 91 89 79 Lrng. Gains – Rdg. 70 79 70 Gains – Rdg. -25% 71 82 56 2011 – Leewood K-8, William Lehman Elementary Schools 2010 – Perrine Elementary School '09PE '09PA '09HW '08FC School Grade A A A B High Standards – Rdg. 83 95 85 54 Lrng. Gains – Rdg. 69 75 74 58 Gains – Rdg. – 25% 61 69 55 60 2009 – Perrine, Palmetto, Howard Drive Elementary Schools 2008 – Florida City Elementary School

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. Ongoing professional development	Principal/PD Liaison	June 2013	
2	2. Vertical teaming	Principal/AP	June 2013	
3	3. Grade level teaming	Grade Level Chair	June 2013	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

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

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
49	0.0%(0)	8.2%(4)	42.9%(21)	49.0%(24)	49.0%(24)	100.0%(49)	24.5%(12)	4.1%(2)	81.6%(40)

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
NA	N/A	NA	NA

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. Grade level chairs evaluate school core content standards/programs; identify and analyze existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. They will 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 children to be considered "at risk"; assist in the design and implementation for 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 an extensive parental program, and Supplemental Educational Services.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

NA

Title I, Part D

District receives funds to support the Educational Alternative Outreach program. Services are coordinated with district Drop-out Prevention programs.

Title II

The District uses supplemental funds for improving basic education as follows:

- Training for add-on endorsement programs, such as Reading, Gifted, and ESOL
- Training and substitute release time for Professional Development Liaison (PDL) at each school

focusing on Professional Learning Communities (PLC) development and facilitation, as well as Lesson Study Group implementation and protocols.

Title III

District funds will be used to provide tutorial programs, resources, and parent outreach activities in order to assist ELL students' academic success.

Title X- Homeless

Trained school site personnel will serve as a coordinator and liaison to ensure the McKinney-Vento Law is being enforced and appropriate services are provided to homeless students. Students will receive all the services and resources they are entitled to according to the McKinney-Vento Law.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

NA

Violence Prevention Programs

NA

Nutrition Programs

1. Dr. Edward L. Whigham Elementary School adheres to and implements the nutrition requirements stated in the District Wellness Policy.
2. Nutrition education, as per state statute, is taught through physical education.
3. The School Food Service Program, school breakfast, school lunch, and after care snacks, follows the Healthy Food and Beverage Guidelines as adopted in the District's Wellness Policy.

Housing Programs

NA

Head Start

The Early Head Start and the Head Start programs are offered to eligible students. Head Start provides activities that support student achievement, such as social skills and school readiness skills allowing for a smooth transition in their educational process.

Adult Education

NA

Career and Technical Education

NA

Job Training

NA

Other

NA

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

- Principal
- Assistant Principal
- One Primary/One Intermediate General Education Teachers
- Reading Coach
- Counselor
- School Psychologist

• ST1 Support Specialist

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 MTSS/RtI at Dr. Edward L. Whigham Elementary School is an extension of the school's Leadership Team and student academic teacher teams. The MTSS/RtI has been strategically integrated in order to support the process of problem solving as issues and concerns arise through an ongoing, systematic examination of available data with the goal of impacting student achievement, school safety, school culture, literacy, attendance, student social/emotional well being, and prevention of student failure through early intervention. It is anticipated that this will be a process of building the foundation and incorporating RtI into the culture of each school.

MTSS/RtI leadership is vital, therefore, the team will be comprised of the following personnel:

Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS/RtI, conducts assessment of RtI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS/RtI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS/RtI plans and activities.

Assistant Principal: Provides a foundation for curriculum related decisions based on ongoing data, develops, implements and facilitates a successful plan that will result in continual data analysis to meet individual student needs. Conducts assessment of MTSS/RtI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS/RtI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities. Formulates small group intensive instruction for students not making learning gains.

General Education Teachers: Provide information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, deliver Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborate with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. Participates in small group intensive instruction for students not making learning gains.

Reading Coach: Assist in the development of the curriculum focus calendar which leads, and evaluates school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student needs while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that identify students "at risk"; assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring. Formulates small group intensive instruction for students not making learning gains.

Counselor: Provides specific ideas, strategies, and tools to teachers for better behavior management in the classroom setting. Positive discipline plans and resources are available to establish effective classroom discipline. Participates in implementation of FABs/BIPs and other behavior intervention plans, facilitates development of intervention plans, provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation. Further, such behavior strategies will enable teachers to maintain an environment conducive to learning.

School Psychologist: Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection; data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation; facilitates data-based decision making activities.

ST1 Support Specialist: participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation; facilitates data-based decision making activities.

The MTSS/RtI Leadership Team will meet at the end of each 9 week grading period to engage in the following activities:

- Review in-house data and data trends within the school and individual classrooms.
- Progress monitoring data is evaluated to assist in making instructional decisions for individual students and classes.
- The team will identify professional development needs based on current data.
- The team will also collaborate regularly to problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation of current interventions, and make instructional decisions.
- Data chats are conducted with individual classroom teachers, both in reading and mathematics, to ensure that all teachers align instruction with individual student needs.
- Maintain communication with staff for input and feedback, as well as updating them on procedures and student progress.
- Provide clear indicators of student need and student progress, assisting in examining the validity and effectiveness of program delivery.
- Assist with monitoring and responding to the needs of subgroups within the expectations for adequate yearly progress.

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

The Leadership team will meet with the School Advisory Council (SAC) and the administration to assist in developing the School Improvement Plan (SIP). The school-based MTSS/RTI Leadership Team will monitor and adjust the school's academic and behavioral goals through data gathering and data analysis. The Leadership Team will monitor the fidelity of the delivery of instruction and intervention. The Leadership Team will provide levels of support and interventions to students based on data. The Leadership Team will consider data at the end of year Tier 1 problem solving.

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.

1. Data will be used to guide instructional decisions and system procedures for all students to adjust delivery of curriculum, instruction, and behavior plans to meet the specific needs of students and to drive decisions regarding professional development.

Reading:

At Dr. Edward L. Whigham Elementary, data is maintained and analyzed from district-required Baseline and Interim assessments using the Edusoft data management system. Florida Assessment for Instruction in Reading (FAIR) data is analyzed using the Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN). Additional data sources include the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA), and Stanford Achievement Test (SAT), as well as school site assessments generated from Edusoft, teacher-made /project based assessments, and student grades. Reports from the technology programs SuccessMaker and Reading Plus are also used.

Mathematics:

At Dr. Edward L. Whigham Elementary data is maintained and analyzed from district-required Baseline and Interim assessments using the Edusoft data management system. Additional data sources include the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA), Stanford Achievement Test (SAT), Houghton Mifflin Harcourt Math computer-based program, school site assessments generated from Edusoft and ExamView, teacher-made/ project based assessments, and student grades. Reports from the technology program SuccessMaker are also used.

Science:

At Dr. Edward L. Whigham Elementary data is maintained and analyzed from district-required Baseline and Interim assessments using the Edusoft data management system. Additional data sources include the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), school site assessments generated from Edusoft and ExamView, teacher-made/ project based assessments, and student grades.

Writing:

At Dr. Edward L. Whigham Elementary data is maintained and analyzed from district-required Baseline and Interim Writing assessments using the Edusoft data management system. Additional data sources include the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), school site assessments, teacher-made/ project based assessments, and student grades.

Behavior:

Managed data will include Student Case Management System, suspensions/expulsions, student behavior referrals, and attendance.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Teachers will be provided with professional development during common planning time and in small sessions throughout the school year. The MTSS Leadership Team will suggest additional professional development as needed during the Leadership Team meetings. The data collected will be utilized to identify the benchmark in greatest need of additional support as well as professional development needs. The data will assess progress towards meeting the SIP goals.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The MTSS Leadership Team will provide visible connections between an MTSS framework with Whigham Elementary school's

mission statement, assist in aligning MTSS policies and procedures across classroom, grade, and building levels, support ongoing efficient facilitation and accurate use of a problem-solving process to support planning, implementing, and evaluating effectiveness of services and provide ongoing data-driven professional development activities that align to core student goals and staff needs.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

- Susan Lyle, Principal
- Barbara Hernandez-Guerra, Assistant Principal
- Sandra Lopez, Reading Coach
- Virginia Traynor, Primary Reading Teacher
- Lisa R. Perry, Intermediate Reading Teacher
- Julio Andrade, Math Teacher
- Susan Cummings, Science Teacher
- Joan Loupus, ESE Reading Teacher

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

The LLT will meet on a monthly basis. Their function will be to ensure the implementation and monitoring of progress towards SIP goals, as well as the implementation of the Miami-Dade K-12 Comprehensive Core Reading Plan.

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

The Literacy Leadership Team at Dr. Edward L. Whigham Elementary will participate in several initiatives. They are as follows: Understand the theory and research on how literacy develops in young people by sharing best practices and research on reading acquisition with all stakeholders (staff, parents, community), Model and demonstrate literacy strategies to support and encourage developing readers, Help students to see themselves as successful readers, growing in confidence and competence, and setting goals to increase literacy achievement. The team will develop a literacy mandate for the entire school, with teams of teachers engaged in building competent readers and writers.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 10/12/2012)

*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.

Students from participating preschools, their teachers, and their parents/guardians visit individual kindergarten classrooms and are actively engaged in daily activities with the students in those classrooms. Additionally, parents/guardians are provided information regarding the school's/district's kindergarten program. All incoming kindergarten students are screened by the school's certified kindergarten teachers in order to determine each child's readiness rate utilizing the Florida Kindergarten Readiness Screener (FLKRS) Assessment. The resulting data is disaggregated in order to provide specific skill remediation. Parents will be notified through flyers, monthly calendars, and Connect-Ed of upcoming parent workshops that will better enable them to work with their child at home. Dr. Edward L. Whigham Elementary also has a Head Start program.

*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

Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1003.413(g)(j) F.S.

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

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

Note: Required for High School - Sec. 1008.37(4), F.S.

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the [High School Feedback Report](#)

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:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 26% (75) of students achieved level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 3 student proficiency by 2 percentage points to 28% (81).
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
26% (75)	28% (81)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 2 – Reading Application	<p>1a.1 Reading strategies such as Reciprocal Teaching will be utilized to help students understand, analyze and synthesize text.</p> <p>Reading teachers will provide explicit instruction using graphic organizers to help students uncover text meaning through analysis of the author's craft. Reading coach will provide refresher training on the use of specific graphic organizers that support identifying the components of the Reading Application Reporting Category.</p> <p>Reading teachers will provide data driven small group differentiated instruction in reading strategies and skills during the 90 minute reading block as outlined in the MDCPS K-12 CRRP.</p> <p>Technology programs such as SuccessMaker 4.0 and Reading Plus will be utilized with consistency. Teachers will monitor student progress.</p>	1a.1 Administrators, Reading Coach, and Literacy Leadership Team (LLT).	<p>1a.1 Following the FCIM model, the administrators, reading coach and teachers will review FAIR. data after each FAIR assessment period. Teachers will adjust small group differentiated reading instruction as needed with support from the Reading Coach.</p> <p>The MTSS/RtI team will review data after each District Assessment and will make recommendations based on school, class and student needs.</p> <p>Department Level/Teacher data chats will be conducted after each District Assessment. Adjustment of instructional strategies and resources will be discussed and implemented including the MTSS/RtI recommendations.</p> <p>Student data chats will be conducted after each District Assessment. Students' strengths and areas for improvement will be discussed.</p> <p>Teachers will review</p>	<p>1a.1 Formative FAIR, District Baseline and Interim Assessments, weekly teacher generated assessments, SuccessMaker and Reading Plus reports</p> <p>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test</p>

				<p>classroom assessment data monthly and adjust instruction as needed with support from the Reading Coach.</p> <p>Teachers will review SuccessMaker and Reading Plus Reports bi-weekly. Students will track their own progress using an individual end of session data chart.</p>	
2	<p>1a.2 The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 3- Literary Analysis/Fiction/ Nonfiction</p>	<p>1a.2 Reading teachers will model the "Think Aloud" strategy to help students interpret story structure, character and plot development within and across texts.</p> <p>Reading teachers will utilize poetry to help students identify and analyze an author's use of descriptive and figurative language to define moods and provide imagery.</p> <p>Reading teachers will use visuals, charts and graphic organizers to help students understand and analyze elements of story structure, character development and descriptive/figurative language.</p> <p>Reading teachers will provide data driven small group differentiated instruction in reading strategies and skills during the 90 minute reading block as outlined in the MDCPS K-12 CRRP.</p> <p>Technology programs such as SuccessMaker 4.0, Reading Plus, and Riverdeep will be utilized consistently. Teachers will monitor student progress</p>	<p>1a.2 Administrators, Reading Coach, and Literacy Leadership Team (LLT),</p>	<p>1a.2 Following the FCIM model, the administrators, reading coach and teachers will review F.A.I.R. data after each FAIR assessment period. Teachers will adjust small group differentiated reading instruction as needed with support from the Reading Coach.</p> <p>The MTSS/RtI team will review data after each District Assessment and will make recommendations based on school, class and student needs.</p> <p>Department Level/Teacher data chats will be conducted after each District Assessment. Adjustment of instructional strategies and resources will be discussed and implemented including the MTSS/RtI recommendations.</p> <p>Student data chats will be conducted after each District Assessment. Students' strengths and areas for improvement will be discussed.</p> <p>Teachers will review classroom assessment data monthly and adjust instruction as needed with support from the Reading Coach.</p> <p>Teachers will review SuccessMaker and Reading Plus Reports bi-weekly. Students will track their own progress using an individual end of session data chart.</p>	<p>1a.2 Formative FAIR, District Baseline and Interim Assessments, weekly teacher generated assessments, SuccessMaker and Reading Plus reports</p> <p>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test</p>
	<p>1a.3. The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 4 – Informational</p>	<p>1a.3. The Reading Teacher will utilize real-world documents such as how-to articles, brochures, fliers and websites to</p>	<p>1a.3. Administrators, Reading Coach, and Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)</p>	<p>1a.3. Following the FCIM model, the administrators, reading coach and teachers will review F.A.I.R. data after</p>	<p>1a.3. Formative FAIR, District Baseline and Interim Assessments,</p>

3	Text/Research Process	<p>provide explicit instruction in locating, interpreting, and organizing information, including Time For Kids Nonfiction Kits.</p> <p>In grade 5, the Reading Teacher will use non-fiction articles and editorials to provide explicit instruction in validity and reliability of information within and across texts.</p> <p>Reading teachers will provide data driven small group differentiated instruction in reading strategies and skills during the 90 minute reading block as outlined in the MDCPS K-12 CRRP.</p> <p>Technology programs such as SuccessMaker 4.0 and Reading Plus will be utilized consistently. Teachers will monitor student progress.</p>	<p>each FAIR assessment period. Teachers will adjust small group differentiated reading instruction as needed with support from the Reading Coach.</p> <p>The MTSS/RtI team will review data after each District Assessment and will make recommendations based on school, class and student needs.</p> <p>Department Level/Teacher data chats will be conducted after each District Assessment. Adjustment of instructional strategies and resources will be discussed and implemented including the MTSS/RtI recommendations.</p> <p>Student data chats will be conducted after each District Assessment. Students' strengths and areas for improvement will be discussed.</p> <p>Teachers will review classroom assessment data monthly and adjust instruction as needed with support from the Reading Coach.</p> <p>Teachers will review SuccessMaker and Reading Plus Reports bi-weekly. Students will track their own progress using individual end of session data chart.</p>	<p>weekly teacher generated assessments, SuccessMaker and Reading Plus reports</p> <p>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test</p>
---	-----------------------	---	--	---

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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:	The results of the 2010-2011 FCAT Reading Test indicate that 27% of students achieved levels 4 and 5 proficiency. Our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to increase levels 4 and 5 student proficiency by 1percentage points to 28%
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27%(86)	28%(90)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2a.1 The area that showed minimal growth and would require students to maintain or improve performance as noted on the 2011 administration of the FCAT Reading Test was Reporting Category 4, Informational Text/Research Process. Students need more exposure to non-fiction literature to increase their motivation for further reading.	2a.1 Use project based learning in order to move students from guided learning to more independent learning addressing HOTS as an enrichment strategy. Increase exposure to non-fiction literature.	2a.1 Literacy Leadership Team	2a.1 Ongoing classroom assessments/observations focusing on students' ability to complete assignments as teacher becomes facilitator, guiding students to become independent learners. Rubrics will be developed to assess student learning.	2a.1 Formative: Engage students in goal setting process; student/teacher conferences with student work samples Summative: District Interim Assessment; FAIR; Voyager Mini Assessments; FCAT 2.0

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 72% (120) of students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase students achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to 77% (129).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
72% (120)	77% (129)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3a.1 The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 2 – Reading Application.	3a.1. Reading teachers will provide data driven small group differentiated instruction in reading strategies and skills during the 90 minute reading block as outlined in the MDCPS K-12 CRRP. Teachers will provide an additional 30 minutes of intense, focused reading intervention using Voyager Passport or SuccessMaker 4.0 T2 intervention courseware as prescribed in the MDCPS K-12 CRRP. (FAIR Decision Tree and all FCAT Level 1 & 2 Students) Applicable progress monitoring of T2 students will be conducted.	3a.1. Administrators, Reading Coach, and Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)	3a.1. Following the FCIM model, the administrators, reading coach and teachers will review F.A.I.R. data after each FAIR assessment period. Teachers will adjust small group differentiated reading instruction as needed with support from the Reading Coach. The MTSS/RtI team will review data after each District Assessment and will make recommendations based on school, class and student needs. Edusoft data reports will be utilized to monitor student progress towards proficiency. Administrators, the reading coach, and reading teachers will meet with Intervention teachers quarterly to analyze and discuss student progress.	3a.1. Formative FAIR, District Baseline and Interim Assessments, weekly teacher generated assessments, SuccessMaker and Reading Plus reports, Voyager Passport Reading Adventure Checkpoints Report Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 77% (32) of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase in the lowest 25% achieving learning gains by 5 percentage points to 82% (34).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
77% (32)	82% (34)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	4a.1 The area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test was Reporting Category 2 – Reading Application.	4a.1 Reading teachers will provide data driven small group differentiated instruction in reading strategies and skills during the 90 minute reading block. Teachers will provide an additional 30 minutes of intense, focused reading intervention using Voyager Passport or SuccessMaker 4.0 T2 intervention courseware as prescribed in the MDCPS K-12 CRRP. Students will be identified for reading intervention using the MDCPS K-12 CRRP (FAIR Decision Tree and FCAT Level 1 and 2 Students) Applicable progress monitoring of T2 students will be conducted.	4a.1 Administrators, Reading Coach, and Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)	4a.1 Following the FCIM model, the administrators, the reading coach and teachers will review F.A.I.R. data after each FAIR assessment period. The MTSS/RtI team will review reading intervention groups progress monitoring data quarterly in order to determine the effectiveness of the interventions and to determine the need for additional tiered support. Edusoft data reports tracking the progress of the Lowest 25% will be utilized to monitor student progress towards proficiency. Administrators, the reading coach, and reading teachers will meet with Intervention teachers quarterly to analyze and discuss student progress.	4a.1 Formative FAIR, District Baseline and Interim Assessments, weekly teacher generated assessments, SuccessMaker and Reading Plus reports, Voyager Passport Adventure Checkpoints Report Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Reading Goal # Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%. 5A :				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	54	58	63	67	71	

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:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 43% (43) of Black students achieved level 3 or higher. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of Black students achieving level 3 or higher by 12 percentage points to 55% (55).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Black: 43% (43)	Black: 55% (55)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5b.1. Black: Following a data analysis of the 2012-2013 Expected Improvements for SIP Goal chart available on http://osi.dadeschools.net , Black students are not making satisfactory progress in Reporting Category 3, Literary Analysis, Fiction/Non-fiction.	5b.1 Reading teachers will provide data driven small group differentiated instruction during the 90 minute reading block. Reading teachers will utilize Poetry to teach how authors use descriptive and figurative language to define moods and provide imagery.	5b.1 Administrators, Reading Coach, and Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)	5b.1 Following the FCIM model, the administrators, reading coach and teachers will review F.A.I.R. data after each FAIR assessment period. Teachers will adjust small group differentiated reading instruction as needed with support from the Reading Coach. The MTSS/RtI team will review data after each District Assessment and will make recommendations based on school, class and student needs. Department Level/Teacher data chats will be conducted after each District Assessment. Adjustment of instructional strategies and resources will be discussed and implemented including the MTSS/RtI recommendations. Student data chats will be conducted after each	5b.1 Formative FAIR, District Baseline and Interim Assessments, weekly teacher generated assessments, SuccessMaker and Reading Plus reports, Voyager Passport Adventure Checkpoints Report Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test

				District Assessment. Students' strengths and areas for improvement will be discussed. Teachers will review classroom assessment data monthly and adjust instruction as needed with support from the Reading Coach.
--	--	--	--	---

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 18% (8) of Students with Disabilities (SWD) students achieved level 3 or higher. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of SWD students achieving level 3 or higher by 20 percentage points to 38% (16).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
18% (8)	38% (16)

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
	5d.1 Following a data analysis of the 2012-2013 Expected Improvements for SIP Goal chart available on http://osi.dadeschools.net , SWD students are not	5d.1 Reading teachers will provide data driven small group differentiated instruction during the 90 minute reading block.	5d.1 Administrators, Reading Coach, and Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)	5d.1 Following the FCIM model, the administrators, reading coach and teachers will review F.A.I.R. data after each FAIR	5d.1 Formative FAIR, District Baseline and Interim Assessments, weekly teacher

1	making satisfactory progress in Reporting Category 3, Literary Analysis, Fiction/Non-fiction	Reading teachers will utilize Poetry to teach how authors use descriptive and figurative language to define moods and provide imagery.	assessment period. Teachers will adjust small group differentiated reading instruction as needed with support from the Reading Coach. The MTSS/RtI team will review data after each District Assessment and will make recommendations based on school, class and student needs. Department Level/Teacher data chats will be conducted after each District Assessment. Adjustment of instructional strategies and resources will be discussed and implemented including the MTSS/RtI recommendations. Student data chats will be conducted after each District Assessment. Students' strengths and areas for improvement will be discussed. Teachers will review classroom assessment data monthly and adjust instruction as needed with support from the Reading Coach.	generated assessments, SuccessMaker and Reading Plus reports, Voyager Passport Adventure Checkpoints Report Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test
---	--	--	---	--

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test indicate that 50% (121) of Economically Disadvantaged (ED) students achieved level 3 or higher. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of ED students achieving level 3 or higher by 6 percentage points to 56% (135).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (121)	56% (135)

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
	Following a data analysis of the 2012-2013 Expected Improvements for SIP Goal chart available on http://osi.dadeschools.net , ED students are not making satisfactory	5E.1. Reading teachers will provide data driven small group differentiated instruction during the 90 minute reading block.	5E.1. Administrators, Reading Coach, and Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)	5E.1. Following the FCIM model, the administrators, reading coach and teachers will review F.A.I.R. data	5E.1 Formative FAIR, District Baseline and Interim Assessments,

1	progress in Reporting Category 3, Literary Analysis, Fiction/Non-fiction	Reading teachers will utilize Poetry to teach how authors use descriptive and figurative language to define moods and provide imagery.		<p>after each FAIR assessment period. Teachers will adjust small group differentiated reading instruction as needed with support from the Reading Coach.</p> <p>The MTSS/RtI team will review data after each District Assessment and will make recommendations based on school, class and student needs.</p> <p>Department Level/Teacher data chats will be conducted after each District Assessment. Adjustment of instructional strategies and resources will be discussed and implemented including the MTSS/RtI recommendations.</p> <p>Student data chats will be conducted after each District Assessment. Students' strengths and areas for improvement will be discussed.</p> <p>Teachers will review classroom assessment data monthly and adjust instruction as needed with support from the Reading Coach.</p>	<p>weekly teacher generated assessments, SuccessMaker and Reading Plus reports, Voyager Passport Adventure Checkpoints Report</p> <p>Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Test</p>
---	--	--	--	--	--

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
3rd Grade Transition from NGSSS to CCSS (Blending of NGSSS and CCSS)	3rd - 5th Grade Reading	Reading Coach	3rd – 5th Grade Reading Teachers	August 2012 with bi-weekly follow up planning sessions	Reading Coach and Administrators will visit classrooms and monitor its implementation. Progress will be discussed at Department Level meetings.	Assistant Principal
2nd and 3rd Grade CCSS Planning for CCSS	2nd & 3rd Grade Reading	Reading Coach/Teacher who attended District CCSS PD	2nd & 3rd Grade Reading Teachers	August 2012 with bi-weekly follow up planning sessions	Reading Coach and Administrators will visit classrooms and monitor its implementation. Progress will be discussed at Department Level meetings.	Assistant Principal
Strategies						

that Foster Comprehension of Complex Text (Metacognition, Graphic Organizers, Engagement)	2-5th Grade Reading	Reading Coach	2-5th Grade Reading Teachers	November 6, 2012 (Professional Development Day)	Progress will be discussed at Department Level meetings.	Assistant Principal
Review of CCSS for K-1st Teachers	K – 1st Grade Reading/Writing	Reading Coach	K – 1st Grade Reading/ Writing Teachers	November 6, 2012 (Professional Development Day)	Reading Coach and Administrators will visit classrooms and monitor its implementation.	Assistant Principal
Success Maker 4.0	Success Maker 4.0	K-5 Reading	SuccessMaker Representative/Reading Coach	October – May 2013 Wednesday early release day	SuccessMaker reports will be monitored by Reading Coach and Administrators monthly.	Literacy Leadership Team Administration
Voyager Passport Reading Intervention Review	K-5 Reading	Literacy Leadership Team/	School Wide All Teachers	September 2012 – May 2013 Department Level	Reading Coach and Administrators will review reports on Vport.	Literacy Leadership Team Administration
Data Driven Differentiated Instruction	K-5 Reading	Reading Coach	School Wide Reading Teachers	October 2012 – May 2013	FAIR Progress Monitoring Interim Assessment Data Chats	Literacy Leadership Team Administration

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading, Understanding, and Analyzing Complex Texts	Exemplar Texts from CCSS Appendix B	Title I	\$700.00
			Subtotal: \$700.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Training for implementation of SuccessMaker 4.0 for T1 and T2 Instruction	Training materials	Title I	\$100.00
			Subtotal: \$100.00
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: \$800.00

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:	The results of the 2011-2012 CELLA Test indicate that 43% (43)of students were proficient in Listening/Speaking. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Listening/Speaking proficiency in the ELL population by 3 percentage points to 46% .
---	--

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:

43% (43)

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 vocabulary impedes ELL students ability to retell events/reactions and is a barrier to our ELL students achieving proficiency level in Listening /Speaking portion of the CELLA.	1.1. Professional Learning Community activities utilizing and modeling effective retelling strategies will be planned to support teachers of English Language Learners.	1.1. Literacy Leadership Team	1.1. Leadership Team will meet monthly to monitor both the effectiveness of program delivery and student progress through the use of prescribed intervention assessments.	1.1. Formative: FAIR, Interim Assessments, Early Star, Star student performance reports. Summative 2013 CELLA.

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

2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:	The results of the 2011-2012 CELLA Test indicate that 36% (36) of students were proficient in Reading. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Reading proficiency in the ELL population by 2 percentage points to 38%.
--	--

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

36% (36)

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. Students need to improve their academic performance in Reading skills. Students need to identify and analyze the elements of plot structure, including exposition, setting and character development.	2.1. Model and use visual/graphic organizers before presenting a reading passage in order to provide additional contextual information in the form of a visual and make the comprehension task easier for ELL learners.	2.1. Administration ELL Chairperson	2.1. Quarterly Grade Level Data Chats will occur to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.	2.1. Formative: FAIR assessment Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 - CELLA Test

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

The results of the 2011-2012 CELLA Test indicate that 31% (32) of students were proficient in Writing.

Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Writing proficiency in the ELL population by 2 percentage points to 33%.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

31% (32)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3.1. Students need to improve their academic performance in Writing. Students need additional instruction in organizing their writing with emphasis on use relevant supporting details.	3.1 Have students compose writing samples using the writing process. Focus instruction on revising to add supporting details. Use writing samples to determine what area of the writing process the student needs direct instruction in.	3.1. Administration ELL Chairperson	3.1. Student writing samples will be monitored to ensure progress is being made on a weekly basis and instruction will be adjusted as needed.	3.1. Formative: FAIR assessment Interim Assessment Summative: 2013 - CELLA Test

CELLA Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Update training for teachers of ELL students.	Training Manuals/Materials from District	Title I	\$200.00
Students need to improve their academic performance in Reading skills. Students need to identify and analyze the elements of plot structure, including exposition, setting and character development.	Funds to implement afterschool tutorial program for identified ELL learners	Title III	\$3,000.00
Subtotal:			\$3,200.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Riverdeep	Computer-based Program	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: \$3,200.00

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 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 30% (87) of students achieved Level 3 proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase Level 3 student proficiency by 1 percentage point to 31% (90).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
30% (87)	31% (90)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1a.1. An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test was Number: Fractions in 3rd grade.	1a.1. Use computer programs to build competence in fractions. Use computer lab time to implement Successmaker and have students complete daily math sessions.	1a.1. Leadership Team	1a.1 Examine Interim Assessment Data to target instruction. Print weekly computer program reports to ensure all students are using programs. Obtain feedback from mathematics teachers during department	1a.1 Interim Assessments. Computer Program reports on Student Learning Gains Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment
2	1a.2. An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test was Geometry and Measurement in 4th grade.	1a.2. Use literature to provide the necessary meaning to grasp measurement concepts and make real world connections including student journals, word walls, and/or books used as lesson lead-in.	1a.2 Leadership Team	1a.2. Print weekly computer program reports to ensure all students are using programs. Obtain feedback from mathematics teachers during department level meetings.	1a.2 Interim Assessments. Computer Program reports on Student Learning Gains Summative: 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment
3	1a.3 An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test was Expressions, Equations, and Statistics in 5th grade.	1a.3 Use Smart Boards to implement Real Life Problems contained within Go Math and Gizmo lessons.	1a.3 Leadership Team	1a.3 Examine Interim Assessment Data to target instruction. Print weekly computer program reports to ensure all students are using programs. Obtain feedback from mathematics teachers during department	1a.3 Interim Assessments. Computer Program reports on Student Learning Gains Summative: 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment

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.	N/A
---	-----

Mathematics Goal # 1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	The results of the 2010-2011 FCAT Mathematics Test indicates the 24%of students achieved proficiency (Levels 4 and 5). Our goal is to maintain and/or increase student proficiency by 1-percentage points to 25%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
24% (75)	25% (79)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2a.1 The level 4 and 5 students showed a deficiency in fractions in Grade 3.	2a.1 Utilize differentiated instruction to push progress of level 4 and 5 students with enrichment activities provided in Go Math.	2a.1 Leadership team	2a.1 Quarterly data chats will be held with Mathematics teachers and administration targeting student with levels 4 and 5. Print weekly computer program reports and review the progress of Level 4 and 5 students.	2a.1 Interim Assessments SuccessMaker Reports Summative: 2013 FCAT Mathematics Assessment

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	On the 2011-2012 FCAT Mathematics Test, 72% (120) of the students made learning gains. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to provide appropriate leveled instruction to increase the percentage of students making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 77% (129).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
72% (120)	77% (129).

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3a.1 An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test was Number: Operations, Problems in 3rd grade.	3a.1 Direct instruction in intervention will be implemented on a daily basis.	3a.1 Leadership Team	3a.1 Obtain monthly teacher feedback from department level meetings on the effectiveness of the use of Smart Boards. Print and Review Successmaker reports weekly to ensure appropriate learning gains are being made.	3a.1 1. Quarterly Interim Assessments. Computer Program reports on Student Learning Gains Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment
2	3a.2. An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test was Number: Fractions in 4th grade.	3a.2. Teachers will incorporate the use of Smart Boards into daily Go Math Lessons.	3a.2 Leadership Team	3a.2 Obtain monthly teacher feedback from department level meetings on the effectiveness of the use of Smart Boards. Print and Review Successmaker reports weekly to ensure appropriate learning gains are being made.	3a.2 1. Quarterly Interim Assessments. Computer Program reports on Student Learning Gains Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment
3	3a.3. An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 administration of the FCAT Mathematics Test was Geometry and Measurement in 5th grade.	3a.3. Student will complete at least one session of Successmaker Math each day.	3a.3 Leadership Team	3a.3 Obtain monthly teacher feedback from department level meetings on the effectiveness of the use of Smart Boards. Print and Review Successmaker reports weekly to ensure	3a.3 1. Quarterly Interim Assessments. Computer Program reports on Student Learning Gains Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0

			appropriate learning gains are being made.	Mathematics Assessment
--	--	--	--	------------------------

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	On the 201-2011 FCAT Mathematics Test, 63% of the students make learning gains. Our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to provide appropriate interventions and remediation in order to increase the percent of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains by 5 percentage points to 68%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
63% (29)	68% (31)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	4a.1. An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 FCAT Mathematics Test was Number: Operations, Problems.	4a.1. Provide before and after school tutoring for Level 1 and 2 students as budget permits.	4a.1. Leadership team	4a.1 Quarterly data chats with teachers of Mathematics and Administration.	4a.1. Quarterly Interim Assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

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	Elementary School Mathematics Goal # Our goal from 2011-2017 is to reduce the percent of non-proficient students by 50%.
--	---

by 50%.	5A :					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	45%	50%	55%	60%	65%	

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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:	<p>2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Test indicate that 26% (11) of Students with Disabilities (SWD) students achieved level 3 or higher.</p> <p>Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of SWD students achieving level 3 or higher by 20 percentage points to 38% (16).</p>
--	---

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
26% (11)	38% (16)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5d.1 Following a data analysis of the 2012-2013 Expected Improvements for SIP Goal chart available on http://osi.dadeschools.net , ED students are not making satisfactory progress in Number: Operations, Problems, & Situations and Geometry and Measurement.	5d.1 Teachers will provide data-driven small group differentiated instruction during the Mathematics Block. Student will complete at least one session of Successmaker Math each day.	5d.1 Leadership Team	5d.1 Examine Interim Assessment Data to target instruction. Print weekly computer program reports to ensure all students are using programs. Obtain feedback from mathematics teachers during department level meetings.	5d.1 Interim Assessments Computer Program reports on Student Learning Gains Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	N/A
---	-----

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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
					Review of Monthly	

SuccessMaker	K-5	Math Chairperson	Teachers of Mathematics	September 2012 - May 2013	SuccessMaker Reports at Department Level Meetings	Leadership Team
Effective Use of Smart Board Technology	K-5	Math Chairperson	Teachers of Mathematics	September 2012 - May 2013	Discussion of Progress at Department Level Meetings	Leadership Team
Gizmos	K-5	Gizmos Representative	Teachers of Mathematics and Science	September 2012 - May 2013	Discussion of Progress at Department Level Meetings	Leadership Team

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Effective use of Smart Board Technology	Smart Board Technology training	Title I	\$500.00
Effective use of Gizmos	Gizmos training	Title I	\$300.00
			Subtotal: \$800.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Interpreting SuccessMaker Reports to Target Instruction	SuccessMaker Reports training	Title I	\$300.00
			Subtotal: \$300.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$1,100.00

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:	On the 2010 administration of the FCAT Science Test, 30% of students achieved proficiency (FCAT Level 3). The expected level of performance for 2011 is 34% achieving proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
22% (24)	26% (29)
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	
	Person or Process Used to

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1a.1 The area of deficiency as noted on the FCAT 2011-12 Science Test was Physical Science.	1a.1 Ensure that instruction includes teacher-demonstrated as well as student-centered laboratory activities that apply, analyze, and explain concepts related to matter, energy, force, and motion.	1a.1 Leadership Team Vertical Science Team	1a.1 The administration and the Vertical Science Team will monitor the District Science Interim Benchmark Assessment results and classroom assessments on a quarterly basis.	1a.1 Formative: Pre/Post Assessments Quarterly Interim Assessments School-site assessments AIMS NGSSS Big Idea Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Test
2	1a.2. Students lack motivation in scientific exploration.	1a.2. Implement W.A.V.E. (Whigham Aquatic Visionary Explorers) Destination Academy for 2nd-5th grade students who qualify. W.A.V.E. students will pursue an aquatic nature theme with an emphasis on hands on learning; and problem solving skills that address the NGSSS; use of the aquatic theme to reinforce Physical and Earth/Space Science; and extended field trips that include local National Parks.	1a.2. Leadership Team W.A.V.E. Destination Academy Committee Vertical Science Team	1a.2 The Science Coach will meet with the W.A.V.E. Destination Academy Committee quarterly to review the effectiveness of thematic curriculum throughout all grade levels using District Science Interim Benchmark Assessments.	1a.2 Formative: Pre/Post Assessments Quarterly Interim Assessments School-site assessments AIMS NGSSS Big Idea Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Test

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal # 1b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	The results of the 2011-2012 FCAT 2.0 Science Test indicate the 12% (11) of students achieved proficiency (Levels 4 and 5). Our goal is to maintain and/or increase student proficiency by 1percentage point to 13% (12).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
12% (11)	13% (12)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2a.1. Level 4/5 Students need additional opportunities for real world problem solving through inquiry.	2a.1. Identify the top 25 percent of students based on 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics and Reading Tests, in order to form Enrichment Group. Offer Stem based activities through differentiated instruction, extended labs and after school science programs. Discovery Ed programs will be utilized to provide a different modality of learning.	2a.1. Leadership Team Vertical Science Team	2a.1. The Leadership Team and the Vertical Science Team will meet bimonthly to monitor student proficiency (teacher tests, scientific power writing and Edusoft reports).	2a.1. Formative: Student Lab Reports and Power Writing District Baseline and Interim Assessments Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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
Data Disaggregation	4th and 5th	Administration	4th and 5th Grade Science Teachers	August 2012, Sept, 2012, Oct. 2012, Nov. 2012, Jan, 2012, Feb. 2012	Data Chats	Administration
Pacing Guide Implementation through a PLC (Professional Learning Community)	K-5 Science Teachers	Vertical Science Team	K/1, 2nd – 5th Grade Science Teachers	Bi-monthly Grade Level Meetings; Early release; and Nov. 6, 2012.	Grade Level Meeting Minutes	Leadership Team Vertical Science Team
Environmental Education – incorporating Everglades National Park to all grade levels	Pre-K – 5	W.A.V.E. DestinationAcademy Team	K -3 Teachers, 4-5 Science Teachers	September 26, 2012	Provide MPP and allow teachers sufficient time to submit a lesson plan and samples of student work. Additionally, have pre/post tests for 3-5.	Administration

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Enrichment Group/Science Club	Materials to enhance scientific discovery	Title I	\$500.00
			Subtotal: \$500.00
			Grand Total: \$500.00

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	On the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Writing Test, 88% (78) of students achieved proficiency. Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase the percentage of students achieving at or above proficiency by 1 percentage point to 89% (79).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
88% (78)	89% (79)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1a.1. An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Writing Test is students lacked ability to use the necessary conventions in order to formulate adequate sentence structure.	1a.1. Teachers will provide explicit mini lesson on conventions of writing. Evidence of this instruction will be seen in student writing samples throughout the writing process.	1a.1. Administration Literacy Leadership Team Grade Level/Subject Level Teams	1a.1. Progress Monitoring on a weekly basis, writing portfolios	1a.1. Formative: Students score on monthly writing assessments District Baseline and Mid-Year Writing Assessment. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Writing Test
2	1a.2. An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Writing Test elaboration and detail. Students lacked the necessary skills needed to connect real life experiences into their writing.	1a.2. Students will use a graphic organizer/plan to write a draft organized with a logical sequence of beginning, middle, and end, while including the use of supporting details, or providing facts and/or opinions through concrete examples to develop focus and elaboration.	1a.2. Administration Literacy Leadership Team	1a.2. Administer and score student writing prompts monthly to monitor students progress and to adjust instruction as needed.	1a.2. Formative: Students score on monthly writing assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Writing Test
3	1a.3. An area of deficiency as noted on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Writing Test is fluency in writing. Students lack the ability to write fluently and coherently on a topic.	1a.3. Writing skills instruction and practice will be implemented across all content and subject areas.	1a.3. Administration Literacy Leadership Team Grade Level/Subject Area Teams	1a.3. Grade Level/Subject Area Teams will meet with an administrator to examine and analyze samples of student writing at the end of each grading period.	1a.3 Formative: Students score on monthly writing assessments. Summative: 2013 FCAT 2.0 Writing Test

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

N/A		N/A		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
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
FCAT 2.0 Writing Updates	4th	Reading Coach	4th Grade Writing Teachers	October 2, 2012	Leadership Team will meet with Writing Teachers after each 9 week grading period to review student progress in writing.	Administration
Best Practices in Teaching Writing	K-5	Reading Coach	K-5 Teachers, Special Area Teachers	September 17, 2012 November 6, 2012	Leadership team will meet monthly to monitor students' progress and the effectiveness of the writing instruction.	Administration

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Using professional texts to enhance and support writing	Building a Writing Community – Freeman, M. Units of Study for Teaching Writing-Calkins, L. Teaching the Qualities of Writing	Title I	\$200.00

instruction	– Portalupi, J. Marvelous Mini Lessons for Teaching Beginning Writing, K-3 – Rog, L.
Subtotal: \$200.00	
Grand Total: \$200.00	

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:	Our 2011-2012 average daily attendance rate was 95.51% (686). Our goal for the 2012-2013 school year is to increase our average daily attendance rate by .50 percentage point to 637, according to current enrollment of 663 students.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
95.51% (686)	96.01% (637)
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
208	198
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
228	217

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	Absences have remained the same from the previous year. Parents are not aware of the district policies.	Provide informational flyers to parents explaining the district policy on attendance and tardiness.	Administration Attendance Review Committee (ARC)	Administration will monitor the school's attendance on a quarterly basis.	Attendance rosters
2	Parents/students not fully aware of the correlation of attendance and performance.	Encourage daily attendance by using a school-wide incentive program.	Administration ARC	Administration will monitor the attendance rosters identifying classes with perfect attendance on a daily basis. Administration will monitor contact log of students with 5 or more consecutive absences on a weekly basis.	Attendance rosters
	Tardies have remained the same from the	Provide informational flyers to parents	Administration Attendance	Administration will monitor the school's	Attendance rosters

3	previous year. Parents are not aware of the district policies.	explaining the district policy on tardiness.	Review Committee (ARC)	tardiness on a quarterly basis.
---	--	--	------------------------	---------------------------------

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
Attendance Procedures	All	Gradebook Manager	School-wide	Opening of School Meeting- August 16, 2012	Faculty Meeting updates	Administration
Parent Meeting for Attendance	All	Administration	School-wide (parents)	Quarterly-October, January, March, June	Leadership Team Meetings	Administration

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Incentives for students	EESAC	EESAC	\$1,000.00
			Subtotal: \$1,000.00
			Grand Total: \$1,000.00

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:	Our goal for the 2011-2012 school year is to decrease the number of students being suspended by 5%.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions

22	20
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
19	17
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
19	17
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
13	12

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	A barrier to decreasing the number of in-school and outdoor suspensions is the lack of a schoolwide student incentive program for positive behavior.	A barrier to decreasing the number of in-school and outdoor suspensions is the lack of a schoolwide student incentive program for positive behavior.	Administrative Team	Monitor incentive programs by grade level and monitor District reports on student outdoor suspensions on a quarterly basis.	Participation log for students who are recognized for complying with the Student Code of Conduct along with the monthly District suspension report.

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Code of Student Conduct	All	Counselor	School-wide	August 16, 2012, through January 31, 2013	Leadership Team Meetings	Administration

Suspension Budget:

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

Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Presentation of Code of Student Conduct.	Copies of Manual	Title I	\$100.00
			Subtotal: \$100.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$100.00

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

1. Parent Involvement					
Parent Involvement Goal #1:		See PIP			
<i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>					
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:		2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:			
35% (350)		40% (400)			
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					

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:		Increase activities for students to design and develop science, math and engineering projects utilizing technology to increase scientific thinking and the development and implementation of inquiry-based activities.			
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 Students lack opportunities for mathematical exploration and scientific inquiry in order to develop deep understanding of scientific and	1.1 Increase activities for students to design and develop science, math, and engineering projects utilizing technology to increase scientific thinking and the development and	1.1. Leadership Team	1.1. Review formative assessment data reports to ensure progress is being made and adjust instruction as needed.	1.1 Student based projects

1	mathematical principles.	implementation of inquiry-based activities. Develop and implement an academy to provide enrichment opportunities for aquatic studies, (W.A.V.E.)	Monitor student progress with Science Fair project development. Monitor implementation of project based learning Monitor lab reports.
---	--------------------------	---	---

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Promotion of W.A.V.E Academy/Program For 2nd – 5th grade students	Informational Brochure	Title I	\$500.00
			Subtotal: \$500.00
			Grand Total: \$500.00

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Reading, Understanding, and Analyzing Complex Texts	Exemplar Texts from CCSS Appendix B	Title I	\$700.00
CELLA	Update training for teachers of ELL students.	Training Manuals/Materials from District	Title I	\$200.00
CELLA	Students need to improve their academic performance in Reading skills. Students need to identify and analyze the elements of plot structure, including exposition, setting and character development.	Funds to implement afterschool tutorial program for identified ELL learners	Title III	\$3,000.00
				Subtotal: \$3,900.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Training for implementation of SuccessMaker 4.0 for T1 and T2 Instruction	Training materials	Title I	\$100.00
CELLA	Riverdeep	Computer-based Program	N/A	\$0.00
Mathematics	Effective use of Smart Board Technology	Smart Board Technology training	Title I	\$500.00
Mathematics	Effective use of Gizmos	Gizmos training	Title I	\$300.00
				Subtotal: \$900.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Mathematics	Interpreting SuccessMaker Reports to Target Instruction	SuccessMaker Reports training	Title I	\$300.00
Suspension	Presentation of Code of Student Conduct.	Copies of Manual	Title I	\$100.00
				Subtotal: \$400.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Science	Enrichment Group/Science Club	Materials to enhance scientific discovery	Title I	\$500.00
Writing	Using professional texts to enhance and support writing instruction	Building a Writing Community – Freeman, M. Units of Study for Teaching Writing- Calkins, L. Teaching the Qualities of Writing – Portalupi, J. Marvelous Mini Lessons for Teaching Beginning Writing, K-3 – Rog, L.	Title I	\$200.00
Attendance	Incentives for students	EESAC	EESAC	\$1,000.00
STEM	Promotion of W.A.V.E Academy/Program For 2nd – 5th grade students	Informational Brochure	Title I	\$500.00
				Subtotal: \$2,200.00
				Grand Total: \$7,400.00

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/12/2012)

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
Funds will be utilized to purchase books for the media center as well as literary materials for classroom teachers that support the implementation of the Common Core State Standards.	\$3,315.00

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

SAC will review and monitor the implementation and progress towards goals of the School Improvement Plan on a monthly basis.
SAC will continue to support school-wide activities that enhance and promote academic achievement for all students.

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Dade School District DR. EDWARD L. WHIGHAM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	72%	62%	78%	38%	250	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%	54%			120	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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?	68% (YES)	63% (YES)			131	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					501	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Dade School District DR. EDWARD L. WHIGHAM ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	65%	63%	89%	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	62%	59%			121	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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?	54% (YES)	67% (YES)			121	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					499	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested