FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: MAPLEWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Broward

Principal: Sherry Bees

SAC Chair: Carlos Duran

Superintendent: Robert Runcie

Date of School Board Approval: December 4, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/23/2012

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	Sherry Bees	Degrees: Master's Degree, Nova University and Bachelor's Degree, Nova University Certification: Educational Leadership (all	12	13	2011-2012 School Grade: B Made Learning Gains in Math: 66.8% Made Learning Gains in Reading: 64.5% Lowest 25% Made Learning Gains in Math: 50.2% Lowest 25% Made Learning Gains in Reading: 62.8% FAA Students Made Learning gains in Math: 47.3% FAA Students Made Learning Gains in Reading: 29.1% 2010-2011 School Grade: A AYP Status: No Made Learning Gains in Math: 63% (146) Made Learning Gains in Reading: 62% (143) Lowest 25% in Math: 69% (37) Lowest 25% in Reading: 59% (33)

		levels), Elementary Education (grades 1-6), Primary Education (K-3), ESOL Endorsement			2009-2010 School Grade: A AYP Status: No 2008-2009: School Grade: A AYP Status: No 2007-2008: School Grade: A AYP Status: Yes 2006-2007: School Grade: B AYP Status: Yes 2005-2006: School Grade: A AYP Status: Yes
Assis Principal	Michele Phillips	Degrees: M. Ed. from Florida Atlantic University B.A. from University of South Florida Certifications: School Principal (all levels) Educational Leadership (all levels) Mentally Handicapped (grades K-12) ESOL Endorsement	4	11	2011-2012 School Grade: B Made Learning Gains in Math: 66.8% Made Learning Gains in Reading: 64.5% Lowest 25% Made Learning Gains in Math: 50.2% Lowest 25% Made Learning Gains in Reading: 62.8% FAA Students Made Learning gains in Math: 47.3% FAA Students Made Learning Gains in Reading: 29.1% 2010-2011 School Grade: A AYP Status: No Made Learning Gains in Math: 63% (146) Made Learning Gains in Reading: 62% (143) Lowest 25% in Math: 69% (37) Lowest 25% in Reading: 59% (33) 2009-2010 School Grade: A AYP Status: No 2008-2009: School Grade: A AYP Status: No 2007-2008: School Grade: N/A AYP Status: No 2006-2007: School Grade: N/A AYP Status: N/A 2005-2006: School Grade: N/A AYP Status: No 2004-2005: School Grade: N/A AYP Status: Yes 2003-2004: School Grade: N/A AYP Status: No

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)
N/A					

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. Participate in Grade Level Meetings	Team Leaders	June, 2013	
2	2. Newly Hired participates in the New Educator Support System (NESS) mentoring program	Lori Moore	June, 2013	
3	3. Staff Development Activities-Professional Learning Communities	Instructional Leadership Team	June, 2013	
4	4. Classroom Walkthrough	Administration and Leadership Team	June, 2013	
5	5. Formal and Informal Observations with feedback provided	Administration	June, 2013	
6	6. Monthly Leadership Team Meetings	Administration	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
8 - Instructional Staff Teaching Out-of-Field 0 - Paraprofessionals (a.k.a. ESP's) Out-of-Field	Teachers are provided Mentors to provide guidance, support and assistance. The Teacher and Mentor meet at least weekly for support. There are opportunities for observations and feedback for the teacher who has received less than an effective rating.

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	10.2%(5)	16.3%(8)	30.6%(15)	36.7%(18)	40.8%(20)	79.6%(39)	2.0%(1)	12.2%(6)	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
Annette Tingley	Yvette Dimeola	New Educator	Monthly MESS Meetings to support the new educator to be successful.
Lauren Arlt	Shelley Terry	New Educator	
Lori Moore	Katherine Constantine	New Educator	

Lysa Hernandez	Alexis Nielsen	New Educator	
Danielle Ortino	Alan Jablonowitz	Support for New Maplewood Staff	The Mentor will meet with the Mentee on an as needed basis. At minimum, they will meet at monthly meetings.
Abena Petruso	Ann Marie Walters	Support for New Maplewood Staff	
Marissa Selbst	Miriam Sandbrand	Support for New Maplewood Staff	

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

Funds will be used for instructional materials and supplies, in addition to parent resources for parent trainings.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

N/A

Title I, Part D

N/A

Title II

N/A

Title III

N/A

Title X- Homeless

N/A

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI funds are used to provide supplemental materials for students who are within the lowest percentage quartile.

Violence Prevention Programs

Maplewood is committed to the Anti-Bullying policy as set forth by the Broward County School Board (5.9). An anti-bullying team has been developed at our school that responds to all potential situations that involve student violence. In addition, our school is committed to ensure that students feel safe in reporting any incidents. The school also offers a non-violence, gang resistance and anti-drug program (DARE) to students provided by our School Resource Officer.

Nutrition Programs

The physical fitness challenge is implemented through the physical education program. Through training in the physical education class, and encouragement by the classroom teacher, the student is encouraged to be physically active and to make healthy nutrition choices.

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

To ensure school readiness, the Specialized PreK Program provides literacy, math and science curricula that align with the K-3 national standards to improve educational outcomes. This connection between curricula and child expectations has contributed to better prepare students to succeed in Kindergarten. An end of the year Teaching Strategies Gold report, detailing students' ongoing assessment is available to familiarize Kindergarten teachers with the Specialized PreK students' progress in the program.

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

Other

N/A

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

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

ESE Specialist: Assists general education teachers with their ESE students, the InD cluster teachers and PreK teachers.

ESE Support: Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching.
Social Worker: Provides services to support the student and his/her family. This support maintains the link between family and home.

Guidance: Supports and maintains the link between school and home.

Psychologist: Participates in the collection and interpretation of data; provides support to the RtI Leadership Team.

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 team meets once a month, to gain information from Team Leaders on each grade level and to discuss students for whom there are concerns either in academic and/or behavioral areas. Students are referred by teachers, support staff, or as of the result of a parent request. When a child is referred the teachers will meet with RtI Liaison assigned to their grade level. Teachers conduct observations, parent conferences and collect data. The information collected include observations, parent conferences and other data that will be utilized to see patterns of behavior, learning difficulties or growth. Also included are summary sheets for initial data collection that is analyzed by the RtI Leadership Team. A review of the cumulative folder, screenings for speech/language, hearing and vision, an observation and documentation of Tier 1 interventions that have been implemented addressing a target behavior. An initial parent conference is requested and concerns are shared with the parent. Tier I data will be collected by the classroom teacher the grade level case manager that is assigned works with the teachers recommending Tier 2 interventions for the child. Documentation is ongoing as is the meetings with the case manager and teacher to discuss intervention outcomes. A second parent conference is held to discuss the student's response to intervention. The RtI model is a three-tiered approach to provide instruction and interventions to meet the students needs. If needed, Tier 3 interventions will be implemented; these are intensive individualized instructional or behavioral interventions. After reviewing the Tier 3 interventions the RtI Leadership Team will make recommendations which may include a change of placement. If Tier 3 intervention are not successful the RtI Leadership Team will refer the child to the School Psychologist for further assessment. Then a determination will be made if the child will be tested. The child will continued to be monitored by a member of the RtI team to ensure success.

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

The RtI Leadership Team is made up of school support staff which work collaboratively through the Collaborative Problem Solving process to meet the needs of the students and close the gap. They offer assistance to classroom teachers in the areas of interventions and differentiating instruction to met the needs of all students. Students who are not making gains will be monitored and data will be collected for further evaluations. Students who have been retained are placed in Reading/ Math recovery class which offer Tier 3 intervention.

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.

The data management system is a multi-tiered approach comprised of data collections in the form of summary sheets, graphs, behavior tracking forms and other instruments used to target behaviors and pinpoint areas of need. Additional data is obtained from Virtual Counselor. Background data, assessment data and other information is noted on summary sheets to provide a snap shot of the student. Anecdotal, referral and behavioral observations are also reviewed to create recommended interventions. After an intervention is implemented the response is documented in order to drive instructional and or behavioral decisions and/or recommendations for an optimal placement/ learning environment. Formal and informal assessment are evaluated to assist in making decisions regarding interventions for students. Collaborative Problem Solving packets contain RtI documentation which is sent to Student Services.

Progress Monitoring: Mini Assessments, FCAT Simulation, Rigby, Phonics Monitoring, Weekly reading assessments and student artifacts

Mid-year: Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Diagnostic Assessment for Reading (DAR), Rigby and Early Reading Diagnostic Assessment (ERDA)

End-of-year: FAIR, Rigby, end-of-year tests and FCAT

Frequency of Data Days: 2 times per month for data analysis

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Staff will be trained in the use of the RtI model through a beginning of the year faculty meeting. Then the support staff assigned will meet with the grade level team meeting monthly to discuss concerns or questions. The school Psychologist, support facilitators and others on the RtI Leadership Team will conduct training twice during the year. The ESE Department trains Team Leaders and Team Leaders share processes with their team. Approaches to data collection and presentation will be determined with examples, methods for differentiating instructions and how to use data as a tool in decision making to develop, implement and evaluate instructional and behavioral strategies.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

The ESE Specialist will gain knowledge by attending meetings and discussing issues with the Psychologist then bring the information back to the teams.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Principal, Sherry Bees: Assistant Principal: Michele Phillips, ESE Specialist: Rachel Tyman, Guidance Counselor: Mindy Mansdorf, ESE Support: Marissa Selbst and Grade level Team Leaders: Kindergarten: Lynn Walsh, Grade 1: Lori Moore, Grade 2: Amy Euler, Grade 3: Annette Tingley, Grade 4: Lauren Arlt, Grade 5: Maria Castranovo

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

The LLT is responsible for monitoring and implementation of the curriculum. The Literacy Team meets monthly to discuss progress toward school wide and individual goals. The Principal prepares the agenda and facilitates the meeting. Each member of the team shares concerns, successes, and contributes, as appropriate, to problem solving discussions.

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

The major initiative of the LLT this year is to facilitate differentiated and small group instruction as appropriate for all students with an end result of increasing the number of students making AYP. Our attention will be especially focused on our lowest 25th percentile, including our Black, Hispanic, ESE population, and Economically Disadvantaged students.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
View uploaded file (Uploaded on 9/30/2012)

*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.

To assist preschool students in transition to elementary school programs. The specialized PreK program provides literacy, math and science curriculum that align with K - 3 standards to improve educational outcomes through the use of curricular and student progress monitoring through teaching strategies so that students are prepared to make the transition to Kindergarten.

*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:	There will be at least a 3% increase of students who scored an Achievement Level 3 in Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
26.7% (94) students scored a level 3 on the FCAT Reading Assessment.	At least 28% (99) (students will score an Achievement Level 3 or better in Reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are not given enough opportunities to practice reading.	Teachers will provide additional practice through literacy centers, to include independent reading, Accelerated Reading with grade level monthly goal (K-3 & 5), reading log (4th grade), vocabulary and Daily 5 in selected grade levels.	Classroom Teacher	Accelerated Reader Tests and Reports, Treasures Reading Assessments, Destination Reading (5th Grade)	Student Teacher Chats, Administration Teacher Chats and Reading Log.
2	Continuous exposure to professional development in the rigor of Common Core.	Grade Level trainings for Daily5, CCSS.	Administration and classroom teacher	Train-the-trainer model (Team/Faculty collaboration)	Classroom observation, benchmark data, assessments (FAIR, AR, RIGBY, Treasures)
3	Understanding and applying higher level thinking skills.	Students will utilize varied complex texts including multiple genre and the use of graphic organizers.	Grade Level Teachers	Classroom observations, data chats with administration and weekly team meetings	Classroom observation, benchmark data, assessments (FAIR, AR, RIGBY, Treasures)

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:	At least 3% more students who take the Florida Alternate Assessment will score at Levels 4, 5 and 6 in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
35.3% (6) students who took the Florida Alternate Assessment scored at Levels 4, 5 and 6 in reading.	38% (7) students who take the Florida Alternate Assessment will score at Levels 4, 5 and 6 in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack the retention of sight word vocabulary	Small group instruction Word Wall Edmark Reading Program Visuals	Classroom Teacher ESE Specialist	Edmark Reading Program ULS Program	ULS post testing
2	Students have difficulty with reading comprehension.	Small group instruction ULS Program activities Visuals	Classroom Teacher ESE Specialist	ULS Program	ULS post testing

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 number of students who scored an Achievement Level 4 will increase by at least 3% in Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
38.9% (137) students scored an Achievement Level 4 in Reading.	At least 41% (144) students will score an Achievement Level 4 in Reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are not provided enough opportunities for reading enrichment.	Teachers will provide opportunities for chapter books, whole and small group.	Classroom Teachers and Instructional Leadership Team	Exhibition of mastery through rubrics for project based learning.	Teacher Assessments and Rubrics
2		Questioning techniques to target differentiated instruction and enrichment.	Classroom Teacher		Benchmark Assessments, Rigby and DAR's

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	At least 3% more students who take the Florida Alternate Assessment will score at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
35.3% (6) students who took the Florida Alternate Assessment scored at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading.	38% (7) students who take the Florida Alternate Assessment will score at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack the retention of sight word vocabulary.	Small group instruction Edmark Reading Program Visuals	Classroom Teacher ESE Specialist	ULS Programs	ULS post testing
2	Students have difficulty with reading	Small group instruction Visuals	Classroom Teacher ESE Specialist	ULS Programs	ULS post testing

	comprehension.	Edmark Reading Program			

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:	There will be an increase of at least 3% students who will make Learning Gains in Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
64.5% (150) of students made Learning Gains in reading.	67% (156) students will make Learning Gains in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Bridging transition gap into CCSS.	Teachers will follow Reading IFC's as a pacing guide. Implement the Common Core State Standards in grades K through 5.	Team Leaders, Administration and Instructional Leadership Team	Weekly grade level team planning and data chats	BAT 1 & 2, FCAT
2		Teachers will participate in Learning Communities that will include the sharing of best practices in reading strategies.	Administration and Instructional Leadership Team	Colleagues will observe each others' classrooms to provide feedback on the effectiveness of strategies after best practices are recognized.	FCAT, BAT 1 & 2, Reading program assessments and weekly assessments
3		All classes will have an uninterrupted 90 minute block (30 minutes whole group and 60 minutes small group)	Administration and Instructional Leadership Team	Classroom walk through to determine the effectiveness of grade level schedules.	FCAT, BAT 1 & 2, Reading Program Assessments
4		PLC's, district based staff development, interdisciplinary lessons.	Classroom Teacher and Administration	Classroom observations, train-the-trainer model for team/faculty	BAT 1 & 2, FCAT

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:	At least 3% students who take the Florida Alternate Assessment will make learning gains in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
64.5% (150) students who took the Florida Alternate Assessment made learning gains in reading.	67% (155) students who take the Florida Alternate Assessment will make learning gains in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teachers need to differentiate instruction.	Review IEP goals and ability group students, PLC's and Professional	ESE Specialist Administration	Classroom Walk Through iObservation and review of lesson plans	ULS post testing and 2013 FAA

		Development			
2	Students have difficulty retaining information presented.	Small group, instruction based on differentiating instruction, utilize ULS activities paired with visuals.	ESE Specialist	Classroom Walk Through	ULS post testing and 2013 FAA

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:	There will be an increase of at least 3% students in the lowest quartile that will make learning gains in Reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
62.8% (38) students in the lowest quartile made learning gains in reading.	65% (39) students in the lowest quartile will make learning gains in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack appropriate decoding skills to master grade level reading	Students assessed and placed in an appropriate phonics based program (May include: Phonics for Reading, Fundations, Intermediate Rewards, Elements of Reading/vocabulary).	Instructional Leadership Team Team Leaders	Program assessments and reports	BAT 1 & 2, FCAT, ORF and RIGBY
2	Opportunities to provide adequate follow-up on identified as the lowest 25%.	Utilize additional case managers to pull small groups for extra instruction.	Support Staff, Guidance, Team Leaders, ESE and Speech	Team meetings, data chats and PLC's	Benchmark Assessment, FAIR, Rigby's and FCAT
3	Understanding and applying higher level thinking skills.	Students will utilize varied complex texts including multiple genre and the use of graphic organizers.	Grade Level Teachers	Classroom Observation, Data Chats with administration, Weekly Team Meetings	Classroom observation, benchmark data, assessments (FAIR, AR, Rigby and Treasures)

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 # 5A : By June 2017, Maplewood Elementary will reduce the achievement gap from 66%% of reading students in grades 3 - 5 scoring proficient or above in reading to 81% of students scoring proficient or above by 2017. 66% of students scored			
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	65%	68%	72%	75%	78%	

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:	At least 3% of students in all subgroups will increase their satisfactory progress in reading.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Student subgroups that did not make satisfactory progress in Reading: White 20.9% (29), Black 51.4% (38), Hispanic 37.3% (38), Asian 36.4% (4), American Indian N/A (0).	The percentage of students not making satisfactory progress will be as follows: White 17% (25), Black 48% (36), Hispanic 34% (36), Asian 33% (3), American Indian 0%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Classroom teacher's lack differentiation of instruction.	Teachers will participate in PLC's for diversified instruction, strategy groups and sharing of best practices.	Administration, Instructional Leadership Team and Team Leaders	Program Assessments	BAT 1 & 2, FCAT, ORF and RIGBY
2	Prerequisite skills are lacking.	Students assessed and placed in an appropriate phonics based program (i.e. Phonics for Reading, Intermediate Rewards, Fundations and/or Elements of Reading).	Administration and Instructional Leadership Team	Administer program pre and post tests and conduct data chats with student teacher and teacher administrator.	Program Assessments FAIR
3	Lack of background knowledge.	Front loading information (United Streaming, Virtual field trips)	Classroom Teacher, Instructional Leadership Team and Reading Coach	Graphic organizers, monitor student growth through data chats	Classroom observation, iObservation, teacher observation and student conferences.

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:	Students in the English Language Learners Subgroup will make satisfactory progress in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (0) students of the ELL Subgroup did not make satisfactory progress in reading.	3% (3) of students in the ELL Subgroup will make satisfactory progress in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Maintaining and increasing the number of ELL students making learning gains.	1-Daily participation in English In A Flash ELL Pen. 2-All classroom teachers will provide small group instruction at the student's level. 3-Teachers will provide appropriate reading interventions as per the Struggling Readers Chart. 4-Teachers of ELL students will identify those students in Tiers 1,2 and 3 and provide appropriate ESOL strategies. 5- Students in grades K-5 will	ESOL Coordinator and Classroom Teacher	Weekly Program Reports, Treasures Reading Assessment, Program Assessments	RIGBY, BAT 1 & 2, FCAT, CELLA and ORF

		participate in learning centers utilizing Language Master with pictures and words, pictures/flashcards, visual cues to enhance the acquisition of language.			

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:	Students with Disabilities will increase satisfactory progress by 3% in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
69.4% (34) Students with Disabilities (SWD) did not make satisfactory progress in reading.	73% (36) of Students with Disabilities (SWD) will make satisfactory progress in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Differentiated Instruction	Teachers will modify curriculum based on IEP for each student.	ESE Specialist Classroom Teacher	Lesson plans will be reviewed during classroom visits.	Program assessments
2	Students with disabilities do not have appropriate modifications to understand concepts.	Teachers will provide accommodations and modify curriculum based on current IEP.	ESE Specialist Classroom Teacher	ESE Specialist will conduct data chats with classroom teachers	RIGBY Assessment DAR ORF BAT 1 & 2 FCAT
3	Students lack of stamina in reading longer passages.	Cooperative groups, buzz about it, reading journals/logs, Daily5	Classroom Teacher	Student data chats, ongoing progress monitoring	ORF's, review journals/logs, Daily5
4	Data driven decision-making	Modeling for staff to drive instruction and facilitate proactive remediation and enrichment. Planning and preparing for groups of students to ensure effective scaffolding. Flexible grouping to meet the needs of all learners.	Team Leaders, Classroom Teachers and Instructional Leadership Team	Data chats and Team planning	Anecdotals from data chats and classroom observations

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	Students who are Economically Disadvantaged will increase satisfactory progress in reading by 3%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
44.9% (79) of Economically Disadvantaged students did not make satisfactory progress in reading.	48% (85) of our Economically Disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Diversifying instruction	All classroom teachers will provide small group instruction at the student's level.	Administration Instructional Leadership Team Team Leaders	Program Assessments	BAT 1 & 2, FCAT, ORF and RIGBY
2	Students lack prerequisite skills to understand concepts.	Teachers will utilize graphic organizers (i.e. KWL charts, RAN, Venn Diagram) to identify student background knowledge to modify instruction.	Aministration Instructional Leadership Team Team Leaders	Student progress evaluated through weekly program assessments.	BAT 1 & 2, FCAT and RIGBY

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
Introduction to Reading: IFC Calendar, develop a plan for incorporating literary analysis, Genre and reading application, curriculum, test specs, plan of action to introduce Core Curriculum to students, beginning of year tests, appropriate target skills in reading, higher order thinking, reading strategies, suggested reading lists and Read Across Broward	K-5 Reading	Mary Martinelli	School-Wide	August, 2012 (3.5 hours)	Instructional Leadership Team will monitor data through monthly meetings.	Administration Inservice Facilitator
Class Process: Centers and small groups, differentiating groups based on BAT data, literary analysis and reading application, best practices,	K-5 Reading	Mary Martinelli	School-Wide	September, 2012 (2 hours)	Instructional Leadership Team will monitor data through monthly meetings.	Administration Inservice Facilitator

	reading strategies, investigate college and career readiness.						
	Resources Available: BEEP Resources, Explicit instruction site, Common Core books, reading strategies	K-5 Reading	Mary Martinelli	School-Wide	November, 2012 (1 hour)	Instructional Leadership Team will monitor data through monthly meetings.	Administration Inservice Facilitator
	Student Mastery of Curriculum: Mid-year vs. end of year tests, analyze scores from BAT, best practices, restructing groups as needed based on BAT data	K-5 Reading	Mary Martinelli	School-Wide	January, 2013 (3 hours)	Instructional Leadership Team will monitor data through monthly meetings.	Administration Inservice Facilitator
	Where are we? Where do we need to be?: Review test specs, supplemental materials, best practices for test specs, what strategies are working, not working?	K-5 Reading	Mary Martinelli	School-Wide	February, 2013 (2 hours)	Instructional Leadership Team will monitor data through monthly meetings.	Administration Inservice Facilitator
	Classroom Environment/Data:Differentiating groups based on BAT Data, Literary analysis and reading application, reading readiness, investigating college and career readiness	K-5 Reading	Mary Martinelli	School-Wide	October, 2012 (3 hours)	Instructional Leadership Team will monitor data through monthly meetings.	Administration Inservice Facilitator
	Assessment: Pulling supplemental materials to fill gaps of NGSS and CCSS, Common Core State Standards	K-5 Reading	Mary Martinelli	School-Wide	March, 2013 (3 hours)	Instructional Leadership Team will monitor data through monthly meetings.	Administration Inservice Facilitator
	Getting Reading for the Next Grade Level: Across grade levels correlations to CCSS	K-5 Reading	Mary Martinelli	School-Wide	April, 2013 (1 hour)	Instructional Leadership Team will monitor data through monthly meetings.	Administration Inservice Facilitator
	Across Grade						

Levels Correlations, Data, Peer-to-Peer Modeling, preparing for next year	K-5 Reading	Mary Martinelli	School-Wide	May, 2013 (3 hours)	Instructional Leadership Team will monitor data through monthly meetings.	Administration Inservice Facilitator
Resources Available: Common Core State Standards, Building the Foundation Video for Common Core State Standards	K-5 Reading	Mary Martinelli	School-Wide	December, 2012 (1 hour)	Instructional Leadership Team will monitor data through monthly meetings.	Administration Inservice Facilitator

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Teachers will participate in Professional Learning Communities for training in reading strategies.	Time for Kids Treasures Weekly Reader	State Reading Allocation	$2,750.00
			Subtotal: $2,750.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $2,750.00

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:	To increase the number of students proficiency in Listening and Speaking by 3%.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
The current percentage of students proficient in Listening/Speaking is 31% (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	Teachers must create an environment where English Language Learners (ELLS) have opportunities to practice language skills in order to grow while acquiring proficiency.	Students will communicate with peers and teachers in a safe setting.	ELL Contact Administration	On-going dialogue between ELL and non-ELL observations of student's engagement in curriculum.	IPT Spring results 2013 CELLA Results
2	Extended time and differentiated instruction for ELL's.	Prescribed lessons utilizing computer programs, giving students applications to work on listening skills.	Classroom Teacher	Teacher monitoring	Language In A Flash Computer-Based Assessment
3		Students will partiicpate in Fundations and Phonics for Reading.	Classroom Teacher Administration	Monthly monitor checks daily times word drills.	Compare Pre and Post testing

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 percentage of students proficient in reading will increase by 2%.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	
The current percentage of student proficient in reading is 8% (3).	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	ELL students experience language challenges that impact their reading comprehension.	ELL readers will utilize of English in a Flash, Fundations, Phonics for Reading through Treasures.	Classroom Teachers Administration	Program Assessment	Spring IPT 2013 CELLA FCAT
2	Meeting the needs of ELL students.	Teacher will incorporate ELL strategies for this subgroup.	Administration ELL Contract	Lesson plans will document strategies.	Lesson Plans Observations

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 percentage of students competency will increase by 5%.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:	
The current percentage of students proficient in writing is 8% (6).	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack prior academic knowledge.	Teachers will incorporate ELL strategies with fidelity and afford students opportunities for buddy and teacher conferences.	Classroom Teacher Team Leaders ELL Contact	Lesson Plans with documentation of strategies.	Writing prompts 2013 CELLA Scores FCAT Writing
2	Teachers need to differentiate with fidelity.	Teachers will be sensitive to cultural diversity.	ELL Contact Administration	Monthly monitoring	Writing Prompts
3	Students are not using translation dictionaries to their fullest capacity.	Teachers will show students how to use translation dictionaries.	ELL Contact	Buddy and Teacher conferencing.	Writing prompts 2013 CELLA FCAT Writing

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	There will be an increase of 3% of students who score at least a level 3 in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28.4% (100) scored an Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.	32% (113) of our students will score an Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Not sustaining an effective pace of instruction.	Grade level teams meet weekly to discuss planning, curriculum concerns, pacing and adherence to IFC's.	Administration, Leadership Team, Classroom Teachers, Math Resource and Team Leaders	Program Assessments	Unit, End-of-Year Tests, FCAT, Mini-BAT, Pre-requisite tests, Mid-year Tests, Teacher Observation and chapter tests
2	Some students are not comprehending math concepts being taught during scheduled instruction.	Grades K-5 and ESE will participate in Calendar Math-Mega Math Grab'n Go, Math Center and/or Destination Math online interventions to reinforce math skills.	Administration, Classroom Teachers, Math Resource and Leadership Team	Administrative walk through to monitor student participation. Followed by Administrator teacher data chats and program assessements.	
3	Students lack prerequisite knowledge of concepts.	Students will utilize Odyssey (Big Idea), First in Math, FCAT Explorer to provide practice and monitor achievement	Administration, Classroom Teachers, math Resource and Leadership Team	Participation and achievement will be monitored by administration, Leadership Team and Classroom Teachers	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1b:	There will be an increase of at least 3% students who take the Florida Alternate Assessment will score at Levels 4, 5 and 6 in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
52.9% (9) of students who took the Florida Alternate Assessment scored at Levels 4, 5 and 6 in mathematics.	55% (10) students who take the Florida Alternate Assessment will score at Levels 4, 5 and 6 in mathematics.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Learning obstacle(s)	ULS weekly plans to work	ESE Specialist	ULS Monthly post testing	ULS

1	related to specific disabilities of the students.	on number sense, time and money skills.	Classroom Teacher		2013 FAA
2	Students have difficulty retaining information presented	Differentiate instruction, small groups, Touch Math, ULS weekly activities	ESE Specialist Classroom Teacher	ULS Monthly post testing	ULS 2013 FAA

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:	At least 3% students will score at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
36.4% (128) students scored at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.	At least 40% (141) students will score at or above an Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students not provided sufficient opportunities for enrichment.	Students grouped according to ability levels and placed in high achiever classroom. Everyday Math and Challenge-Go Math	Administration	Program Assessments	Go Math Program Assessments, FCAT, enrichment workbooks and Riverdeep
2	Students require increased practice with critical thinking and cognitive and complex tasks to further and deepen knowledge of content.	Math Journals (writing connection), CCSS, BEEP-online tools, challenging games, Onsets and Equations, Everyday Math	Classroom Teachers and Math Resource	Student achievement data and class observations	iObservation reports, learning rubrics, Benchmark Assessment and FAIR

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:	There will be an increase of at least 1% of students who take the Florida Alternate Assessment that will score at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
17.6% (3) students who took the Florida Alternate Assessment scored at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics.	18% (4) students who take the Florida Alternate Assessment will score at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Gap of pre-requisite skills due to student abilities.	Expose students to test information through ULS	ESE Specialist Classroom Teacher	ULS Post Testing	ULS
	Students have difficulty	Differentiate instruction,	ESE Specialist	ULS Post Testing	ULS

2	retaining information presented	small groups, Touch Math, ULS weekly activities	Classroom Teacher		

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:	At least 3% students will increase making learning gains in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
66.8% (155) students made learning gains in mathematics.	69% (160) students will make learning gains in mathematics.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack prerequisite skills in math.	Students will utilize Odyssey (Big Ideas), Destination Math, First in Math, and FCAT Explorer to provide practice and monitor achievement	Administration, Classroom Teachers, Math Coach and Leadership Team	Participation and achievement will be monitored quarterly by the Curriculum Specialist	Assessment reports from programs
2	Lack of ability grouping.	Students are grouped by area of weakness in grades 4 and 5 and work with the teacher daily in small group instruction.	Administration and Leadership Team	Student assessments monitored weekly by teachers, quarterly by administration and Curriculum Specialist	Program assessment, Go Math

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:	There will be an increase of 3% of students who take the Florida Alternate Assessment that will make learning gains in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
47.3% (5) students who took the Florida Alternate Assessment made learning gains in mathematics.	50% (6) students who take the Florida Alternate Assessment will make learning gains in mathematics.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Inconsistent use of manipulatives in the classroom.	Utilize hands-on manipulatives during small group lessons and PLC's.	Classroom Teacher ESE Specialist	ULS post testing	ULS 2013 FAA
2	Difficulty retaining math concepts.	Small groups and/or 1:1 lessons of functional skills through real-life situations by using hands-on manipulatives.	Classroom Teacher ESE Specialist	ULS post testing	ULS 2013 FAA

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:	At least a 3% increase of students in the lowest quartile will make learning gains in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50.2% (29) students in the lowest quartile made learning gains in mathematics.	53% (31) students in the lowest quartile will make learning gains in mathematics.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students in the lowest quartile lack an understanding of math concepts.	Go Math Intervention Resources are to provide a double dose of math instruction. Reteach, Go Math book, Promethean/Smart Board.	Leadership Team, Classroom Teacher and Math Resource	Math data maintained and monitored for achievement weekly by the teacher, monthly curriculum and quarterly with Administrative Data Chats	Teacher observation, Math Facts-In-A-Flash, Chapter and Unit Tests
2	Students in the lowest quartile lack math computation skills.	First in Math and Odyssey are utilized to assist computation skills. Math Fluency Center is utilized in every classroom.	Leadership Team, Classroom Teacher and Math Resource	Program reports are monitored for achievement weekly by teacher and quarterly in administration teacher data chats.	Math Facts In A Flash and Odyssey Reports

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target	
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Elementary School Mathematics Goal # 5A : By June 2017, Maplewood Elementary will reduce their achievement gap in Math from 65% for 3rd, 4th & 5th Grade students scoring proficient in Math in 2011-2012 to 82% of students scoring proficient in Math by 2016-2017.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	65%	70%	73%	76%	79%	

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:	There will be an increase of at least 3% students in each subgroup will make satisfactory progress in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Students in the following subgroups not making satisfactory progress in mathematics: White 24.5% (34), Black 51.4% (38), Hispanic 40.2% (41), Asian 18.2% (2) , American Indian N/A (0), ELL 100% (8)	Students in the following subgroups not making satisfacotry progress in mathematics: White 21% (29), Black 48% (49), Hispanic 37% (38), Asian 15% (2), ELL 97% (7).

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	Students not meeting mastery require additional learning opportunities.	Go Math Intervention Resources are used to provide a double does of math instruction. I-Tools and hands-on manipulatives are used to promote conceptual understanding.	Leadership Team, Classroom Teacher and Math Resource	Math data maintained and monitored for achievement weekly by teacher and quarterly with Administrative Data Chats. Formal and informal observation for correct use of manipulatives	Teacher observation, Go Math Program Assessments
2		Teachers will use math manipulatives to introduce concepts. Students will use manipulatives to learn math concepts on a concrete level of understanding.			Moving with math Assessment, teacher observation, Touch Math, Go Math Program Assessments
3		Reteach through mini focus groups with specific targets			

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:	At least 3% more students in the English Language Learners Subgroup will make satisfactory progress in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (8) students of the ELL Subgroup did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics.	97% (7) or less students in the ELL Subgroup will not make satisfactory progress in mathematics.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Maintaining and increasing the number of ELL students who made AYP.	Grade level teams will meet weekly to discuss planning, curriculum concerns, pacing and information exchange.	Administration, Classroom Teacher, Math Resource and Team Leaders	Team Leaders will facilitate the sharing of best practices and discuss the effectiveness of the lesson.	Benchmark Assessment Test, FCAT Explorer Assessments, FCAT
2		Students in grades 1-5 and ESE will participate in or Calendar Math and Grab'n Go Math Center to reinforce math skills.		Administrators will conduct Classroom Walk Through to monitor student participation with Calendar/Mountain Math.	
3		Students in grades 1-5 will utilize Destination Math and/or iTools on classroom computers.		Administration and Classroom Teachers will monitor data for the students on Odyssey and/or the school-wide data base.	
4		Students will use Mega Math, and FCAT Explorer (grade 5) to provide practice and monitor student achievement.		Participation will be monitored by the administrators.	
5		STEM Word Walls, small group instruction, concept maps, journals, online textbook (spanish)		Data Meetings, data chats	

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:	Students with Disabilities (SWD) will increase satisfactory progress by 3% in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
63.3% (31) Students with Disabilities (SWD) did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics.	66% (33) of Students with Disabilities (SWD) will make satisfactory progress in mathematics.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	SWD lack pre requisite math skills.	SWD participate in Calendar Math and Touch Math activities to reinforce math skills.	ESE Specialist, Classroom Teacher, Math Resource and Leadership Team	Participation and achievement monitored weekly by teacher quarterly through data chats.	Formal program assessments and informal teacher observation
2	SWD Lack additional instruction to understand concepts.			Data from program assessments are monitored weekly by ESE teacher, quarterly through Administrative Data Chats	Go Math unit, Mid/End of year assessments, mid-year Assessment
3	SWD lack math concepts needed to solve problems	Manipulatives utilized for all new concepts and available to all students for practice		Teacher observation or correct use of manipulatives	Go Math Program Assessment
4	SWD lack individual attention needed to learn math concepts	Small group instruction with specific strategies.		Data from program assessments are monitored weekly by ESE teacher, Administrative Data Chats	Go Math Program 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:	Students who are Economically Disadvantaged will increase satisfactory progress in mathematics by 3%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
48.3% (85) Economically Disadvantaged students did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics.	51% (90) of our Economically Disadvantaged students will make satisfactory progress in mathematics.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students not meeting mastery require additional learning opportunities.	Teachers will provide small group instruction on a daily basis to meet the individual needs of students.	Administration, Classroom Teacher, Math Resource and Leadership Team	Data from program assessment monitored weekly by teacher and quarterly through Administrative data chats	Go Math Assessment, Assessment reports from programs and Mini BAT's

2		Students will utilize Destination Math, First in Math and Mega Math to provide practice and monitor achievement	Administration and Leadership Team	Participation and achievement will be monitored by Administration, Leadership Team and Classroom Teacher	
3			Administration and Leadership Team	Students are administered a pre/post test to compare results	

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
Introduction to Math: Teachers as facilitators, peer to peer learning, Introducing the PLC- develop a plan for incorporating fractions and geometry/measurer on a weekly basis, Review curriculum/ Test specs, Plan of Action for introducing Core Curriculum to students. Appropriate grade level target skills in math – Correlate with IFC's and CCSS	K-5 Math	Miriam Sandbrand	School-Wide	August, 2012 (3.5 hours)	Instructional Leadership Team will monitor data through monthly meetings.	Administration Inservice Facilitator
Class Process: Centers and small groups Classroom environment, Common Language, Discuss best practices and geometry	K-5 Math	Miriam Sandbrand	School-Wide	September, 2012 (2 hours)	Instructional Leadership Team will monitor data through monthly meetings.	Administration Inservice Facilitator
Classroom Environment Data: Classroom environment, DifferentiatingGroup based on BAT data and Go Math and OnCore Tests. Geometry/measurer and fractions,	K-5 Math	Miriam Sandbrand	School-Wide	October, 2012 (3 hours)	Instructional Leadership Team will monitor data through monthly meetings.	Administration Inservice Facilitator

Focus monthly on standards for mathematical practices						
Resources Available: BEEP Resources, Common Core books	K-5 Math	Miriam Sandbrand	School-Wide	November, 2012 (1 hour)	Instructional Leadership Team will monitor data through monthly meetings.	Administration Inservice Facilitator
Resources Available: More resources available, sharing of best practices	K-5 Math	Miriam Sandbrand	School-Wide	December, 2012 (1 hour)	Instructional Leadership Team will monitor data through monthly meetings.	Administration Inservice Facilitator
Student Mastery of Curriculum: Go Math and OnCore Tests vs. End-of-Year tests, Analyze scores from BAT, how are you reaching struggling students, how are you challenging higher students, Math Groups are fluid and determined by areas of strengths/weaknes	K-5 Math	Miriam Sandbrand	School-Wide	January, 2013 (3 hours)	Instructional Leadership Team will monitor data through monthly meetings.	Administration Inservice Facilitator
Where are we? Where do we need be?: Review Test Specs, Curriculum Review, Supplemental Material, Best practices with test specs	K-5	Miriam Sandbrand	School-Wide	February, 2013 (2 hours)	Instructional Leadership Team will monitor data through monthly meetings.	Administration Inservice Facilitator
Assessments: Test Specs and testing strategies, Pulling supplemental materials to fill the gaps from NGSSS to CCSS, Starting transition from NGSSS to CCSS	K-5	Miriam Sandbrand	School-Wide	March, 2013 (3 hours)	Instructional Leadership Team will monitor data through monthly meetings.	Administration Inservice Facilitator
Getting ready for the next grade level: Across grade level correlations	K-5	Miriam Sandbrand	School-Wide	April, 2013 (1 hour)	Instructional Leadership Team will monitor data through monthly meetings.	Administration Inservice Facilitator
Data: Across Grade Level Correlations, Data, Peer-to-peer modeling, Preparing for next year - NGSSS TO CCSS	K-5	Miriam Sandbrand	School-Wide	May, 2013 (3 hours)	Instructional Leadership Team will monitor data through monthly meetings.	Administration Inservice Facilitator

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Provides instructional materials for the lowest quartile	Math Materials for below level students	Accountability Funds and School Funds	$2,000.00
			Subtotal: $2,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $2,000.00

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:	Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in Science will increase by at least 3%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33% (38) students scored an Achievement Level 3 in science.	36% (42) students will score at least an Achievement Level 3 in science.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Insufficient knowledge of science journaling/written evaluation	Teacher will use high yield strategies:analyzing, predicting, reflecting, interpreting, cooperative learning and note-taking	Administration PLC Representatives Instructional Leadership Team Classroom Teacher	Science journaling/ utilizing high-yield strategies/Portfolios-student artifacts	Grades K-5: Science Journals Portfolios BAT Tests & FCAT (Grade 5)
	Lack of use of hands-on Science Kits / Experiments	Teachers will provide hands-on experiments and projects using	Team Leader PLC Representatives	Classroom lab will be implemented and observation/monitoring	Science journals Science project

2		materials from Delta Kits and IFC's in all classrooms.	Administration Classroom Teacher	by administration. Kindergarten: Exploration Station usage	and Lab rubrics (Grades 4 & 5)
3	Insufficient knowledge of Science vocabulary	Implement science vocabulary into daily curriculum and use of science word walls, KWL and/or RAN.	Administration Classroom Teacher	BEEP Lessons/ FCAT/ BAT Administration. Will conduct CWT to observe the implementation of vocabulary word walls.	BAT Tests (Grade 5) Beginning, middle and end-of-year tests (Grades 3 - 5)
4	Teachers have difficulty ensuring that all grade-level benchmarks are covered during the school year.	Teachers will follow IFC's with revisions as needed to provide a more in depth investigations of deficits using the NGSSS/CCSS.	Administration Classroom Teacher	Lesson plans will be monitored by administration.	BEEP Lessons FCAT & BAT (Grade 5)
5	Challenging students in understanding the Scientific process and concepts.	Teachers will use high yield strategies through Science journaling using the scientific method and the engineering method.	Administration, Leadership Team and Classroom Teacher	Science journaling utilizing high-yield strategies	Science Mini Assessments Teacher Assessments Student Journals Lab Rubrics (Grades 4 & 5) BAT Tests (Grade 5)
6	Students not provided sufficient opportunities for enrichment.	Science journals, CCSS, BEEP - Virtual labs, hands-on experiments (science kits), project based learning	Classroom Teacher, Science PLC	Student achievement data, classroom based learning	Beginning, middle and end-of-year assessment guides

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:	2% of students who take the Florida Alternate Assessment will score at Levels 4, 5 and 6 in science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
14.3% (1) students who take the Florida Alternate Assessment scored at Levels 4, 5 and 6 in science.	16% (2) students who take the Florida Alternate Assessment will score at Levels 4, 5 and 6 in science.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Challenging students in understanding the Scientific process and concepts.	Exposure to the scientific process through monthly activities.	ESE Specialist	Unique Learning Systems (ULS) Post Testing	ULS
2	Students understanding high level vocabulary	Exposure to the scientific process through month activities	ESE Specialist	Unique Learning Systems (ULS) Post Testing	ULS

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:	There will be an increase of at least 3% of students who will score at or above an Achievement Level 4 in Science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
18.3% (21) students scored an Achievement Level 4 or higher in Science.	At least 22% (25) students will score an Achievement Level 4 or higher in Science.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Challenging students in understanding the Scientific process and concepts.	Teachers will use high yield strategies through Science journaling using the scientific method and the engineering method (student directed).	Administration, Classroom Teacher and Leadership Team	Science journaling utilizing high-yield strategies.	Science Mini Assessments Teacher Assessments Student Journals Lab Rubrics (Grades 4 & 5) BAT Tests (Grade 5)
2	Students not provided sufficient opportunities for enrichment.	Science journals, CCSS, BEEP - Virtual Labs, hands-on experiments (science kits), project based learning.	Classroom Teacher, Science PLC	Student achievement data, classroom based learning	Beginning, middle and end-of-year assessment guides

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:	2% of students taking the Florida Alternate Assessment will score at or above Achievement Level 7 in science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0) students taking the Florida Alternate Assessment scored at or above Achievement Level 7 in science.	1% (1) student taking the Florida Alternate Assessment will score at or above Achievement Level 7 in science.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Challenging students in understanding the Scientific process and concepts.	Exposure to the scientific process through monthly ULS activities.	ESE Specialist Classroom Teacher	ULS Post Testing	ULS 2013 FAA

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
Science Fair: Discuss science fair and process	K-5 Science	Maria Castranovo	School-Wide	December, 2012 (1 hour)	Instructional Leadership Team will monitor data through monthly meetings.	Administration Inservice Facilitator
Student Mastery of Curriculum: Mid-year vs. end-of-year tests, Analyze scores from BAT differently, Best practices for before testing, how are you reaching struggling students, how are you challenging higher students, Restructuring groups as needed according to BAT	Grade 5 Science	Maria Castranovo	School-Wide	January, 2013 (3 hours)	Instructional Leadership Team will monitor data through monthly meetings.	Administration Inservice Facilitator
Introduction to Science: Facilitators for peer to peer learning, Introduce and examine the IFC Calendar, Develop a plan for incorporating Science journaling in all grades, Review curriculum/ Test specs, Plan of Action for incorporating Core Curriculum into Science Curriculum, End-of-year tests (Gr. 2-5), Mid and end-of-year tests (K & 1) Appropriate grade level target skills in Science, Higher order thinking, Scientific Method, Engineering Method	K-5 Science	Maria Castranovo	School-Wide	August, 2012 (3.5 hours)	Instructional Leadership Team will monitor data through monthly meetings.	Administration Inservice Facilitator
Class Processes: How to incorporate						

hands on Science activities, Classroom environment, Word walls, Interactive Science bulletin boards, Science technology (digital lessons and labs), How to differentiate instruction, Common Language, Best practices	K-5 Science	Maria Castranovo	School-Wide	September, 2012 (2 hours)	Instructional Leadership Team will monitor data through monthly meetings.	Administration Inservice Facilitator	
Classroom Environment Data: Classroom environment, DifferentiatingGroups based on BAT data and End-of-year tests activities based on benchmark skills, Reading strategies for informational text	3-5 Science	Maria Castranovo	School-Wide	October, 2012 (3 hours)	Instructional Leadership Team will monitor data through monthly meetings.	Administration Inservice Facilitator	
Resources Available: BEEP Resources, Carefully look through Explicit Instruction site (http://explicitinstruction.org/)	K-5 Science	Maria Castranovo	School-Wide	November, 2012 (1 hour)	Instructional Leadership Team will monitor data through monthly meetings.	Administration Inservice Facilitator	
Where are we? Where do we need to be?: Review Test Specs, Discuss teaching strategies for each benchmark, Supplemental Material (What are you using), Best practices with test specs, What strategies are working and not working?	K-5 Science	Maria Castranovo	School-Wide	February, 2013 (2 hours)	Instructional Leadership Team will monitor data through monthly meetings.	Administration Inservice Facilitator	
Assessment: Pulling supplemental materials to fill the gaps from NGSSS to CCSS, Remainder of year start transition from NGSSS to CCSS, teacher's knowledge	K-5 Science	Maria Castranovo	School-Wide	March, 2013 (3 hours)	Instructional Leadership Team will monitor data through monthly meetings.	Administration Inservice Facilitator	

and experience of CCSS						
Getting ready for the next grade level: Across Grade Level, Correlations to CCSS, Utilize teachers knowledge and experience of CCSS	K-5 Science	Maria Castranovo	School-Wide	April, 2013 (1 hour)	Instructional Leadership Team will monitor data through monthly meetings.	Administration Inservice Facilitator
Across Grade Level Correlations: Data, Peer-to-peer modeling, Preparing for next year (NGSSS TO CCSS)	K-5 Science	Maria Castranovo	School-Wide	May, 2013 (3 hours)	Instructional Leadership Team will monitor data through monthly meetings.	Administration Inservice Facilitator

Science Budget:

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

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:	The number of students who score at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing will increase by 3%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

89.1% (106) students scored an Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.	At least 92% (110) students will score an Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Vocabulary usage not well developed	Cross-curricular immersion, journals, word walls/banks, student created glossaries, small groups	Classroom Teacher Team Collaboration	Monitoring Journals and student artifacts	BAT, scored writing samples
2	Lack of self assessment and editing in the writing process.	Rubric, collaborating with peers and exemplars	Classroom Teacher Team Collaboration	Scored writing samples and rubrics	Writing rubrics and 4th grade writing FCAT
3	Lack of pre-requisite writing skills.	Follow BEEP Lessons for successful scaffolding and exemplars	Classroom Teacher Team Collaboration	Writing samples and BEEP Lessons	Writing samples
4	Student use of standard grammar and writing conventions	Writing PLC, use of rewards writing and exemplars	Classroom Teachers	Classroom observations and writing samples	Student writing assessments and FCAT
5	Lack of student self motivation.	Student oriented newsletter	Principal (Administration)	Developing student newsletter	Final product, newspaper, observation of increased motivation throughout the school

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:	The number of students who take the Florida Alternate Assessment will score at 4 or higher in writing will increase by 2%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
83.3% (5) students taking the Florida Alternate Assessment scored at 4 or higher in writing.	85% (6) students taking the Florida Alternate Assessment will score at 4 or higher in writing.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students have limited ability and exposure to writing.	Exposing students to writing experiences weekly in journals through differentiated instruction using visuals and cloze activities.	ESE Specialist Classroom Teacher	Unique Learning Systems (ULS) Journal Entries	ULS Journals 2013 FAA

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
Writing Beginnings and Endings: Topic sentences, Effective endings, Dialogue/Voice, Adding descriptive words, Conventions, Discuss rubric and how to assess	K-5 Writing	Maxine Williams	School-Wide	October, 2012 (3 hours)	Instructional Leadership Team will monitor data through monthly meetings.	Administration Inservice Facilitator
Writing/Choosing Topics/Pre-writing and Planning: Narrative vs. Expository writing, Informational/Opinion/Persuasive, Writing what they know (Personal exposition0, Drawing pictures, making lists, and Venn Diagrams, Discuss how to assess using rubric	K-5 Writing	Maxine Williams	School-Wide	September, 2012 (2 hours)	Instructional Leadership Team will monitor data through monthly meetings.	Administration Inservice Facilitator
Staying on Topic Transitional Phrases: Looking for “left field” sentences, Supporting details, Adding anecdotes, Conventions, Discuss how to assess using rubric	3-5 Writing	Maxine Williams	School-Wide	November, 2012 (1 hour)	Instructional Leadership Team will monitor data through monthly meetings.	Administration Inservice Facilitator
Transitions between paragraphs: Conventions, Spelling Site Words, Discuss how to assess using rubric	3-5 Writing	Maxine Williams	School-Wide	December, 2012 (1 hour)	Instructional Leadership Team will monitor data through monthly meetings.	Administration Inservice Facilitator
Sentence Variations: Specific nouns, Expressing feelings, Spelling Multi-Syllabic, Discuss how to assess using rubric	K-5 Writing	Maxine Williams	School-Wide	January, 2013 (3 hours)	Instructional Leadership Team will monitor data through monthly meetings.	Administration Inservice Facilitator
Assessing Individual Papers: Student self						

evaluations, Peer conferencing, Reading Prompts to determine Expository/Narrative writing, Discuss how to assess using rubric	K-5 Writing	Maxine Williams	School-Wide	February, 2013 (2 hours)	Instructional Leadership Team will monitor data through monthly meetings.	Administration Inservice Facilitator
Revising and Editing: Conventions, Grammar, Verb agreement, Spelling of commonly used words, Discuss how to assess using rubric	3-5 Writing	Maxine Williams	School-Wide	March, 2013 (3 hours)	Instructional Leadership Team will monitor data through monthly meetings.	Administration Inservice Facilitator
Writing Across The Curriculum	K-5 Writing	Maxine Williams	School-Wide	April, 2013	Instructional Leadership Team will monitor data through monthly meetings.	Administration Inservice Facilitator
Writing across the curriculum: Common Core Standards and prepare to align for following year	K-5 Writing	Maxine Williams	School-Wide	May, 2013 (3 hours)	Instructional Leadership Team will monitor data through monthly meetings.	Administration Inservice Facilitator
Introduction to the craft and process of writing: Introducing the writing PLC, Review curriculum, Plan of Action for introducing Core Curriculum to students, Types of writing, Appropriate grade level target skills in writing – Correlate with IFC's, Using a writing rubric	K-5 Writing	Maxine Williams	School-Wide	August, 2012 (3.5 hours)	Instructional Leadership Team will monitor data through monthly meetings.	Administration Inservice Facilitator

Writing Budget:

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $0.00

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	Students in grades K-5 will increase the average daily attendance and tardy rate by 3%.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
The average attendance rate for the 2011-2012 school year was 94.9% (126059).	The expected average attendance rate for the 2012 – 2013 school year is 98% (130215).
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
32 students had excessive absences (10 or more) for the 2011-2012 school year.	31 or less students will have excessive absences (10 or more) for the 2012-2013 school year.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
158 students had excessive tardies (10 or more) for the 2011-2012 school year.	153 or less students will have excessive tardies (10 or more) for the 2012-2013 school year.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are dropped off late	Students will have his/her name submitted for Caught Being Good when arriving to school on time.	Administration / IMT	Tardy log/ BTIP Report	TERMS attendance records, STAR and Sign-In Sheets
2	students had excessive absences.	Communicationwill be made to parent and student to encourage attendance. Parent link and teacher phone call will be made to encourage attendance.	Administration/IMT	Attendance Log and BTIP Report	TERMS attendance records, STAR and Sign-In Sheets
3	Follow the established BTIP Process	Information gathered from DWH to identify non-attendeesearly intervention can be done	Administration/IMT/ Guidance Counselor	Attendance Logs and BTIP Report	Terms attendance records, STAR and Sign-in sheets.

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	Internal and External Suspension rate will be reduced by at least 3%.
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
28 students was the total number of In-School Suspensions for the 2012 school year.	The number of In-School Suspensions will be at or below 26 for the 2013 school year.

2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
10 students was the total number of students suspended In-School for the 2012 school year.	The number of students suspended In-School will be at or below 7 for the 2013 school year.
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
4 students was the total number of students suspended Out-of-School for the 2012 school year.	The number of students suspended Out-of-School will be at or below 3 for the 2013 school year.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
4 students was the total number of students suspended Out-of-School for the 2012 school year.	The number of students suspended Out-of-School will be at or below 3 for the 2013 school year.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of classroom management.	School-wide CHAMPS training and implementation, Classroom Norms	Administration Team Leaders	Classroom Walk-Through Team Meetings	Suspension Data from Data Warehouse and Basis Referral Data from Data Warehouse and Basis.
2	Ineffective use of CHAMP's within the classroom.	Classroom management training for all staff and Classroom Norms.	Administration Team Leaders	Classroom Walk-Through Team Meetings	Suspension and referral data from Data Warehouse and 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
School-Wide Behavioral Support Plan	PreK - 5 School-wide Behavior Management	Discipline Committee Facilitator	All Staff	Faculty Meetings	Data Warehouse Reports Basis Virtual Counselor Instructional Leadership Team will monitor data through monthly meetings.	Administration Discipline Committee

Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s) / Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $0.00

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to “Guiding Questions”, identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	At least 3% more Parents will participate in evening parent workshops to assist their child(ren) in writing, reading, math and science.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
840 parents participated in parent evening activities (Science Fair-252 parents attended, Open House-588 parents attended)	At least 865 parents will participate in evening 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	A small population of our parents participated in evening parent activities.	Parents will have the opportunity to attend Curriculum Nights to aid in understanding the math, reading writing and science expectations, Science Fair, Kindergarten Round-Up, Meet The Masters, Peace, Love & Pride Day and BINGO nights.	Administration	Student progress will be monitored in the areas of math, reading, science and writing.	Sign-In Sheet and Parent Survey

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
Primary parents will be invited to attend a Literacy Night to learn strategies to use at home to aide their children with reading skills.	K & 1 Reading	All Primary Teachers	Parents of Primary Students	November 15, 2012 6:30 - 8:00	Sign - in sheet to determine and increase in parental involvement. FAIR Data, Teacher Observation	Classroom Teacher Reading Coach
Grades 3 - 5 parent training on Math and Science curricular strategies and expectations.	Grades 3-5 Math Science	Intermediate Teachers	Parents of Intermediate Students	2nd Quarter	Sign - In sheet to determine increase in parent involvement. FCAT, Teacher Observations of project completion.	Classroom Teacher Math Resource

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
N/A	N/A	N/A	$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	Grades K - 5 classes will do 4 or more science inquiry

STEM Goal #1:	activities (hands-on and/or interactive labs) each month while reinforcing the words located on the STEM Word Wall posted in their classrooms.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack exposure to science and math word attack skills.	Teach word attack skills, add pictures, use vocabulary words frequently and word walls	Administration Classroom Teachers	Science and Math Journaling	Science BAT Tests (Grade 5) Science Middle & end-of-the-year tests (Grades 1 - 5) Math (Grades 3 - 5) Math Big Idea (Grades 3 - 5) Math Unit Tests (Grades K - 5)
2	Classrooms lack wall space for multiple word walls	Integrate Word Walls if space is limited use portable word walls	Administration	Science and Math Journaling	Science BAT Tests (Grade 5) Science Middle & end-of-the-year tests (Grades 1 - 5) Math (Grades 3 - 5) Math Big Idea (Grades 3 - 5) Math Unit Tests (Grades K - 5)
3	Develop effective cross curricular activities that integrate science, math and technolgy.	Science Fair projects, research based projects	Classroom Teachers	Classroom Observation	Project based rubric and teacher observation
4	Update technology to help support the 21st Century learning.	negotiate with partners in education to upgrade technology that will support STEM educational goals.	Partners Representative, Administration	Documentation of teacher use of technology	iObservation
5	Lack of use of hands-on Science Kits / Experiments	Teachers will provide hands-on experiments and projects using materials from Delta Kits and IFC's in all classrooms.	Team Leader PLC Representatives Administration Classroom Teacher	Classroom lab will be implemented and observation/monitoring by administration. Kindergarten: Exploration Station usage	Science journals Science project and Lab rubrics (Grades 4 & 5)

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

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

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

N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Teachers will participate in Professional Learning Communities for training in reading strategies.	Time for Kids Treasures Weekly Reader	State Reading Allocation	$2,750.00
CELLA	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Mathematics	Provides instructional materials for the lowest quartile	Math Materials for below level students	Accountability Funds and School Funds	$2,000.00
Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Writing	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Attendance	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Suspension	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Parent Involvement	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
STEM	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
				Subtotal: $4,750.00

Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
CELLA	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Writing	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Attendance	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Suspension	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Parent Involvement	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
STEM	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00

Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
CELLA	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Writing	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Attendance	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Suspension	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Parent Involvement	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
STEM	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00

Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
CELLA	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Mathematics	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Science	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Writing	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Attendance	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Suspension	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
Parent Involvement	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00

STEM	N/A	N/A	N/A	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
				Grand Total: $4,750.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

○ Priority	○ Focus	○ Prevent	● NA

Are you a reward school: ● Yes ○ No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 9/1/2012)

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
Student Planners/Agendas	$3,000.00
Weekly Readers	$700.00
NewsCurrents	$269.00

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

The coordination with Title 1 and a focus on parental involvement. Title 1 school plan will be aligned with the SAC plan, which will be synergistic with classroom plans. We are moving towards the nationwide Common Core, which will revise the SAC plan creation process to increase participation between students, parents and staff. While doing so, we will hold break-out sessions on specific areas of the School Improvement Plan during monthly SAC meetings.

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Broward School District
MAPLEWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	84%	83%	91%	48%	306	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%	63%			125	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	59% (YES)	69% (YES)			128	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					559	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Broward School District
MAPLEWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	83%	85%	94%	60%	322	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	72%	67%			139	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	56% (YES)	61% (YES)			117	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					578	
Percent Tested = 98%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested