

# FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

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

School Name: QUIET WATERS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Broward

Principal: Lori McConaughey

SAC Chair: Marilyn Smith & Samantha Uribe

Superintendent: Robert Runcie

Date of School Board Approval: December 4, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/20/2012

## PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

### STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

### ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
		BA/Speech Language Pathology West Liberty State College			Principal of Quiet Waters Elementary School: 2011-12 Grade: A Reading: 61% Math: 63% Writing: 78% Science: 60% 2010-11 Grade: A Reading: 84% Math: 84% Writing: 89% Science: 55% AYP: No 2009-10 Grade: A Reading: 85% Math: 83%

Principal	Lori McConaughy	MS/Speech Language Pathology/ West Virginia University  Educational Leadership/ Florida Atlantic University  Certification: Speech Correction K-12 Educational Leadership PK-12	20	22	Writing: 92% Science: 57% AYP: No 2008-09 Grade: A Reading: 87% Math: 85% Writing: 96% Science: 49% AYP: No-ELL subgroup in math 2007-08 Grade: Reading: 85% Math: 86% Writing: 83% Science: 48% AYP: Met all subgroups 2006-07 Grade: A Reading: 85% Math: 81% Writing: 86% Science: 58% AYP: Met all subgroups 2005-06 Grade: A Reading: 85% Math: 81% Writing: 88% AYP: Met all subgroups
Assis Principal	William Hartner	B.S. Elementary Education, University of South Florida Masters of Education. Educational Leadership Nova Southeastern University J.D. Nova Southeastern University	3	6	Assistant Principal, Quiet Waters Elementary School 2011-12 Grade: A Reading: 61% Math: 63% Writing: 78% Science: 60% 2010-11 Grade: A Reading: 84% Math: 84% Writing: 89% Science: 55% AYP: No Assistant Principal of Charles Drew Elementary School: 2009-10 Grade: C Reading: 44% Math: 59% Writing: 96% Science: 34% AYP: No 2008-09 Grade: C Reading: 50% Math: 52% Writing: 91% Science: 25% AYP: No 2007-08 Grade: C Reading: 47% Math: 49% Writing: 92% Science: 15% AYP: No
Principal					

## INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
--------------	------	-----------------------------	------------------------------	--------------------------------------	---

Reading	Nina Cohen	B.S. Elementary Education ESOL Endorsement Reading Endorsement	6	1	2011-12 Grade: A Reading: 61% Math: 63% Writing: 78% Science: 60%
---------	------------	--	---	---	--

### 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. New Educator Support System – a support program for new teachers, providing mentoring, modeling, and training. 2. Partnering new teachers or teachers new to the school with veteran staff 3. Facilitated and coordinated monthly Learning Community meetings 4. Recruit highly qualified teachers at district job fair.	Nina Cohen, NESS Liaison	Ongoing	
2	Partnering new teachers or teachers new to the school with veteran staff.	Nina Cohen, NESS Liaison	Ongoing	
3	Will facilitate and coordinate monthly Learning Community meetings.	Nina Cohen, NESS Liaison	Ongoing	
4	Recruit highly qualified teachers at district job fair.	Lori McConaughey & William Hartner Principal/Assistant Principal	Ongoing	
5				

### 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
NA	NA

### 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
89	2.2%(2)	10.1%(9)	44.9%(40)	40.4%(36)	47.2%(42)	100.0%(89)	6.7%(6)	13.5%(12)	95.5%(85)

### 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
		The first year teacher has been paired	One-on one mentoring with a state certified teacher training in BCPS: *Lesson Planning

Cohen, Nina	Calle, Oriana	with a grade level teacher to provide curriculum support.	*Classroom management strategies *Individual student interventions *Technical assistance *Data analysis
Fields, Adrienne	Zadroga, Kristy	The first year teacher has been paired with a grade level teacher to provide curriculum support.	One-on one mentoring with a state certified teacher training in BCPS: *Lesson Planning *Classroom management strategies *Individual student interventions *Technical assistance *Data analysis
Herbster, Erin	Alvarado, Ana	The new to our school teacher has been paired with a grade level teacher to provide curriculum support.	One-on one mentoring with a state certified teacher training in BCPS: *Lesson Planning *Classroom management strategies *Individual student interventions *Technical assistance *Data analysis

## 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

Title I funds provide additional teachers to assist students, particularly low performing students. Staff Development funds are used to develop a comprehensive professional training program to improve delivery of instruction through a variety of workshops designed to move teachers to mastery and improve student achievement. Parental Involvement Funds are utilized to fund monthly academic parent nights that provide parents with new skills to support student learning at home. Improving the frequency and quality of family participation and increasing family literacy are also goals of our parental involvement component. Monies are used to purchase food, supplies/materials and provide stipends for teacher presenters.

#### Title I, Part C- Migrant

NA

#### Title I, Part D

NA

#### Title II

eachers participate in district-developed workshops in differentiated instruction and academic standards training.

#### Title III

ELL students receive reading and developmental language arts instruction by a certified ESOL teacher.

#### Title X- Homeless

Teachers and staff members are responsible for helping to identify homeless students and referring them to the Homeless Education program offered by the district. The purpose of the Homeless Education Program is to identify homeless students, remove barriers to their education, including school enrollment, provide them with supplemental academic and counseling case management services as well as linkages to their school social worker while maintaining school as the students stable

environment

#### Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI funds will be utilized to fund an additional dose of academic intervention to assist struggling students. Funds will also be used to provide additional before and after school tutoring for fragile students.

#### Violence Prevention Programs

Quiet Waters Elementary School implements the County Student Code of Conduct and follows the District Discipline Matrix. Our school enforces the District's Anti Bullying Policy and has a zero tolerance for bullying and violence. Bullying prevention programs are supported through the Office of Prevention, guest speakers and student assemblies. Quiet Waters Elementary School builds a violence prevention culture through classroom instruction in anger management, conflict resolution bullying prevention, and the Broward County adopted character traits. In addition to the classroom instruction, all teachers and staff members received training on the Anti Bully policy and CHAMPS I training.

#### Nutrition Programs

Nutritional programs and health education are an integral part of our Unified Arts Program, specifically through the Physical Educational curriculum.

#### Housing Programs

NA

#### Head Start

To ensure school readiness, the Head Start (HS) Program has implemented a new literacy, math, and science curricula in the 119 HS classrooms. The program has aligned the literacy and math standards with the K-3 national standards to improve educational outcomes. This transparent connection between curricula and child expectations has contributed to better prepare students to succeed in kindergarten. An end of the year Creative Curriculum Continuum report, detailing students' ongoing assessment, is placed in the students' cumulative folder to familiarize kindergarten teachers with the HS students' progress in the program.

Regarding the logistics of registering students at the elementary schools, the Head Start Program ensures a smooth transition to kindergarten by clearly specifying the necessary enrollment processes and timelines to all families participating in the program. The HS family services support team and the HS teachers provide ongoing guidance to the HS families by indicating the students' corresponding home school, immunization requirements, and dates scheduled for kindergarten roundup at those schools.

#### Adult Education

NA

#### Career and Technical Education

NA

#### Job Training

NA

#### Other

NA

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

#### School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The Quiet Waters Elementary MTSS Leadership Team is composed of the: Assistant Principal, MTSS/RtI Team Coordinator/Behavior Support, Reading Resource Specialist, ESE Specialist, Guidance Counselor, ESOL Contact, Speech/Language Pathologist, School Psychologist, School Social Worker, and Grade Level Team Leader.

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?

Our MTSS team meets on Mondays, at 2:10 and, as needed, on additional days. Methods used for case management of Tier 2 and Tier 3 cases include differentiated support from the Grade Level and MTSS Teams. Our Team follows the RtI Problem

Solving Process to fidelity.

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?

1- To provide a path for the implementation of effective strategies and interventions for Teachers to use in the classroom, to successfully meet student's individual/differentiated needs.  
2- To assist the Teachers with implementing targeted/differentiated interventions, to fidelity, from the Struggling Readers and Math Charts, and research based behavioral interventions, depending on their student's individual needs.

- At Tier 1, "data chats" (conducted by the Administration and the Reading Resource Specialist) are used:
  - a. to evaluate the effectiveness of the core curriculum in reading and math.
  - b. to refer struggling students, who may be in need of Tier 2 or Tier 3 supports, to the MTSS Team.
- At Tier 2, the MTSS Leadership Team is using the Struggling Reader Charts for reading interventions and the Struggling Math Chart for math interventions. Staff with behavior training and expertise supports behavior concerns/interventions. The Team is consistently using the district RtI Records (with the required progress monitoring graphs) to monitor student progress, make good data-based decisions, and evaluate the effectiveness of interventions implemented.
- At Tier 3, the MTSS Leadership Team is using the Struggling Reader Charts for reading interventions and the Struggling Math Chart for math interventions. Staff with behavior training and expertise supports behavior concerns/interventions. The Team is consistently using the district RtI Records (with the required progress monitoring graphs) to monitor student progress, make good data-based decisions, and evaluate the effectiveness of interventions implemented.

Quiet Waters Elementary processed 103 students through the MTSS Leadership Team, during the 2011-12 school year. Of these:

- 58 of these students were referred for psychological assessment. With the exception of 2 students, all of the students tested to date have qualified for an ESE eligibility (97% or 56/58 students).
- 45/103 (44%) of these students were monitored by the MTSS Team during the school year.
- 34/103 (33%) of these students, whose cases were reviewed by the MTSS Team during the 2011-12 school year, will continue being monitored during the 2012-13 school year.

#### MTSS Implementation

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

1. "Data chats" are scheduled, by Administration, with every general education Teacher 2 times per year, to review District and research based student data.
2. Teachers provide individual student District and research based data on the RtI Record, which is reviewed and discussed during the MTSS Leadership Team meetings.
3. An MTSS/RtI Data Base is kept on each individual child's meeting dates, information shared, and progress.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

1. The MTSS Leadership Team is trained in the basics of RtI, as well as all content and procedures.
2. The MTSS Team routinely disseminates needed information to QWE staff:  
Ongoing individual teacher training, as needed and/or requested.
3. MTSS Team accesses training materials on the Student Support Services website:  
[www.broward.k12.fl.us/STUDENTSUPPORT/psychologicalservices/html/CPS\\_RTI.htm](http://www.broward.k12.fl.us/STUDENTSUPPORT/psychologicalservices/html/CPS_RTI.htm)

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

1. To continue assisting Teachers to clearly understand that the MTSS/RtI process is a general vs. special education process... with the goal being the student's successful response to intervention in the classroom.
2. For Teachers to independently and/or with the support of their grade level team members, define the child's problem, implement substantive interventions, and measure the progress before they meet with the MTSS Team.
3. To more clearly assign case management support to Teachers with students in the MTSS/RtI process.
4. To provide additional training to the MTSS Team members on the Struggling Reading and Struggling Math Charts.

## School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The following are members of the Literacy Leadership Team:

Lori McConaughy, Principal  
William Hartner, Assistant Principal  
Nina Cohen - Reading Resource Specialist  
Debra Rosenzweig, Angela Quijano, Stephanie Williams- Primary Representatives  
Jamie Wulkan and Paula Jasser- Intermediate Representative  
Donna Chandler- Media Specialist  
Christine Allison and Marcia Anderson-ESE Support  
Samantha Uribe - ELL Representative

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

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

Create capacity of reading knowledge within the school building. Encourages a literate climate to support effective teaching and learning.

Roles & Responsibilities:

- Gather knowledge about literacy and resources
- Facilitate staff/parent workshops
- Organize study groups
- Coaching and modeling/Follow-up in classrooms with differentiated instruction
- Participate in demonstration lessons
- Use data management systems to accurately and effectively analyze data
- Literacy Leadership Team should develop a flowchart for each grade level that would easily depict appropriate testing and what to do with results of the testing and Include types of interventions.
- Gather knowledge about literacy and resources, which should include all types of media such as, newspapers, documentaries, academic journals, Internet, magazines, books, etc.
- Serve as a representative on the CPST Team & RtI Leadership Team
- Title I initiatives – Parent Training & Staff Development

Meetings: Monthly meetings

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

Purpose: Create capacity of reading knowledge within the school building. Encourages a literate climate to support effective teaching and learning.

Roles & Responsibilities:

- Gather knowledge about literacy and resources
- Facilitate staff/parent workshops (Title I initiative)
- Organize study groups
- Coaching and modeling/Follow-up in classrooms with differentiated instruction
- Participate in demonstration lessons
- Use data management systems to accurately and effectively analyze data
- Develop a flowchart for each grade level that would easily depict appropriate testing and what to do with results of the testing and Include types of interventions
- Gather knowledge about literacy and resources, which should include all types of media such as, newspapers, documentaries, academic journals, Internet, magazines, books, etc.
- Serve as a representative on the CPS Team & RtI Leadership Team

Meetings: Monthly meetings

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

The LLT will focus on the following domains:

I. Professional Development

- a) Will facilitate training for all teachers on administration of Reading Assessments listed on the Struggling Readers Chart. Training will also encompass the interpretation of test result and identify individual student needs.
- b) Will facilitate a monthly Professional Learning Community that addresses the "Struggling Reader."

II. Parent Involvement

- a) Will facilitate quarterly parent involvement activities that focus on connecting the home and school learning.
- b) Strategies will be modeled for the purpose of home implementation.

III. Monitoring Student Assessments and Benchmark Data

## Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification  
[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 10/13/2012)

### \*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 ensure school readiness, the Head Start (HS) Program has implemented a new literacy, math, and science curricula in the 119 HS classrooms. The program has aligned the literacy and math standards with the K-3 national standards to improve educational outcomes. This transparent connection between curricula and child expectations has contributed to better prepare students to succeed in kindergarten. An end of the year Creative Curriculum Continuum report, detailing students' ongoing assessment, is placed in the students' cumulative folder to familiarize kindergarten teachers with the HS students' progress in the program.

Regarding the logistics of registering students at the elementary schools, the Head Start Program ensures a smooth transition to kindergarten by clearly specifying the necessary enrollment processes and timelines to all families participating in the program. The HS family services support team and the HS teachers provide ongoing guidance to the HS families by indicating the students' corresponding home school, immunization requirements, and dates scheduled for kindergarten roundup at those schools.

### \*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

NA

### \*High Schools Only

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

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

NA

How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is personally meaningful?

NA

### Postsecondary Transition

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

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

NA



## PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

### Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading.  Reading Goal #1a:	The percentage of students mastering a level 3 will increase through the participation of ninety-minute uninterrupted reading block utilizing differentiated instruction.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
23.5%(144/613) of students in grades 3-5 scored at a level 3.	23.5%(144/613) of students in grades 3-5 scored at a level 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	1a.1. Appropriate utilization of student assessment data to drive instruction and determine specific interventions.	1a.1. Provide training on specialized programs and interventions that focus on the six areas of reading.	1a.1. Literacy Leadership Team & Administration	1a.1. Data chats with administration and monitoring of individual student by student data.	1a.1. Informal/snapshot evaluations, benchmark data points (FAIR, FOCUS Assessments & BAT 1 & 2, etc.), and student profile sheets.
2	1a.2. Increase rigor of classroom instructional strategies and materials to meet FCAT Specs 2.0	1a.2. Increase teacher knowledge of 1a.2. Increase teacher knowledge of FCAT Specs 2.0 to increase the utilization of higher level strategies. Utilization of technology software programs: Study Island, FCAT Explorer, iStation, Destination Riverdeep	1a.2. Administration	1a.2. Data chats with administration and monitoring of individual student by student data.	1a.2. Benchmark data points (FAIR, FOCUS Assessments & BAT 1 & 2) and informal assessments.
3	1a.3. Increase the utilization of informational text across content areas	1a.3. Provide training and materials to support text complexity	1a.3. Classroom Teachers, Literacy Leadership Team	1a.3. Data chats with administration and monitoring of individual student by student data.	1a.3. Informal/snapshot evaluations, lesson plans, benchmark data points (FAIR, FOCUS Assessments & BAT 2) and student profile sheets
4					
5					
6					

7				
---	--	--	--	--

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 this present time, no students are scheduled to take the FAA during the 2012-2013 school year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (1/1) scored at a level 6	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading.  Reading Goal #2a:	The percentage of students mastering a level 4 and 5 will increase through the participation of ninety-minute uninterrupted reading block utilizing differentiated instruction.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
37.8% (232/613) of students in grades 3-5 scored at a level 4 or 5.	40% (245/613) of students in grades 3-5 scored at a level 4 or 5.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2a.1. Appropriate utilization of student assessment data to drive instruction and determine specific interventions.	2a.1. Provide training on specialized programs and interventions that focus on the six areas of reading.	2a.1. Literacy Leadership Team & Administration	2a.1. Data chats with administration and monitoring of individual student by student data.	2a.1 Informal/snapshot evaluations, benchmark data points (FAIR, FOCUS Assessments & BAT 1 & 2) and student profile sheets.
2	2a.2 Increase rigor of classroom instructional strategies and materials to meet FCAT Specs 2.0	2a.2. Increase teacher knowledge of FCAT Specs 2.0 to increase the utilization of higher level strategies Utilization of technology software programs: Study Island, FCAT Explorer, iStation, Destination Riverdeep.	2a.2. Administration	2a.2. Data chats with administration and monitoring of individual student by student data. iStation and Riverdeep reports.	2a.2. Benchmark data points (FAIR, FOCUS Assessments & BAT 1 & 2) and informal assessments.

3	2a.3 Differentiated instruction is not being correlated with assessment results.	2a.3 Analyze student data and to determine individual student strengths and needs and tailoring classroom instruction to meet those needs Utilization of technology software programs: Study Island, FCAT Explorer, Destination Riverdeep,	2a.3 Classroom Teacher Leadership Literacy Team, Administration	2a.3 Data chats with administration and monitoring of individual student by student data.	2a.3 Informal/snapshot evaluations, lesson plans, benchmark data points (FOCUS Assessments, FAIR & BAT 1 & 2) and student profile sheets.
---	--	---	---	---	---

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 this present time, no students are scheduled to take the FAA during the 2012-2013 school year,
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0/1) scored at a level 6.	NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading.  Reading Goal #3a:	The percentage of students demonstrating a learning gain in reading will increase through the participation of ninety-minute uninterrupted reading block utilizing differentiated instruction and the Struggling Readers Chart.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
76.5% (300.8/393) of students in grades 3-5 achieved a learning gain.	79%(310.5/393) of students in grades 3-5 will achieve a learning gain.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3a.1. The Comprehensive Core Reading Program (CCRP), Supplemental Intervention Reading Programs (SIRP), and Comprehensive Intervention Reading Programs (CIRP) in the areas of fluency and	3a.1. Review, practice, and monitor the implementation of these programs to fidelity through co-planning, modeling, PLC's, sharing of best practices, etc.	3a.1. Administration and Reading Resource Specialist	3a.1. Data chats with administration and monitoring of individual student by student data. Weekly CWT's with focus on instructional strategies with feedback to teachers.	3a.1. Informal/snapshot evaluations, lesson plans, benchmark data points (FAIR FOCUS Assessments, & BAT 1 & 2) and student profile

	comprehension are not being implemented with fidelity and consistency.				sheets.
2					
3	3a.2. Increase the utilization of informational text across content areas.	3a.2. Provide training and materials to support text complexity.	3a.2. Classroom Teachers, Literacy Leadership Team	3a.2. Data chats with administration and monitoring of individual student by student data.	3a.2. Informal/snapshot evaluations, lesson plans, benchmark data points (FAIR, FOCUS Assessments & BAT 1& 2) and student profile sheets.

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 this present time, no students are scheduled to take the FAA during the 2012-2013 school year.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0/1) made learning gains in reading.	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.  Reading Goal #4:	The percentage of students in the lowest 25% demonstrating a learning gain in reading will increase through the participation of a ninety-minute uninterrupted reading block and an additional double-dose of reading instruction utilizing strategies from the Comprehensive Intervention Reading Programs.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
62% (63/102) of students in the lowest 25% in grades 3-5 achieved a learning gain in Reading.	64% (65/102) of students in the lowest 25% in grades 3-5 will achieve a learning gain 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
4.1. Limited resources and personnel to effectively address the specific differentiated	4.1. Creatively scheduled to provide additional reading instruction that extends beyond the initial	4.1. Administration and Reading Resource Specialist	4.1. Data chats with administration and monitoring of individual student by student data.	4a.1. Benchmark data chats ( FAIR, FOCUS Assessments &

1	needs of struggling readers.	ninety-minute reading block for which a double and triple-dose of targeted instruction is delivered. Utilization of technology software programs: Study Island, FCAT Explorer, iStation, Destination Riverdeep.			BAT 1 & 2, etc.)
2	4.2. The Comprehensive Core Reading Program (CCRP), Supplemental Intervention Reading Programs (SIRP), and Comprehensive Intervention Reading Programs (CIRP) the focus being fluency and comprehension are not being implemented with fidelity and consistency.	4.2. Review, practice, and monitor the implementation of these programs to fidelity through co-planning, modeling, PLC's, sharing of best practices, etc.	4.2. Administration and Reading Resource Specialist	4.2. Data chats with administration and monitoring of individual student by student data. Weekly CWT's focus on instructional strategies with feedback provided to teachers.	4.2. Informal/snapshot evaluations, lesson plans, benchmark data points (FAIR, FOCUS Assessments & BAT 1 & 2) and student profile sheets.
3	4.3 Differentiated instruction is not being correlated with assessment results.	4.3. Analyze student data and to determine individual student strengths and needs and tailoring classroom instruction to meet those needs. Review, practice, and monitor the implementation of these programs to fidelity through co-planning, modeling, PLC's, sharing of best practices, etc.	4.3. Leadership Literacy Team and Administration	4.3. Data chats with administration and monitoring of individual student by student data.	4.3. Informal/snapshot evaluations, lesson plans, benchmark data points (FAIR, FOCUS Assessments & BAT 1 & 2) and student profile sheets.
4					

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 # In 2016-2017, the percentage of our students demonstrating non-proficiency will be reduced by 50%. 5A :					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	66%	69%	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:	The percentage of students in each student sub-group acquiring adequate yearly progress in reading will increase through the participation of ninety-minute uninterrupted reading block utilizing differentiated instruction.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 31.2% (72/231) Black: 51.6% (65/126) Hispanic: 40.4% (82/208) Asian: 26.7% (5/23) American Indian: 30.8% (4/13) Are currently meeting satisfactory progress in reading.	White: 34%(79/231) Black: 54%(68/126) Hispanic: 44%(91/208) Asian: 30% (7/23) American Indian: 33% (5/33) Will increase on the FCAT Reading Assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5B.1. Limited resources and personnel to effectively address the specific differentiated needs of struggling readers regardless of the subgroup classification.	5B.1. Creative scheduling to provide additional reading instruction that extends beyond the initial ninety-minute reading block for which a double and triple dose of targeted instruction is delivered. Utilization of technology software programs: Study Island, FCAT Explorer, iStation, Destination Riverdeep.	5B.1. Administration and Reading Resource Specialist	5B.1. Data chats with administration and monitoring of individual student by student data. Informal/snapshot evaluations	5B.1. Benchmark data points (FAIR, FOCUS Assessments & BAT 1 & 2, etc.) and student profile sheets.
2	5B.2. Students learn at different rates and through different modalities.	5B.2. All students will receive small group differentiated instruction to meet their individual needs	5B.2. Administration and Reading Resource Specialist	5B.2. Data collected from informal/snapshot evaluations and monitoring of benchmark data points.	5B.2. Informal/snapshot evaluations, lesson plans, benchmark data points (FAIR, FOCUS Assessments & BAT 1 & 2) and student profile sheets.

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.  Reading Goal #5C:	The percentage of ELL students mastering making adequate yearly progress in reading will increase through the participation of a ninety-minute uninterrupted reading block utilizing differentiated instruction.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
77.8%(49/63) of ELL students made satisfactory Progress in Reading.	680%(50/63) of ELL 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	5C.1. Limited background knowledge for students due to strong home environmental and primary language influence	5C.1. Parent involvement training on effective reading strategies and vocabulary rich environments.	5C.1. ELL Contact, Administration	5C.1. Data collected through student assessment both formal and informal.	5C.1. Benchmark data points, LEP conferences, and workshop sign-in sheets
2	5C.2. Difficulty understanding content area-grade level vocabulary.	5C.2. Provide supplemental strategies and model use of them and offer additional opportunities for students to be exposed and apply vocabulary utilization of technology software programs:	5C.2. ELL Contact, Classroom Teachers, Administration	5C.2. Data collected through student assessment both formal and informal.	5C.2. Benchmark data points and analysis of informal and formal data.

		Study Island, FCAT Explorer, iStation, Destination Riverdeep.			
3	5C.3. Student's limited exposure to various literary genres in both native language and English. Difficulty understanding content-area/grade-level vocabulary	5C.3. Provide supplemental strategies and model use of them and offer additional opportunities for students to be exposed and apply vocabulary utilization of technology software programs: Study Island, FCAT Explorer, iStation, Destination Riverdeep	5C.3. ELL Contact, Classroom Teachers, Administration	5C.3. Data collected through student assessment both formal and informal.	5C.3. Benchmark data points and analysis of informal and formal data.

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.  Reading Goal #5D:	The percentage of SWD students making adequate yearly progress in reading will increase through the participation of a ninety-minute uninterrupted reading block in addition to their identified IEP goals utilizing differentiated instruction and reading strategies.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
70.9% (61/86) of SWD students made satisfactory progress in Reading.	73% (63/86) of SWD 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	5D.1. Utilization of the RtI process in a timely and effective manner and to introduce research based interventions aligned with student IEP goals.	5D.1. Review, practice, and monitor the implementation of these programs to fidelity based on student data. Utilize reading diagnostic data (DAR) to identify deficiencies to be addressed through appropriate intervention materials.	5D.1. ESE Specialist, Reading Resource Specialist, and ESE Teachers	5D.1. Data chats with administration and monitoring of individual student by student data. Collaboration between general education and ESE support teachers to identify effective strategies and accommodations.	5D.1. Benchmark data points (FAIR, FOCUS Assessments, & BAT 1 & 2).
2					

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading.  Reading Goal #5E:	The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students making adequate yearly progress in reading will increase through the participation of a ninety-minute uninterrupted reading block utilizing differentiated instruction and reading strategies.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
45.5% (171/376) of ED students made satisfactory progress in Reading.	49% (184/376) of Economically Disadvantaged students made 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	5D.1. Appropriate utilization of student assessment data to drive instruction and determine specific interventions.	5D.1. Provide training on specialized programs and interventions that focus on the six areas of reading and how to look at data and make instructional decisions.	5D.1. Administration and Reading Resource Specialist	5D.1. Data chats with administration and monitoring of individual student by student data. Weekly CWT's focus on differentiated reading strategies with feedback provided to teachers.	5D.1. Benchmark data points (BAT 1 & 2) and student profile sheets.
2	5E.2. Limited background knowledge for students entering school.	5E.2 Provide vocabulary rich environments and experiences for all students. Instruction through small/whole group read alouds, and shared readings. Exposure to real life experiences through SEAS field trips and use of video enrichment in class.	5E.2. Classroom teachers, Administration, Reading Resource Specialist	5E.2. Classroom observations, assessments which measure mastery of concepts and comprehension	5E.2. Classroom assessments. Formal and informal observations, student generated feedback on field trips and video experiences.

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core Standards (PLC)	K-5	Reading Resource Specialist and Team Leaders	Teachers K-5	Fourth Tuesday of Each Month	Coaching and Observations Online Wiki Postings	Reading Resource Specialist Administration
Reading Strategy Presentations: *Informational Text Integration through Content Area Texts *Word Walls *Literacy Centers *Speaking/Oral Language	K-5	Reading Resource Specialist, Literacy Team	Teachers K-5	September 27, 2012 October 25, 2012	Coaching and Observations	Reading Resource Specialist, Literacy Team, and Administration
ELL/ESE Reading Strategies *Interpreting iStation Reports and Using Intervention Activities *Implementation of Reader's Theater to increase fluency and vocabulary in content areas	Grades K-5	Reading Resource Specialist, ELL Contact, ESE Teachers	Teachers Grades K-5	October 26, 2012 January 18, 2013	Coaching and Observations	Reading Resource Specialist, ELL Contact, ESE Teachers
Administration						



of FAIR in grades 1-5 and utilizing data to identify individual needs of each student.	Grades 1-5	Reading Resource Specialist	Teachers Grades 1-5	August 29 & 30, 2012	Coaching and Observations, Data Analysis & Data Chats	Reading Resource Specialist
--	------------	-----------------------------	---------------------	----------------------	---	-----------------------------

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
FAIR Training	Reading Resource Specialist	Title I Staff Development Funds	\$6,000.00
			Subtotal: \$6,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$6,000.00

End of Reading Goals

## Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.		54% (187/345) of ELLs in grades K-5 will achieve Listening/Speaking proficiency, as measured by CELLA			
CELLA Goal # 1:					
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
52% (178/345) of ELLs in grades K-5 are proficient in Listening/Speaking.					
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	1.1. Strong influence of home environment	1.1. Build upon prior knowledge and existing	1.1. ELL Contact, Classroom	1.1. Collection of informal and formal	1.1. Teacher observation and

1	and primary language.	language skills; incorporate familiar topics to introduce academic concepts.	Teachers	student assessment data	reports, IPT-1 (Listening/Speaking), LEP Committee meetings
2	1.2. Difficulty understanding and using grade-level vocabulary and limited knowledge of English grammar and conventions.	1.2. Provide explicit vocabulary instruction and provide authentic opportunities for social and academic language use.	1.2. ELL Contact & Classroom Teachers	1.2. Collection of informal and formal student assessment data	1.2. Teacher observation and reports, IPT-1 (Listening/Speaking), LEP Committee meetings.

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:	28% (97/345) of ELLs in grades K-5 will achieve Reading proficiency, as measured by CELLA.
--	--

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

26% (88/345) of ELLs in grades K-5 are proficient 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	2.1. Strong influence of home environment and primary language.	2.1. Incorporate literature with multicultural characters and themes; offer parent trainings on effective reading strategies.	2.1. ELL Contact, Administration, Classroom Teachers	2.1. Collection of informal and formal student assessment data	2.1. Benchmark data points (FAIR, DRA, IRI, BAT 1 & 2), IPT-1 & IPT-2 (Reading), LEP Committee meetings
2	2.2. Difficulty understanding content-area/grade-level vocabulary; increased text complexity to meet CCSS.	2.2. Provide explicit vocabulary instruction and provide authentic opportunities for language use; Introduction and on-going modeling and practice of reading strategies; Utilization of technological resources: iStation, Earobics, Destination Riverdeep, Study Island, FCAT Explorer	2.2. ELL Contact & Classroom Teachers	2.2. Collection of informal and formal student assessment data	2.2. Benchmark data points (FAIR, DRA, IRI, BAT 1 & 2), IPT-1 & IPT-2 (Reading), LEP Committee meetings

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	21% (74/345) of ELLs in grades K-5 will achieve Writing proficiency, as measured by CELLA.
--	--

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

19% (67/345) of ELLs in grades K-5 are proficient 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	3.1. Strong influence of home environment and primary language.	3.1. Build upon prior knowledge and existing language skills; incorporate familiar topics in writing.	3.1. ELL Contact, Classroom Teachers	3.1. Collection of informal and formal student assessment data	3.1. Benchmark data points (writing prompts), IPT-1 & IPT-2 (Writing), LEP Committee meetings.
2	3.2. Difficulty understanding grade-level vocabulary and limited knowledge and application of English grammar and conventions.	3.2. Provide explicit vocabulary instruction and incorporate language objectives across the content areas; Provide on-going modeling of the writing process and authentic purposes for writing. 2.3.	3.2. ESOL Contact, Classroom Teachers	3.2. Collection of informal and formal student assessment data	3.2. Benchmark data points (writing prompts), IPT-1 & IPT-2 (Writing), LEP Committee meetings.

CELLA Budget:

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

# Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal # 1a:	The percentage of students mastering a level 3 will increase through the participation of a sixty-minute uninterrupted math block utilizing differentiated instruction.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29.6% (181/612) of students in grades 3-5 scored at a level 3.	32% (196/612) of students in grades 3-5 will score at a level 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	1a.1. Continue aligning the Go Math Series for the school year 2012-2013 to correlate to the FCAT 2.0 and the Standards	1a.1. Continue to provide training and grade level support in the Go Math series	1a.1. Grade Chairs and a cadre of trainers	1a.1. Progress monitoring and data analysis	1a.1. Math Assessments identified on the planning chart and BAT 1 and 2.
2	1a.2. Students need to increase critical thinking skills to answer higher order questions.	1a.2. Provide multiple opportunities and formats in classroom instruction.	1a.2. Classroom Teachers, Reading Resource Specialist, Administration	1a.2. Classroom observations and student data	1a.2. Math Assessments identified on the planning chart and BAT 1 and 2.
3	1a.3. Students need to be able to communicate and justify the strategies and methods used to solve problems in written form.	1a.3. Integrate multi-step problems into daily math problems. Allow collaboration with peers to solve and develop written answers that demonstrate understanding of strategies and methods used.	1a.3. Classroom teachers Administration	1a.3. Classroom observations, teacher/student informal group conversations	1a.3. Math Assessments identified on the planning chart and BAT 1 and 2.

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal # 1b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (1/1) of students in grade 5 scored at a level 4.	N/A

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #2a:	The percentage of students mastering a level 4 and 5 will increase through the implementation of the math curriculum-Pupil Enrichment Program (PEP).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
33.7%(206/612) of students in grades 3-5 scored at or above a level 4.	35%(226/612) of students in grades 3-5 will score at or above a level 4.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2a.1. Continue aligning the Go Math Series for the school year 2012-2013 to correlate to the FCAT 2.0 and the Standards.	2a.1. Implement higher level math strategies	2a.1. Classroom teacher	2a.1. Progress monitoring and data analysis. journals and the classroom environment.	2a.1. Math Assessments identified on the planning chart and BAT 1 and 2.
2	2a.2. Students need to provide explanations of methods obtained to solve a given problem.	2a.2. Provide students with opportunities to work cooperatively in solving mathematical problems which involve multiple steps.	2a.2. Classroom Teachers, Reading Resource Specialist	2a.2. Classroom observations & Student data	2a.2. FCAT 2.0 math, teacher made assessments, math assessments identified on the planning chart and BAT 1 and 2.
3					
4	2a.3. Students need to increase critical thinking skills to answer higher order questions.	2a.3. Provide multiple opportunities and formats in classroom instruction.	2a.3. Classroom Teachers, Reading Resource Specialist, Administration	2a.3. Classroom observations and student data	2a.3. Math Assessments identified on the planning chart and BAT 1 and 2.

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #2b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0/1) of student in grade 5 scored at or above a level 7.	N/A

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #3a:	The percentage of students demonstrating a learning gain in mathematics will increase through participation in a sixty minute block of math utilizing strategies from the Go Math series and the Florida Math standards.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
80.1% (313.8/392) of students in grades 3-5 made learning gains.	83% (325.4/392) of students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	3a.1. Continue aligning the Go Math Series for the school year 2012-2013 to correlate to the FCAT 2.0 and the Standards.	3a.1. Provide training and grade level support in greater depth of the Go Math series to address problem solving strategies, implementing and monitoring of Soar to Success.	3a.1. Grade chairs and a cadre of trainers	3a.1. Progress monitoring and data analysis	3a.1. Math assessments identified on the planning chart and BAT 1 and 2.
2	3a.2. Students need to improve their basic mathematical vocabulary and operational skills (addition, subtraction, multiplication, division)	3a.2. Provide additional materials for remediation within the classrooms. Use of technology for additional remediation.	3a.2. Classroom Teachers and Leadership Team	3a.2. Program analysis, classroom observations, teacher observations	3a.2. Math assessments identified on the planning chart and BAT 1 and 2.
3					

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #3b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
0% (0/1) of students in grade 5 made learning gains.	N/A

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

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #4:	The percentage of students in the lowest 25% demonstrating a learning gain in math will increase through participation in a sixty minute block of mathematics and an additional dose of mathematics instruction utilizing the Soar to Success program.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
72.1% (76.4/106) of students in the lowest 25% in grades 3-5 made learning gains.	75% (79.5 /106) of students in the lowest 25% in grades 3-5 will make learning gains.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	4a.1. Continue aligning the Go Math Series for the school year 2012-2013 to correlate to the FCAT 2.0 and the Standards.	4a.1. Provide training and grade level support in greater depth of the Go Math series to address problem solving strategies, implementing and monitoring of Soar to Success.	4a.1. Grade chairs and a cadre of trainers	4a.1. Progress monitoring and data analysis	4a.1. Math assessments identified on the planning chart and BAT 1 and 2.
2	4a.2. Various levels of student abilities within a group.	4a.2. All students will receive small group differentiated instruction with an emphasis on increasing skill knowledge to meet their individual needs.	4a.2. Administration	4a.2. Administration and Teachers will review data points to determine academic progress and needs.	4a.2. Math Assessments identified on the planning chart and BAT 1 & 2.
3	4a.3. Limited vocabulary of students	4a.3. Increase student vocabulary skills, through the use of various vocabulary programs.	4a.3. Classroom Teachers, Leadership Team	4a.3. Classroom observations, teacher monitoring, analysis of program assessments.	4a.3. Math assessments identified on the planning chart and BAT 1 and 2.

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 #					
	In 2016-2017, the percentage of our students demonstrating non-proficiency will be reduced by 50%.					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	66%	69%	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 mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	The percentage of students in each student subgroup acquiring adequate yearly progress in mathematics will increase through the participation of a sixty minute uninterrupted math block utilizing differentiated instruction.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 29% (67/231) Black: 51.6% (65/126) Hispanic: 35.1% (71/202) Asian: 21.7% (5/23) American Indian: 61.5% (8/13)	White: 31%(71.6/231) Black: 54%(68/126) Hispanic: 38%(76.75/202) Asian: 23(5.29/23) American Indian: 63%(8.19/13)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5B.1. Various levels of student abilities within a group.	5B.1. Providing training and grade level support in learning the new series through collaborative planning and sharing of best practices.	5B.1. Administration & Leadership Team	5B.1. Administration and Teachers will review data points to determine academic progress and needs.	5B.1. Math Assessments identified on the planning chart and BAT 1 & 2.
2	5B.2. Students learn at different rates and through different modalities.	5B.2. All students will receive small group differentiated instruction to meet their individual needs.	5B.2. Administration and Reading Resource Specialist	5B.2. Data collected from informal/snapshot evaluations and monitoring of benchmark	5B.2. Informal/snapshot evaluations, lesson plans, benchmark data points (FAIR, FOCUS assessments and BAT 1 & 2) and student profile sheets.

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	The percentage of ELL students mastering making adequate yearly progress in mathematics will increase through the participation of a sixty minute uninterrupted math block utilizing differentiated instruction.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
73% (60/86) of ELL students in grades 3-5 made adequate yearly progress	76% (65.4 /86)of ELL students in grades 3-5 will make adequate yearly progress.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5C.1. ELL learners have demonstrated difficulty with vocabulary and concepts.	5C.1. Emphasize math vocabulary and concepts through teacher modeling, discussion, math journals, word walls, children's literature, and technology (Riverdeep/Soar to Success).	5C.1. Administration & Leadership Team	5C.1. Administration and Teachers will review data points to determine academic progress and needs.	5C.1. Math Assessments identified on the planning chart and BAT 1 & 2.



2	5C.2. Difficulty relating mathematics to real-life situations.	5C.2. Explore BEEP lessons which relate mathematics to real-life situations for the purpose of implementation.	5C.2. Administration	5C.2. Administration and Teachers will review data points to determine academic progress and needs.	5C.2. Math Assessments identified on the planning chart and BAT 1 & 2.
3	5C.3. Integrate ELL strategies into math instruction.	5C.3. Grade level teams will review ELL strategies to determine appropriate use in mathematics instruction.	5C.3. Administration	5C.3. Administration and Teachers will review data points to determine academic progress and needs.	5C.3. Math Assessments identified on the planning chart and BAT 1 & 2.

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #5D:	The percentage of SWD students making adequate yearly progress in mathematics will increase through the participation of a sixty minute uninterrupted math block in addition to their identified IEP goals utilizing differentiated instruction and math strategies.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
69.8% (60/86) of SWD students in grades 3-5 made adequate yearly progress.	72% (61.9 /86) of SWD students in grades 3-5 made adequate yearly progress

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5D.1. SWD learners demonstrate a weakness in learning mathematical concepts.	5D.1. The district's Struggling Math Chart will be used to meet the needs of this AYP subgroup.	5D.1. Administration and Leadership Team	5D.1. Administration and Teachers will review data points to determine academic progress and needs.	5D.1. Math Assessments identified on the planning chart and BAT 1 & 2.
2	5D.2. Collaboration with general education teachers and teachers of students with disabilities.	5D.2. Teachers of SWD students will assist general education teachers in identifying and utilizing accommodations and differentiated strategies to meet specific needs of students.	5D.2. Administration and Leadership Team	5D.2. Administration and Teachers will review data points to determine academic progress and needs.	5D.2. Math Assessments identified on the planning chart and BAT 1 & 2.
3	5D.3. Students difficulty with understanding of higher complexity questions.	5D.3. Greater emphasis will be placed on hands-on activities and the utilization of manipulatives.	5D.3. Administration	5D.3. Administration and Teachers will review data points to determine academic progress and needs.	5D.3. Math Assessments identified on the planning chart and BAT 1 & 2.

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics.  Mathematics Goal #5E:	The percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students making adequate yearly progress in mathematics will increase through the participation of a sixty minute uninterrupted mathematics block utilizing differentiated instruction and math strategies.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
42.9% (161/375) of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-5 made adequate yearly progress.	46% (172.5/375) of economically disadvantaged students in grades 3-5 will make adequate yearly progress

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	5E.1. Students limited knowledge of vocabulary related to mathematics.	5E.1. Integrate mathematics vocabulary into word of the day and/or word walls.	5E.1. Administration and Leadership Team	5E.1. Administration and Teachers will review data points to determine academic progress and needs.	5E.1. Math Assessments identified on the planning chart and BAT 1 & 2.
2	5E.2. Students learn at different rates and through different modalities.	5E.2. A variety of media and technology resources for directed and independent learning activities will be utilized by teachers and students.	5E.2. Administration and Leadership Team	5E.2. Administration and Teachers will review data points to determine academic progress and needs.	5E.2. Math Assessments identified on the planning chart and BAT 1 & 2.

*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
Developing Problem Solvers in the Primary Classroom (PLC)	K-2	Leadership Team	Teachers K-2	September 2012 – May 2013, after-school; minimum of two meetings per month	Snapshots, Informal Observations, and Classroom Observations	Administration and Leadership Team
Developing Problem Solvers in the Intermediate Grades (PLC)	3-5	Leadership Team	Teachers 3-5	September 2012 – May 2013, after-school; minimum of two meetings per month	Snapshots, Informal Observations, and Classroom Observations	Administration and Leadership Team

Mathematics Budget:

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

## 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:		The percentage of students demonstrating a level 3 or above will increase through the participation of daily science instruction aligned with hands-on learning activities.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
42% (83/197) of students in grade 5 scored a level 3 or above.		45% (88.8 /197) of students in grade 5 will score a level 3 or above.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1a.1. Difficulty comprehending content area material and text.	1a.1. Teachers will utilize district curriculum and support materials as a resource for science learning (activity guides for grades 3-5, FCAT Dailies, 5E Model, IFC's, and BEEP). Unwrapping the benchmarks and focusing on specific skills associated with the benchmark. All students will complete hands-on lab activities weekly and use a common lab report format to document hands-on investigations.	1a.1. Leadership Team and Administration	1a.1. Classroom Walk-throughs and project based learning rubrics	1a.1. Science mini assessments & Science BAT 1 & 2.
2					
3	1a.2. Difficulty comprehending content area material and text.	1a.2. All students will complete hands on lab activities weekly and use a common lab report format to document hands-on investigations.	1a.2. Administration	1a.2. Grade chairs will review results of common assessment date monthly, to determine progress towards mastery of standards.	1a.2. Common assessments tied to Florida Science Standards administered weekly, BAT 1 & 2, and Florida Achieves Focus Assessments.
4	1a.3. Continued adaptations for Science curriculum.	1a.3. Provide continued support for the current Science Curriculum.	1a.3. Grade chairs and Grade level trainers.	1a.3. Progress monitoring and data analysis.	1a.3. Science Assessments identified with Science Curriculum, BAT 1 & 2, and Florida Achieves

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:	At the present time, no students qualify to take FAA.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (1/1) students in grade 5 scored a level 5 in Science.	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science.  Science Goal #2a:	The percentage of students demonstrating a level 3 or above will increase through the participation of daily science instruction aligned with hands-on learning activities.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27% (48/175) of students in grade 5 scored a level 4 or above on the FCAT Science Assessment.	30% (53/175) of students in grade 5 will score a level 4 or above on the FCAT Science Assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	2a.1. Difficulty comprehending content area material and text.	2a.1. All students will complete hands-on lab activities found in BCHS kits, Science Fusion hand-on-activities, virtual labs, student created projects and science journals to enrich student knowledge of the scientific process through out the school year.	2a.1. Leadership Team, and Administration	2a.1. Grade chairs will review results of common assessment data monthly to determine progress toward benchmark.	2a.1. Common assessments tied to Florida Science Standards administered weekly, BAT 1 & 2, and Florida Achieves Focus Assessments.
2	2a.2. Continued adaptation of Science Curriculum for the 2012-13 school year.	2a.2. Continued grade level support for current Science Curriculum.	2a.2. Grade chairs and grade level trainers	2a.2. Progress monitoring and data analysis	2a.2. Science Assessments identified with Science Curriculum, BAT 1 & 2, and

					Florida Achieves Focus Assessments.
3	2a.3. Students need to increase critical thinking skills to answer higher order questions.	2a.3. Provide multiple opportunities and formats in classroom instruction.	2a.3. Classroom Teachers, Reading Resource Specialist, Administration	2a.3. Classroom observations and student data	2a.3. Math Assessments identified on the planning chart and BAT 1 and 2.

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science.  Science Goal #2b:	At the present time, no students qualify to take FAA.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
100% (1/1) students in grade 5 scored a level 5 in Science.	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Teachers will integrate digital curriculum resources available through BEEP into daily classroom instruction	Science K-5	Staff Facilitators	Grade K-5 Teachers	August 2012-Ongoing	Mini Benchmarks and Informal/Snapshot Observations	Administration and Leadership Team
Teachers will "unwrap" Science Benchmarks and develop higher order questioning with 3 levels of complexity	Science-K- 5	Staff Facilitators	Grade K-5 Teachers	August 2012-Ongoing	Mini Benchmarks and Informal/Snapshot observations	Administration and Leadership Team
Teachers will collaborate						

for ongoing curriculum support and the integration of Common Core Standards.	Science K-5	Staff Facilitators	Grade K-5 Teachers	August 2012-Ongoing	Mini Benchmarks	Administration and Leadership Team
Teachers will participate in training on implementing Science Journals	Science K-5	Staff Facilitators	Grade K-5 Teachers	August 2012-Ongoing	Rubrics	Administration and Leadership Team

Science Budget:

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

End of 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 percentage of students mastering adequate yearly progress in writing will increase through participation in a structured writing curriculum.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
89% (157/177) of students in grade 4 scored a level 4.0 or higher.		80% (155.2/194) of students in grade 4 will score a level 4.0 or higher.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool

1	1a.1. Diverse level of skills and writing abilities.	1a.1. Provide a Writers Workshop for all students including but not limited to modeled writing, small group differentiated writing instruction, independent writing, conferencing, and publishing. Utilization of the district's BEEP writing curriculum which will include editing for language conventions, revising for quality details, use of relevant, logical and plausible support as part of instruction.	1a.1. Leadership Team and Administration	1a.1. Evaluation of writing prompts and data through the utilization of the Writing Rubric. Teachers will use teacher-student conferencing and peer reviews bi-monthly as evaluation tools. FLDOE anchor papers will be integrated as part of the feedback process. Data chats will be held quarterly with administration, support staff, and teachers to monitor bi-monthly student progress through the use of student data including writing portfolios, etc.	1a.1. Student Writing Profile Sheet, Bi-monthly Writing Prompts, Student Portfolios, and BAT Writing 1 & 2
2	1a.2. Exposure to expected writing formats in fourth grade.	1a.2. Students and teachers in grades 3 & 4 will participate and co-teach in buddy/peer writing lessons.	1a.2. Leadership Team and Administration	1a.2. Evaluation of writing prompts and data	1a.2. District writing rubric and writing portfolios
3	1a.3. Instruction on writing conventions and use of supporting details.	1a.3. FLDOE anchor papers and student work samples will be used as teaching tools. Teachers will use teacher-student conferencing and peer reviews bi-monthly as evaluation tools. Data chats will be held quarterly with administration, support staff, and teachers to monitor bi-monthly student progress through the use of student data including writing portfolios, etc.	1a.3. Fourth grade classroom teachers	1a.3. Analysis of student work samples/prompts	1a.3. Student Writing Profile Sheet & Prompts/rubric

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
The district writing curriculum/BEEP lessons will be reviewed and discussed across grade levels for scope and sequence.	Grades K-5	Reading resource specialist & district trainers	Teachers K-5	September 2012-ongoing	Classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans, and review of data.	Reading resource specialist and administration
Based on the new CCSS, PLC's will identify how to implement scaffolding throughout grade levels to promote independence in writing and in depth analysis.	Grades K-5	Reading resource specialist & district trainers	Teachers K-5	September 2012-ongoing	Classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans, and review of data.	Reading resource specialist and administration

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Implementation and use of Study Island writing program to fidelity.	Study Island computer based program.	PTA Funding	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Modeled Writing and Strategy Presentation 3-4	Substitute teachers to provide temporary coverage for Modeled Writing	Title I Professional Development	\$1,800.00
			Subtotal: \$1,800.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
			\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$1,800.00



## Attendance Goal(s)

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

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

1. Attendance Attendance Goal # 1:	By June 2013, the average daily attendance rate of students in Kindergarten through grade 5 will increase to 97% (1338.5/1380).
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
The average daily attendance rate of students in kindergarten through grade 5 is 95.5% (239183/250578).	The average daily attendance rate of students in kindergarten through grade 5 will increase to 97% (243060.65/250578).
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
64 students in grades kindergarten through grade 5 have 10 or more absences for the year.	355 students in grades kindergarten through grade 5 will have 10 or more absences for the year
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
270 students in grades kindergarten through grade 5 have 10 or more tardies for the year.	250 students in grades kindergarten through grade 5 will have 10 or more tardies for the year.

### Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Parents not having knowledge of the district's attendance policy	1.1. Review Broward County's attendance policy during Open House, parent conferences, and in written form through newsletters, parent conferences, website, trainings, etc.	1.1. IMT, Attendance Clerk, Classroom Teacher, and Guidance Counselor	1.1. Review daily attendance reports and BTIP reports.	1.1. Attendance Reports & BTIP data
2	1.2. A large number of students arrive after the 8 am start of school.	1.2. Stress the importance of students being in school to promote student achievement through newsletter, parent conferences, website, trainings, etc.	1.2. IMT, Attendance Clerk, Classroom Teacher, and Guidance Counselor	1.2. Review daily attendance reports and BTIP reports	1.2. Attendance Reports & BTIP data

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

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

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


Attendance Budget:

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

*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:	By June 2013, the number of students in kindergarten through grade 5 receiving an in-school suspension will decrease to 3.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
6 in school suspensions were enforced for grades K-5.	The number of internal suspensions will decrease to 3.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
5 students in grades kindergarten through 5 received in-school suspensions.	The number of students suspended in school will decrease
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
2 external suspensions were enforced for grades K-5.	The number of external suspensions will decrease to 1.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-

School	of-School				
1 student was suspended out-of-school.	The number of students suspended out of school will decrease to 1				
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	1.1. Classroom behavior plans are not specifically teaching expectations and behaviors.	1.1. Classroom teachers will learn to self assess their current competencies as well as to determine the level of structure required to meet the needs of their students through the implementation of the CHAMPS I: A Proactive and Positive Approach to Classroom Management.	1.1. Administration	1.1. Classroom Walk throughs, observations, and monitoring of behavior referrals.	1.1. Behavior Data & CHAMPS Rubric

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 Discipline Plan and CHAMPS strategies	K-5	District/ staff	School-wide	August 2012 - ongoing	Classroom walk-through observations, and student referral data	Administration

Suspension Budget:

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

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

## Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

1. Parent Involvement  Parent Involvement Goal #1:  <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	The percentage of parents participating in school related activities will increase to 80%.				
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:				
78% (1082/1387) of parents participated in a school sponsored event.	80% (111/1387) of parents will participate in a school sponsored event.				
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	"See PIP"	"See PIP"	"See PIP"	"See PIP"	"See PIP"
2					

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

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

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:		By June 2013, 45% (89) of fifth grade students will score at achievement level 3 on the FCAT Science and 75% (142) will score at achievement level 3 and above.			
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	Teacher knowledge regarding instruction through inquiry.	Weekly science-based lessons aligned with instructional framework.	Teachers Administration	Science fair projects for academic showcase/class projects.	Rubrics
2	Teachers level of proficiency in identifying appropriate STEM based projects and activities.	Teachers will collaboratively plan and organize STEM project based learning activities.	Teachers Administration	Observations Student Projects	Rubrics
3	Teacher training in the Common Core standards.	Teachers will use IFC's provided through BEEP for their grade level.	Teachers Administration	Classroom Observations Lesson plans Data Chats	Chapter Tests/Assessments from Science Fusion, BAT 1 \$ 2, Florida Achieves

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
Effective Use of Science journals STEM Inquiry Investigations	Teachers in grades K-5	Grade Chair for each grade level	Schoolwide K-5 Teachers	Early Release Training Days *Every third Tuesday of the month	STEM projects, Fusion Assessments, BAT 1 & 2	Administration

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

## Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

# FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	FAIR Training	Reading Resource Specialist	Title I Staff Development Funds	\$6,000.00
CELLA				\$0.00
Mathematics				\$0.00
Science				\$0.00
Writing				\$0.00
Attendance				\$0.00
Suspension				\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$6,000.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading				\$0.00
CELLA				\$0.00
Mathematics				\$0.00
Science				\$0.00
Writing	Implementation and use of Study Island writing program to fidelity.	Study Island computer based program.	PTA Funding	\$0.00
Attendance				\$0.00
Suspension				\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading				\$0.00
CELLA				\$0.00
Mathematics				\$0.00
Science				\$0.00
Writing	Modeled Writing and Strategy Presentation 3-4	Substitute teachers to provide temporary coverage for Modeled Writing	Title I Professional Development	\$1,800.00
Attendance				\$0.00
Suspension				\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$1,800.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading				\$0.00
CELLA				\$0.00
Mathematics				\$0.00
Science				\$0.00
Writing				\$0.00
Attendance				\$0.00
Suspension				\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
				Grand Total: \$7,800.00

## 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 10/13/2012)

## 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
FCAT Afterschool Tutorials & Test Preparation	\$10,000.00

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

The School Advisory Council will take an active role in developing, implementing, and evaluating the school improvement plan. SAC members will participate in monitoring the progress of the school improvement plan and will assist in completing a needs assessment to best determine how to revise the current plan.

SAC members will assist in facilitating parent involvement activities, which will include (i.e., curriculum nights, parent orientations, etc.). SAC members will design a Parent Needs Assessment to compile the effectiveness of parent involvement activities throughout the year.

# AYP DATA

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

## SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Broward School District QUIET WATERS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	84%	84%	89%	55%	312	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	73%	73%			146	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?	62% (YES)	68% (YES)			130	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					588	
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 QUIET WATERS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	85%	83%	92%	57%	317	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	70%	69%			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?	57% (YES)	61% (YES)			118	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					574	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested