

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: OAKRIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Broward

Principal: Debra R. Friedman

SAC Chair: Evelyn Schwartz

Superintendent: Robert Runcie

Date of School Board Approval: 12/4/2012

Last Modified on: 10/24/2012

PART I: CURRENT SCHOOL STATUS

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

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

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

ADMINISTRATORS

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

Position	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Administrator	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO Progress along with the associated school year)
		Master of			2011-2012, Principal School Grade: 2012 - C Reading % Satisfactory or higher 52% Math% Satisfactory or higher 51% Writing % Satisfactory or higher 76% Science% Satisfactory or higher 36% Reading % for Learning Gains 62% Math Points for Learning Gains 70% Reading Gains for Lowest 25% - 62% Math Gains for Lowest 25% - 75% 2006-2011, Director, Program Development and Alignment

Principal	Debra R. Friedman	Science in Education Leadership; Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education; Certifications: ESOL, Reading, Early Childhood, School Principal	1	9	2002-2005, Assistant Principal, Sheridan Hills High Standards Reading: 2003 - 64% to 2005 79% showing an increase of 15% High Standards Math: 2003 - 67% to 2005 - 80% showing an increase of 13% High Standards Writing: 2003 - 84% to 2005 - 88% showing an increase of 4% Making Learning Gains in Reading: 2003 - 63% to 2005 - 75% showing an increase of 12% Making Learning Gains in Math: 2003 - 55% to 2005 - 71% showing an increase of 16% Lowest 25% Making Gains in Reading: 2003 - 51% to 2005 - 67% showing an increase of 16% 1996-2002 Curriculum Coach, Reading Resource Specialist
Assis Principal	Gregory Charlotin	Master of Science in Educational Leadership; Bachelor of Arts in ELED	17	4	Assistant Principal: 2008-2012 School Grade: 2012 - C; 2011-C; 2010-A; 2009-A; 2008-A High Standards Reading: 2012 - 52%, 2011 - 63%, 2010-76%, 2009-71%, 2008-69% High Standards Math: 2012 - 51% 2011 - 67%, 2010-79%, 2009-72%, 2008-74% High Standards Writing: 2012 - 76%, 2011 -81%, 2010-92%, 2009-88%, 2008-87% High Standards Science: 2012 - 36%, 2011 - 32%, 2010-39%, 2009-40%, 2008-38% Learning Gains Reading: 2012 - 62%, 2011 - 56%, 2010-69%, 2009-68%, 2008-70% Learning Gains Math: 2012 - 70%, 2011 - 57%, 2010-56%, 2009-70%, 2008-62% Learning Gains Lowest 25% Reading: 2012 - 62%, 2011 - 49% , 2010-67%, 2009-65%, 2008-70% Learning Gains Lowest 25% Math: 2012 - 75%, 2011 - 61%, 2010-61%, 2009-59%, 2008-67% AYP: 2011 - N (67% Y - N for Total Reading, White, Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL, SWD), Math, Y - White, N for Black, Hispanic, Ed, ELL, SWD) 2010-N (85% Y - N for Total Reading, White, Math, ELL Reading, ELL Math, SWD Reading, SWD Math) 2009-N (95% Y - N for BLACK Math, ED Math), 2008-N (90% Y - No for ELL Reading, ELL Math, SWD Reading, SWD Math) Teacher Task Assignment: 2007-2008 Oakridge Elementary Teacher: 1994-2007

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 Area	Jeannine Hamilton	Master of Education in Early Childhood Bachelor of Art/Science in Education; Certifications: Varying Exceptionalities (K-12); Primary Education (K-3);	1	2	Oakridge Elementary 1995-2005 ESE resource teacher Wilton Manors Elementary 2006-2009 ESE resource teacher Royal Palm Elementary 2008-2009 Writing Coach increase from 68%-72% 2009-2010 Writing Coach increase from 72%-78%

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. Enter educator in school induction program (NESS) and provide program orientation	NESS Liaison	As hired	
2	2. Assign teacher new to school and/or grade level to team leader or highly qualified teacher at specific grade level.	Administrators	June 2013	
3	3. Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) - Facilitators identified to coordinate and lead PLCs in vertical/cross grade learning initiatives	PLC Facilitators	June 2013	
4	4. Team Planning & Support Team Weekly Collaboration Meetings - Teachers and staff plan with their grade level teams to address and solve instructional and procedural concerns and conduct lesson studies	Team Leaders Administrators Support Team	June 2013	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

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

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
45	0.0%(0)	11.1%(5)	40.0%(18)	48.9%(22)	55.6%(25)	93.3%(42)	2.2%(1)	37.8%(17)	95.6%(43)

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
Pauline Watson	Patricia Whitlock	Mentee new to district	Monthly NESS meetings and weekly team meetings
Kimberly A. Johnson	Esther Osorio	Mentee new to district	Monthly NESS meetings and weekly team meetings
Elyse Dryden	Laura Selsky	Mentee new to district	Monthly NESS meetings and weekly team meetings
Luz Delph	Jeannine H. Hamilton	Mentee new to district	Monthly NESS meetings and weekly team meetings

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 are used to provide additional instructional positions (3.22) to support the educational program for our students. Also, parent involvement training sessions are funded by Title I, as well as professional development sessions for teachers that address effective instructional practices in reading, writing, mathematics, science, data analysis, learning centers and student assessment.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

N/A

Title I, Part D

N/A

Title II

Title II funds are used to provided additional instructional support.

Title III

Supplemental materials provided by Title III are implemented as part of differentiated instruction for ELL students.

Title X- Homeless

N/A

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Funds are utilized to provide remediation for identified students by reducing the size of the group so a lower student to teacher ratio is attained.

Violence Prevention Programs

District's Character - The Core of Our Lives Program
District's Silence Hurts Initiative
District's Anti-Bullying Campaign
Counseling with School Counselor on as needed basis

Nutrition Programs

District Initiative: "Adventure to Fitness" interactive movement video (30 minutes)
School Initiative: Mileage Club

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

Other

N/A

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

The RtI team includes the following: Administrators, Reading Resource Specialist, ESE Specialist, School Counselor, School Psychologist; School Social Worker; and Classroom Teacher. The RtI Team may also include additional personnel based on specific problems or issues as needed.

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

The RtI Leadership Team meets at least two times per month. The ESE Specialist coordinates RtI meetings. Students are most always identified by classroom teacher and/or members of the RtI leadership Team through data analysis. Once identified, teachers contact their grade level case manager who assists with recommendations for interventions and monitoring of students, based on outcome of classroom interventions. Monitoring activities include the transfer of data collected to appropriate graphs or tables to show growth. Administration follows up with quarterly Academic Conferences with the Leadership Team and individual teachers.

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

The school-based RtI Leadership Team is an integral part of the development of our SIP. Prior to the start of the school year (and as new students enroll), members identify students in need of Tier II and Tier III strategies based on previous school year student data. Also, members regularly examine Tier I data to assist with improving core curriculum and school wide behavior plan. They also review the RtI process, resources available (i.e. Intervention Records, progress monitoring graphs generated for individual students, Struggling Readers' Chart and Struggling Math Chart) for interventions and develop goals for targeted students and subgroups.

MTSS Implementation

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

Baseline Data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Benchmark Assessment Tests [BAT 1 & 2 for Reading, Mathematics & Science (grade 5 only)], Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT), Inventory Tests, STAR Reading; RIGBY PM Benchmark Running Records in first grade and Kindergarten screening.

Progress Monitoring: PMRN, Mini-Benchmark Assessments; Oral Reading Fluency Assessments, Running Records, Successmaker, Foundations, Wilson, GO MATH Assessments, BCPS Writing Prompts, Classroom Behavior Plans, and Code of Conduct. Data points to identify issues of attendance and/or behavior are taken from attendance, school support and discipline panels.

Midyear: FAIR, Mini-BATS, STAR Reading, Behavioral Referrals and PBIPs.

End-of-Year: FAIR, FCAT, STAR Reading, DAR and other designated alternative assessments.

All academic and behavioral data are kept on Virtual Counselor and TERMS when appropriate. Also, individual data for students in grades 3-5 are tracked via an individualized AYP Data Chat form.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional development will be provided by the RtI Leadership Team during staff meetings and during each grade level team's common planning time or after school. The RtI will also determine the need for targeted professional development throughout the year as it relates to identified student and teacher needs.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Principal - Debra R. Friedman
Assistant Principal - Gregory Charlotin
Reading Resource Specialist - Jeannine Hamilton
Media Specialist - Gabriela Kilianski
Kindergarten Team - Mandy Bayles
First Grade Team - Patrencia Kinchen
Second Grade Team - Darlene Gonzalez
Third Grade Team - Maggie Bishop
Fourth Grade Team - Kimberly Johnson
Fifth Grade Team - Heather Heffernan
ESE/Specials Team - Judith Kemp

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

LLT meets monthly to address issues related to student literacy. Members review data from ongoing assessments, and make recommendations based on data gleaned. In addition, the LLT reviews components of the District's K-12 Reading Plan to ensure that all aspects are being implemented with fidelity.

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

Major LLT initiatives for this school year include the following:
Implement Common Core Standards in Literacy
Continue to implement school wide reading practice program (before school, during lunch and at dismissal)
Develop and implement a school wide Accelerated Reader student achievement program
Monitor school wide implementation of the District's K-12 Reading Plan
Implement applicable components from the District's Struggling Reader's Chart
Provide training and support for teachers to administer the DAR, analyze the results and implement strategies to increase student performance in reading
Provide training and support for teachers to differentiate reading instruction to students in all AYP subgroups
Provide parent training sessions that support home-based literacy connections
Implement Rigby Assessments for grades K-2
Implement FAIR for grades K-5

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification

No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

During the 2011-2012 school year, our school implemented a Preschool ESE program. The Preschool ESE teachers met with the kindergarten teachers to share assessment data and assist in the transition process for students who remained at the school. All Preschool ESE and kindergarten students and parents are invited to an Orientation prior to the first day of school so they may meet teachers and teacher assistants and to learn about their child's new teacher and class. During these sessions, students also participate in classroom activities. During Title I Public Meeting/Open House, parents learn about important school and Title 1 information, policies and opportunities. Following that, parents are invited to seek further information via a question/answer session.

*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?

N/A

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

N/A

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

N/A

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	Trend data based on a comparison of 2011 and 2012 FCAT Reading indicate that student reading proficiency scores declined as scores decreased from 36% (93) in 2011 to 28% (85) in 2012.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Results on 2012 FCAT Reading indicated that 28% (85) of students in grades 3-5 scored Level 3.	By June 2013, at least 86% (267) students in grades 3-5 will demonstrate proficiency in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack stamina to read long passages of text	Increased time on task for practice during reading instruction block, before school, during lunch and dismissal as well as required reading for homework Pilot the Daily 5 Reading program focusing on more student time dedicated specifically to reading	Administrators Reading Resource Specialist Reading PLC	Within one month following the BAT assessments, disaggregate the data and conduct data chats with individual teachers and teams regarding student achievement to determine effectiveness of instructional strategies and students targeted for extra support Review of FAIR data	Data Chat Tool Mini-BAT, BAT 1 & 2 Weekly Reading Assessments FAIR
2	Students deficient in comprehension and vocabulary in informational and literary text	Students will engage in reading informational and literary texts available through the Media Center, content textbooks (science, social studies) as well as weekly publications which may include Scholastic News, or Time for Kids.	Administrators Reading Resource Specialist Media Specialist Reading PLC	Monthly monitoring and disaggregation of AR Student and Class Reports Science and Social Studies chapter tests	AR Student and Class Reports Science and Social Studies chapter tests
3	Implement Common Core Standards to add rigor and consistency to reading instruction as well as developing an understanding of text complexity	Explicitly follow the Common Core Standards for reading instruction Increased use of complex text as suggested through the District's Common Core Subject area PLCs with twice-monthly focus on Common Core and sharing research-based practices. Share at PLC meetings Students will analyze complex text through small group projects and	Reading Resource Specialist Media Specialist Science Resource Teacher	Analyze and discuss grade level exemplars and provide feedback on student presentations and reflective journals	Presentation rubric Student journals Lesson plans

	participate in class presentations/journal reflections		
--	--	--	--

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

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:	Trend data based on a comparison of 2011 and 2012 FCAT Reading indicate that student reading proficiency scores decreased from 27% (70) in 2011 to 24% (74) in 2012.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Results on 2012 FCAT Reading indicated that 24% (74) of students in grades 3-5 scored at Level 4 and 5.	By June 2013, at least 86% (267) of students in grades 3-5 will score at Level 4 and 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	Students need to engage in sufficient independent reading practice to maintain higher levels of comprehension	Implement rigorous in-class and homework reading practice to include Accelerated Reader books to measure higher levels of comprehension	Reading Resource Specialist Media Specialist	Disaggregation of student weekly reading assessments, AR class reports, BAT data, FAIR and istation assessments	Weekly Reading Assessments and AR management reports Mini-BAT, BAT 1 & 2, FAIR and istation management reports
2	Students need to engage in cross-curricular reading and create oral or technology based presentations	Implement in-class cross-curricular reading experiences and have students work individually or in groups to create	Reading Resource Specialist Media Specialist	Evaluation of student presentations	Teacher-created Presentation Rubric

	oral or technology based presentations		
--	--	--	--

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

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:	FCAT Reading indicate that reading scores for students increased in 2011 from 56% (111) to 63% (135) in 2012.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Results on 2012 FCAT Reading indicated that 63% (135) of students in grades 3-5 made learning gains in reading.	By June 2013, at least 86% (266) of students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains to demonstrate proficiency in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students deficient in vocabulary and comprehension due to limited background knowledge of informational and literary text	Students will engage in reading informational texts Twice-monthly PLC meetings to support teachers in the implementation of graphic organizers to support vocabulary strategies and comprehension development	Administrators Reading Resource Specialist Reading PLC	Analysis of students' Weekly Reading Assessments Review of PLC Minutes	Weekly Reading Assessments PLC Minutes
	Students do not engage in sufficient independent reading practice to maintain higher levels of comprehension in more complex text	Students will have more opportunities in class to practice reading skills and strategies in the content areas	Administrators Reading Resource Specialist Reading PLC Media Specialist	Analysis of weekly reading assessments and monthly analysis of istation management reports	Weekly Reading Assessments Monthly istation reports

2	<p>Building text complexity knowledge and using more complex text features and higher complex text in all curricular areas</p> <p>Implementation of instruction to further reading comprehension</p> <p>Increased reading practice before school, during lunch and dismissal</p>	<p>Within a month following the FAIR and BAT assessments, disaggregate the data to determine the effectiveness of the reading instruction</p>	<p>Mini-BAT, BAT 1 & 2</p> <p>FAIR</p>
---	--	---	--

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

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

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:

<p>4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.</p> <p>Reading Goal #4:</p>	<p>Trend data based on a comparison of 2011 and 2012 FCAT Reading indicates that reading scores for students in the lowest 25% making learning gains increased as scores increased from 49% (26) in 2011 to 65% (36) in 2012.</p>
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
<p>Results on 2012 FCAT Reading indicated that 65% (36) of students in the lowest 25% in grades 3-5 made learning gains in reading.</p>	<p>By June 2013, at least 86% (266) of students in the lowest 25% in grades 3-5 will make learning gains to demonstrate proficiency in reading.</p>

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
Students deficient in vocabulary due to limited background knowledge	Twice monthly PLC meetings will support teachers with	Administrators Reading Resource Specialist	Review of PLC Minutes Monthly team review of	PLC Minutes Weekly Reading

1		implementation of vocabulary strategies, graphic organizers to strengthen concepts and Word of the Week via the closed circuit TV channel	Reading PLC	student assessment data	Assessments Teachers observations of students using the word of the week
2	Students lack prerequisite skills to perform on grade level	Intervention reading groups, differentiated instruction, double dosing and push-in instruction Implementation of DAR and Rigby PM Benchmark diagnostic tools	Administrators Reading Resource Specialist	Within a month following the FAIR, BAT, and weekly reading assessments, disaggregate the data to determine the effectiveness of the reading instruction Disaggregation of data on FAIR, DAR and Rigby PM Benchmark and BAT assessments as well as discussions with teachers to monitor proper reading group placement	Mini-BAT, BAT 1 & 2, results FAIR Weekly Reading Assessments DAR and Rigby PM Benchmark assessments
3	Students deficient in fluency due to lack of stamina for reading long passages of text and reading practice to apply learned strategies	Increased time for reading practice to include programs such as Quick Reads, as well as additional reading opportunities before school, during lunch and dismissal	Administrators Reading Resource Specialist	Data chats with individual teachers regarding student achievement to determine effectiveness of instructional strategies Monitor Quick Read data	Data Chat Tool Mini-BAT, BAT 1 & 2 FAIR Weekly Reading Assessments
4	Students are deficient in comprehension skills	Students will participate in school-wide AR program	Administrators Media Specialist	Twice-Monthly disaggregation of AR Student and Class reports	AR Student and Class reports
5	Need for increased instructional time	Selected students will attend After School Camps and SES Tutoring	Administrators Reading Resource Specialist	Monitor student attendance Monitor student classroom progress through increased communication	After School and SES Camp Pre-test and Post-Tests Student participant list to teachers Monthly update communication form between provider and teacher (attendance and progress)
6	Students belonging to one or more subgroup may require intensive assistance in multiple strand areas	Implement targeted intervention for students including FAIR Tool-Kit and istation computer program to monitor deficient skills	Reading Resource Specialist	Classroom teachers will monitor progress using FAIR and istation data	FAIR and istation reports

Based on Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs), AMO-2, Reading and Math Performance Target						
5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Reading Goal # In six years, students will reduce their achievement gap by 50%. 5A :				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	47	52	57	61	66	

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:

<p>5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</p> <p>Reading Goal #5B:</p>	<p>Trend data based on a comparison of 2011 and 2012 FCAT Reading indicate that reading scores for students in all subgroups did not make Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP).</p>
<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</p>
<p>Results on 2012 FCAT Reading indicated the following did not make AYP:</p> <p>White: 34% (35) Black: 57% (50) Hispanic: 42% (65) Asian: 62% (3) American Indian: 0% (0)</p>	<p>By June 2013, students will obtain 86% proficiency in reading or targeted AYP goal:</p> <p>White: 95 Black: 230 Hispanic: 213 Asian: 10 American Indian: 3</p>

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students deficient in fluency due to lack of stamina for reading long passages of text and reading practice to apply learned strategies	Increased time for reading practice to include close reads and rereads as well as reading opportunities available before school, during lunch and dismissal	Administrators Reading Resource Specialist	Data chats with individual teachers regarding student achievement to determine effectiveness of instructional strategies Within one month following the FAIR and BAT assessments, disaggregate the data and conduct data chats with teachers and teams to determine effectiveness of instructional strategies and students targeted for extra support	Data Chat Tool Mini-BAT, BAT 1 & 2 FAIR Weekly Reading Assessments Data from Oral Reading Fluency
2	Students belonging to one or more subgroups require intensive assistance in multiple strand areas	Implement interventions in the FAIR Assessment Tool-Kit and istation teacher led lessons	Reading Resource Specialist	Data disaggregation of FAIR and istation management reports	FAIR and istation management reports

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

<p>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</p> <p>Reading Goal #5C:</p>	<p>Trend data based on a comparison of 2011 and 2012 FCAT Reading indicate that reading proficiency scores for ELL students decreased from 31% (15) in 2011 to 100% (12) in 2012.</p>
<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</p>
<p>Results on 2012 FCAT Reading indicated that 100% (12) of ELL did not make satisfactory progress in reading.</p>	<p>By June 2013, at least 86% of ELL students in grades 3-5 will demonstrate proficiency in reading.</p>

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	Learning gaps in language acquisition	Utilize "Newcomer Kits," "In-Step Readers," "English in My Pocket" and "Reading Basics" with ELL students during small group instruction Instruct in use of Heritage Language Dictionary	Administration ELL Committee	Quarterly Data Chats with ELL students Ongoing progress monitoring	Data Chat Tool
2	Personalization of individual student instructional needs in vocabulary and comprehension	Differentiated instruction through small groups, learning centers and use of Radius Audio Learning System Implement small group, targeted instruction through use of classroom teachers and teacher assistants	Administrators Reading Resource Specialist	Quarterly Data Chats for ELL students in grades 3-5 Within a month following the FAIR and BAT assessments, disaggregate the data to determine the effectiveness of the reading instruction	Data Chat Tool Record of Student Data Chat meetings Mini-BAT, BAT-1 & 2 results FAIR Review of Weekly Reading Assessments
3	Students belonging to one or more subgroups may require assistance in multiple strand areas	Implementation of FAIR Tool-Kit and istation	Reading Resource Specialist	Monitor progress using disaggregated data for FAIR and istation reports	FAIR istation management reports

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	Trend data based on a comparison of 2011 and 2012 FCAT Reading indicates that reading proficiency for SWD students increased from 33% (21) in 2011 to 75% (39) in 2012.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Results on 2012 FCAT Reading indicated that 75% (39) of SWD students in grades 3-5 did not demonstrate satisfactory progress in reading.	By June 2013, at least 86% (34) of SWD students in grades 3-5 will demonstrate 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	Gen Ed and ESE Teachers need additional planning time to personalize the individual students' instructional needs	Gen Ed and ESE Teachers will collaborate on instruction for SWD students Analyze diagnostic assessment data (DAR) to develop appropriate reading interventions Tailor pull-out or push-in instruction to meet reading deficiency of students	Administrators Reading Resource Specialist ESE Specialist Rtl Committee	Monthly Data Chats between students, teachers and ESE specialist to individually discuss student achievement and determine effectiveness of instructional strategies Within a month following the FAIR and BAT assessments, disaggregate the data to determine the effectiveness of the reading instruction Ongoing collaboration between Gen. Ed., ESE teachers and ESE Specialist on effectiveness of interventions	Data Chat Tool Record of Student Data Chat meetings Mini-BAT, BAT 1 & 2 results FAIR Weekly Reading Assessments Record of student groups that target specific reading deficiencies and progress made

2	Students have individual unique barriers to overcome as documented on their IEPs	Push-in or pull-out instruction provided by ESE teacher Differentiated instruction to meet their needs	Administrators ESE Specialist	IEP Review, informal and formal observations, FAIR and BAT assessments	Mini-BAT, BAT 1 and 2 results FAIR
---	--	---	----------------------------------	--	---

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	Trend data based on a comparison of 2011 and 2012 FCAT Reading indicate that reading proficiency for ED students as scores decreased from 55% (148) in 2011 to 52% (135) in 2012.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Results on 2012 FCAT Reading indicated that 52% (135) of ED students in grades 3-5 did not make satisfactory progress in reading.	By June 2013, at least 86% of ED students in grades 3-5 will demonstrate proficiency in reading to 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	Students deficient in vocabulary and comprehension due to limited background knowledge in literacy and complex informational text	Twice-monthly PLC meetings will support teachers with implementation of strategies and graphic organizers to strengthen concepts in vocabulary and comprehension	Administrators Reading Resource Specialist	Review of PLC Minutes Within a month following the FAIR and BAT assessments, disaggregate the data to determine the effectiveness of the reading instruction progress	PLC Minutes Weekly Reading Assessments Mini-BAT, BAT-1 & 2, results FAIR
2	Students lack books and technology at home to support developing literacy skills	Students will be invited into the Media Center before and after school to obtain books for home use As a tutoring initiative, selected students will be invited to use the Computer Lab before school for additional reading interventions	Administrators Media Specialist Reading Resource Specialist	Review of istation records and reports generated	istation management reports

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

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

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

Treasures Reading Training	New teachers	District	New teachers	January 2013	Follow-up Assignments	Reading Resource Specialist
Continued implementation of Accelerated Reader	K-5	PLC Leader Reading Resource Specialist Media Specialist	Reading PLC Team Leaders	Monthly PLC meetings Monthly Literacy Team Meetings	Literacy Team Data analysis reports provided within the Accelerated Reader Program	Administrators Reading Resource Specialist Media Specialist
PLC focus on implementation of Common Core Standards for Literacy	K-5	PLC Leader Reading Resource Specialist	Teachers Reading PLC Representatives for K-5 Team Leaders	Weekly team meetings Monthly PLC meetings Early Release Days and Teacher Planning Days	Assessment of students activities, running records, graphic organizers and collaborative lesson planning	Reading Resource Specialist Teachers
DOE Common Core Training to assist with meeting AMOs Ready for Rigor: Challenging Our Students DA Summer Academy	K-5	State of Florida District	Administration	June, July, August and ongoing	Follow-up Assignments (Action Plan and Progress Monitoring)	Director

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Provide leadership and support to teachers	Reading Resource Specialist	General Fund or Other	\$46,100.00
			Subtotal: \$46,100.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Increase stamina to read long passages	Accelerated Reader Renaissance Place Online Program	General Fund	\$3,000.00
			Subtotal: \$3,000.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
District reading trainings	Substitutes as needed	Title 1	\$900.00
			Subtotal: \$900.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Need for increased instructional time	After School Camps	District (pending) Accountability	\$18,000.00
Need for increased instructional time	Supplemental Educational Services (SES) tutoring	Title 1 SES Provider	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$18,000.00
			Grand Total: \$68,000.00

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.

CELLA Goal #1:

By 2013, 86% (11) of ELL students will be proficient in listening/speaking.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:

In 2012, 40% (8) students were 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	Students focus on home language demonstrate limited oral communication skills	Increase opportunities for listening and speaking in the classroom with English proficient peers. Opportunities should include oral individual and group presentations.	Administrators Reading Resource Specialist	Analysis of Idea Proficiency (IPT) Tests	Idea Proficiency Tests (IPT) booklet

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:

By 2013, 86% (11) of ELL students will be proficient in reading.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

In 2012, 35% (7) were 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	Students lack academic terminology due to limited language skills	Pair ELL students with English proficient, higher-level students for peer tutoring	Administrators Reading Resource Specialist	Analysis of Florida Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)	CELLA BAT 1 & 2 FCAT FAIR (k-2)
2	Students have limited understanding of vocabulary in context, language uses and comprehension skills needed to attain proficiency in reading	Increase time on computer-based iStation program to develop vocabulary and comprehension skills	Administrators Reading Resource Specialist	Analysis of iStation Management Reports	iStation Management Reports

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

By 2013, 86% (11) of ELL students will demonstrate proficiency in writing.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

In 2012, 20% (7) students were 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	Students lack writing proficiency due to limited writing fluency, grammar skills and writing conventions	Increased time with teacher to develop writing fluency, grammar and writing conventions	Administrators Reading Resource Specialist	Analysis of CELLA along with analysis of student writing samples along with the new Idea Proficiency Tests (IPT) 2 Reading & Writing Idea Proficiency Tests	CELLA Idea Proficiency Tests 2

CELLA Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Provide push-in support to ELLS	Teacher Assistant	General Fund/Title III	\$16,340.00
			Subtotal: \$16,340.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
iStation	Provided to school from Title 1	Distict Title 1	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Increase teacher proficiency in use of iStation	Training provided by school-based staff	N/A	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Implementation of the Idea Proficiency Test (IPT-2) Reading, Writing and Oral	Assessment booklets	General Budget	\$1,267.20
			Subtotal: \$1,267.20
			Grand Total: \$17,607.20

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:	Trend data based on a comparison of 2011 and 2012 FCAT Math scores indicate that math proficiency decreased from 38% (97) in 2011 to 27% (82) in 2012.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Results on 2012 FCAT Math indicated that 27% (82) of students in grades 3-5 scored at Level 3.	By June 2013, at least 86% (267) of students in grades 3-5 will demonstrate proficiency in math.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students have difficulty maintaining the mathematical concepts and skills as they matriculate to the next level.	Needs will be identified through item analysis of beginning of year/inventory tests and other assessments Implementation of differentiated instruction in small groups using data from item analysis Implementation of Mountain Math or Calendar Math to reinforce spirial review of Common Core skills	Administrators Math PLC Leaders	Utilizing data disaggregation of assessments to make instructional adjustments as needed Data chats with Administration and teachers to discuss progress of each student and the differentiated instruction provided for mastery of skills Progress monitoring of all Level 3 and/or above students on the cusp of Level 3 using Mini-Bats, BAT 1 & 2 data	GO Math Assessments (beginning of year/inventory tests, Chapter and End of Year) Mini-BAT, BAT 1 & 2 results Record of individual Data Chats conducted for each student in grades 3-5
2	Implement Common Core Standards to add rigor and consistency to mathematical instruction	Subject area PLCs with twice-monthly focus on building the bridge between Common Core and the NGSSS as well as sharing research-based practices PLCs to share at Team meetings	Administrators PLC Leaders	Review of PLC/Team Minutes to ensure that all teachers implement consistent instructional practices	PLC/Team Minutes

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

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:	Trend data based on comparison of 2011 and 2012 FCAT Math indicate that math proficiency for Level 4 and 5 students decreased from 29% (75) in 2011 to 24.4% (74) in 2012.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Results on 2012 FCAT Math indicated that 24.4% (74) of students scored at or above level 4.	By June 2013, at least 86% (267) of students will demonstrate a high level of achievement to to meet the Benchmark.

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	Meeting the needs of high-level students to complete rigorous activities to meet mathematics benchmarks	<p>Consistent implementation of First in Math to challenge and engage students in higher-order multi-step problem solving</p> <p>Participate in school-wide mixed math homework review program sponsored by the PTA</p> <p>Integrate mathematics and science using hands-on investigations with a focus on measurement</p> <p>Provide enrichment through participation in the Broward County Teacher of Mathematics (BCCTM) Math Contest</p>	Administrators PLC Leaders	<p>Data chats with administrators and teachers to discuss mastery of benchmarks and achievement</p> <p>Monthly review of mixed math homework review program by PTA/Teachers</p>	<p>Mixed math homework results</p> <p>Data chats collection form</p> <p>End-of-Year BCCTM Competition results</p>

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

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

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:	Trend data based on comparison of 2011 and 2012 Math scores indicate that students making learning gains increased from 57% (114) in 2011 to 72% (153) in 2012.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Results on the 2012 FCAT Math indicated that 72% (153) of students made learning gains	By June 2013, at least 86% (267) of students will demonstrate learning gains in mathematics

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students have difficulty understanding the concepts upon initial mathematical delivery of instruction	Students will participate in teacher-directed small group instruction for remediation on a weekly basis	Administrators Math PLC Support Staff	Teachers will review assessment and digital data and make modifications as needed	GO MATH Chapter Tests and digital resources Mini-BAT, BAT 1 & 2 Results GO MATH Online assessments
2	Additional instruction time is needed for student mastery and inclusion of interventions	Teachers will provide additional instruction to the lowest performing students	Administrators Math PLC	Ongoing progress monitoring through the analysis of formal and informal assessments Data chats with each teacher and team to monitor student achievement based on assessment results	GO MATH! assessments Mini-BAT, BAT 1 and 2 Results Data Chat Tool
3	Students struggle with solving math word problems due to limited analytical and reading skills	Provide explicit instruction in problem solving strategies and developing vocabulary to help students comprehend and solve word problems Implement 8 Standards of Math in kid-friendly language to increase problem solving Implement/monitor use of math journals	Administrators	Ongoing progress monitoring during problem solving cooperative groups	Mini-BAT, BAT 1 and 2 results Math journals

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

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:	Trend data based on a comparison of 2011 and 2012 FCAT Mathematics indicate that students in the lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics increased from 61% (31) in 2011 to 74% (42) in 2012.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Results on 2012 FCAT Mathematics indicated that 74% (42) of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains.	By June 2013, at least 86% (69) of students in lowest 25% will make learning gains in mathematics.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack understanding of math concepts due to gaps in number skills	Incorporate the GO MATH Intervention program to help students master concepts taught during initial instruction	Administrators Math PLC	Ongoing progress monitoring through formal and informal assessments Quarterly data disaggregation and data chats to monitor progress of each student	GO MATH Assessments Data Chat Tool Mini-BAT, BAT 1 & 2 results
2	Students lack understanding of math concepts due to limited math vocabulary knowledge	Explicitly reteach vocabulary and concepts to build student mastery; math journals will be implemented and monitored	Administrators Math PLC	Review of student journals on a monthly basis for evidence of math vocabulary and concepts	Student journals GO MATH Assessments

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Elementary School Mathematics Goal # In six years, the school will reduce the achievement gap by 50%. 5A :
--	--

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	46	51	56	61	66	

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:	Trend data based on a comparison of 2011 and 2012 FCAT math indicate that scores for White, Black, Hispanic, ED, ELL and SWD students did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Results on 2012 FCAT Math indicated the following did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics: White: 28% (15) Black: 52% (61) Hispanic: 52% (59) Asian: 50% (4) American Indian: 100% (1)	By June 2013, at least 86% of students in lowest 25% will make learning gain in mathematics or meet the targeted AYP benchmarks: White: 15, Black: 36, Hispanic: 40 Asian: 0, American Indian: 0

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of instructional time to use concrete examples and manipulatives during instruction to further understanding of mathematical concepts	Implement manipulatives and/or digital technology to strengthen students' mathematical skills Implement Florida On-Line Intervention	Administrators Team Leaders Math PLC	Ongoing progress monitoring through the use of formal and informal assessments Mid-Chapter and Chapter Test disaggregation of assessments and data chats with each teacher and team to review student achievement based on assessment results	Data Chat Tool GO MATH Assessments Mini-BAT, BAT 1 & 2 results
2	Struggling students lacking basic math skills	Students will use pictorial representations in math journals or GO MATH digital resources such as Destination Math or Mega Math to strengthen mathematical skills	Administrators Team Leaders Math PLC	Monitor student progress on GO MATH assessments Within one month following the BAT administration, disaggregate the assessment data and monitor student progress Evaluate student journals monthly	GO MATH Assessments Mini-BAT, BAT 1 & 2 results Student work in student journals to show evidence of pictorial representations

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:	Trend data based on a comparison of 2011 and 2012 FCAT Mathematics indicate that mathematics proficiency scores for ELL students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics increased from 35% (17) in 2011 to 83% (10) in 2012.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Results on 2012 FCAT Mathematics indicated that 83% (10) of ELL students did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics.	By June 2013, at least 86% (11) of ELL students in grades 3-5 will demonstrate learning gains in mathematics.
---	---

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Struggling ELL students lacking vocabulary to master basic math skills and word problems	During small group instruction, rigorous mathematical vocabulary instruction will be implemented to expand students' vocabulary	Administrators Math PLC ELL Liaison	Review student assessments and conduct data chats with teachers and support team to monitor progress made by ELL students	GO MATH Assessments Mini-BATS, BAT 1 & 2 results Data Chat Tool
2	ELL students lacking mastery of basic mathematical facts with fluency	Implementation of Destination Math and Florida Online Intervention program focusing on basic mathematical facts Practice with teacher made games/activities Pairing ELL students with fluent students	Administrators Math PLC ELL Liaison	Teachers review student assessment results and pull into small groups	GO MATH Chapter Tests and data from Destination Math

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	Trend data based on a comparison of 2011 and 2012 FCAT mathematics indicate that mathematics proficiency for SWD students decreased from 31% (20) in 2011 to 73% (38).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Results on 2012 FCAT Mathematics indicated that 73% (38) of SWD students in grades 3-5 did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics.	By June 2013, at least 86% (34) of SWD students in grades 3-5 will demonstrate proficiency in mathematics.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	SWD pull-out schedules impact classroom instruction	Gen Ed and ESE teachers will meet to discuss SWD needs and differentiated instruction	Administrators ESE Specialist	Data chats with Gen Ed, ESE Specialist and ESE teacher Review of student assessment results with teacher and support team to assess progress made by SWD students Individual Student Data Chat form	GO MATH assessment results Mini-BAT, BAT 1 & 2 results Individual Student Data Chat form
2	Struggling SWD students lacking mastery of basic facts with fluency	Implementation of digital technology to include Destination Math and Florida Online Intervention programs Use of concrete manipulatives to gain foundational	Administrators ESE Specialist	Within one month following the BAT administration, disaggregate the assessment data and monitor student progress	Mini-BAT, BAT 1 & 2 results

		understanding of math facts fluency		
--	--	-------------------------------------	--	--

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:	Trend data based on a comparison of 2011 and 2012 FCAT Mathematics indicate that mathematics proficiency for ED students decreased as scores decreased from 56% (151) in 2011 to 51.9% (136).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Results on 2012 FCAT Mathematics indicated that 51% (136) of ED students did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics.	By June 2013, at least 86% (237) of ED students in grades 3-5 will demonstrate proficiency in math.

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	Struggling ED students lacking basic math skills	Teachers will provide additional small group instruction	Administrators Math PLC	Informal monitoring of student progress with small group instruction Within one month following the administration of the BAT, disaggregate the data and conduct data chats with the support team and teacher to assess progress made by ED students	GO MATH Assessment results Data Chat Tool Mini-BAT, BAT 1 & 2 results
2	Need for more instructional time to meet the needs of the students	Targeted students requiring more remediation will attend before school math lab for additional differentiated experiences contingent upon continued funding from SES/Title 1	Administrators Math PLC	Review of management data from digital math programs	GO MATH Assessment results Mini-BAT, BAT 1 & 2 results

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Big Idea Podcasts	K-5	PLC Leaders	Teachers Team Leaders	Twice Monthly PLC Meetings	Monitoring of assessment results	Team Leaders PLC Math
Big Idea 1,2 and 3 math trainings	New teachers	District	New teachers	December 2012	Follow-up Assignments	New Teacher Mentors Math PLC Leader
Review Curriculum						

Frameworks for student mastery of NGSSS and Common Core Standards	K-5	PLC Leaders	Teachers Administrators	October 2012	Review of lesson plans for alignment with Curriculum Framework	Team Leaders
DOE Common Core Training to assist with meeting AMOs Ready for Rigor: Challenging Our Students DA Summer Academy	K-5	State of Florida District	Administration	June, July, August and ongoing	Follow-up Assignments (Action Plan, Progress Monitoring)	Director

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Teaching effective test-taking strategies	GO MATH Assessment Guides	Accountability	\$1,400.00
			Subtotal: \$1,400.00
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
GO MATH Training for new teachers	Substitutes for District training	Title 1	\$800.00
			Subtotal: \$800.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$2,200.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal # 1a:	Trend data based on a comparison of 2011 and 2012 FCAT Science indicate that student science proficiency decreased as scores decreased from 26% (20) in 2011 to 24.5% (26)2012.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Results on 2012 FCAT Science indicated that 24.5%	By June 2013, at least 86% (83) of students in grade 5

(26) of students in grade 5 scored at Level 3.

will demonstrate to meet the benchmarks.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack authentic scientific learning experiences	Use of inquiry based activities using Delta Science kits and District-based lesson plans Implementation of a new weekly science special in grades K-5. Use of community and outreach resources (such as Air Quality Program Environmental Newsletter, Museum of Science and Discovery, and Parent Night program)	Administrators Science Resource Teacher Science PLC	Plan, analyze and discuss science experiences at monthly PLC/Team meetings New Science Specialist to assist teams in wider integration of hands-on classroom experimentation	PLC/Team Minutes
2	Students lack background knowledge	Science instruction will be taught with fidelity at all grade levels as per the district's guidelines Incorporate use of Science Fusion digital lessons and labs Instruct students using the Five "E" Model (engage, explore, explain, evaluate and extend), throughout Science Fusion lessons	Administrators Science Resource Teacher Science PLC	Analyze Science FUSION student assessments to drive instruction	Science FUSION assessments
3	Teachers and students lack experience with inquiry-based STEM investigations	Implement a Science Special focusing on STEM initiatives to provide opportunities for more hands-on science experiences. Conduct science planning with the Science Resource teacher at each grade level to ensure that inquiry based STEM investigations are implemented Incorporate technology to provide virtual experiments	Science Resource Teacher Science/Math PLC	Review of Science Team Meeting Minutes Review/Collaboration on Science and Math PLC minutes by Science and Math PLC leaders	Minutes of Science Team Meetings Lesson plans
4	Students lack reflective thinking skills	Journaling to allow time for reflection Think-alouds during instruction	Science Resource Teacher	Review of Science Journals	Student Science Journals

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science.				
Science Goal #1b:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
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.	Trend data based on a comparison of 2011 and 2012 FCAT Science indicate that student science proficiency increased from 5% (4) in 2011 to 11.3% (12) in 2012.
Science Goal #2a:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Results on 2012 FCAT Science indicated that 11.3% (12) of students in grade 5 scored at or above Level 4.	By June 2013, at least 86% (89) of students in grade 5 will demonstrate proficiency in science.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack of motivation due to inexperience in STEM activities	Increase number of project-based STEM activities and related school and local competitions	Administrators Science Resource Teacher Science/Math PLC	Review projects for quality/thoroughness, student self-reflection and student oral presentations	Rubric to assess quality of key project components
2	Limited science interactive experiences due to lack of instructional time	Teachers will conduct weekly hands-on experiments/activities using differentiated instruction suggestions provided in the Science FUSION series and BEEP along with STEM activities	Administrators Science Resource Teacher Science PLC	Discussion via Science and Math Team Meetings and PLCs as well as review of activities	Minutes from Science and Math Team Meetings and PLC's

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science.	
Science Goal #2b:	

2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
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
Train teachers on the philosophy and implementation of inquiry-based STEM investigations	K-5	Science Resource Teacher	Science and Math PLC members	Monthly PLC meetings	Follow-up Assignment	PLC Leaders
PLC focus on infusion of technology in both instruction and student projects i.e. Power Point presentations	K-5	Science Resource Teacher	PLC members	Twice monthly PLC meetings	Follow-up Assignment	PLC Leaders

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Implement Science as a Special	All students to receive no less than 30 minutes instruction from Specialist along with classroom Science	General Fund	\$40,000.00
			Subtotal: \$40,000.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Implement use of Science Fusion	On line support Resource from adopted Science text	Included with textbook adoption	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Teachers and Science Special	District training for Science		

teacher to participate in Science and STEM District training	Special teachers and District STEM trainings	District Funds Title 1 for subs	\$800.00
			Subtotal: \$800.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$40,800.00

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:		Trend data based on a comparison of 2011 and 2012 FCAT writing indicates that student proficiency decreased from 81%(72) in 2011 to 76% (81) in 2012.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
Results of 2012 Writing indicate 76% (81) students scored at 4.0 and above.		By 2013, at least 86% (74) of students will score at 4.0 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	Teachers need to master the implementation of the Common Core Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy in History, Social Studies, Science and Technical Curricula	Teachers will plan together with a focus on lesson studies to implement the Common Core Standards.	Administrators Writing PLC	Increased daily writing across the curriculum to produce clear and coherent writing in which the development, organization and style are appropriate to task, purpose, and audience	Teacher created, grade-level appropriate writing rubrics that measures student writing
2	Students in grades 3 and 4 lack the ability to produce writing as expected by the Common Core Standards.	Every Monday and Friday third grade teachers bring their students to a fourth grade writing lesson for 30 minutes	Administrators Writing PLC Reading Resource Specialist	Third and fourth grade teachers will meet monthly to analyze and score student writing samples and develop effective instructional strategies	Student Samples with Writing Rubrics
3	Implement anchor standards for writing across all content curriculum areas	Develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, editing, rewriting in all subject areas	Writing PLC	Teachers will analyze student writing samples	Student Samples with Writing Rubrics
4	Students lack technology experience in word processing to draft and publish writing	Students will learn word processing, publishing and presentation skills	Administrators Writing PLC	Teachers will analyze student writing samples published using technology	Student samples with Writing 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
Common Core Standards for writing will be studied through the Writing PLC	K-5	PLC Leaders	Writing PLC team representatives	Monthly PLC meetings in compliance with Guidelines for Professional Development #10-3A	Cross grade level sharing, planning and review of student samples	Writing PLC coordinator Team Leaders
Teacher collaboration in student writing instruction	3-4	Team Leaders	Teachers in grades 3-4	Monthly meetings with teachers in grades 3 and 4, during Early Release and/or Teacher Planning Days in compliance with the Guidelines for Professional Development #10-3A	Utilization of writing rubric when scoring student samples	Writing PLC coordinator Team Leaders
Technical training for teachers on implementing Power Point presentations with students	K-5	Media Specialist Teachers	Teachers in grades K-5	October 2012	Teacher plans Completed student presentations	Writing PLC coordinator Team Leaders

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Teacher training on Common Core Writing	District sponsored training	Title 1 funds for subs	\$1,200.00

Teachers will model writing using multiple materials to enhance writing across grade levels	Story paper, journals, sentence strip	General Fund	\$850.00
			Subtotal: \$2,050.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Teacher training on use of Power Point and Keynote programs	In house training with teacher experts	Title 1 funds for substitutes for teacher trainers to support classroom teachers	\$600.00
			Subtotal: \$600.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$2,650.00

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of attendance data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. Attendance		Trend data based on a comparison of 2011 and 2012 indicates that attendance increased from 94.5 to 94.8.			
Attendance Goal # 1:					
2012 Current Attendance Rate:		2013 Expected Attendance Rate:			
The attendance rate for 2012 was 94.8%.		By June 2013, the attendance rate will increase to 97.8%.			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)			
The number of students with excessive absences for 2012 was 81.		The expected number of students with excessive absences for 2013 will decrease by 50%.			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)			
The number of students with excessive tardies for 2012 was 219.		The expected number of students with excessive tardies for 2013 will decrease by 50%.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Lack of parental understanding of, and/or commitment to, the District's	Communicate District's attendance policy during Title I Public meeting/Open House,	Assistant Principal School Social Worker Guidance	Review attendance reports on a daily, weekly and monthly basis	Comparison of Yearly Attendance Reports

1	attendance policy	parent/teacher conferences, school newsletter and school's website Utilize District's ParentLink call-out system to remind parents of need to report absences along with the importance of their children coming to school on time and daily BTIP conferences with parents whose children exhibit a pattern of non-attendance	Counselor		
2	Students who come to school late/tardy on a regular basis	Implement school wide project, 100% on time to reduce number of students late to school by motivating students to be on time.	Principal WKID coordinator	Review chart of classes with 100% on time reported	Teacher Verification Email transferred to chart in news room

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						

Attendance Budget:

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

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:	Trend data indicates that students continue to be suspended in and out of school; however, with a mobility rate of approximately 38%, this represents a very small population of students.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
The total number of in-school suspensions for 11-12 was 4.	The expected number of in-school suspensions for 12-13 will be reduced by 25%.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
The total number of students suspended in-school for 11-12 was 3.	The expected number of students suspended in-school for 12-13 will be reduced by 33%.
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
The total number of out-of-school suspensions for 11-12 was 7.	The expected number of out-of-school suspensions for 12-13 will be reduced by 14%.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
The total number of students suspended out-of-school for 11-12 was 5.	The expected number of students suspended out-of-school for 12-13 will be reduced by 20%.

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
	Students not familiar with school wide expectations Students demonstrate behaviors that cause safety concerns	Orient all students in school wide and classroom policies and procedures along with expectations found in Code of Student Conduct Monthly Character Trait Education program including recognition of one student per class	Assistant Principal Teachers Character Trait Liaison Classroom teacher Team leaders Classroom	Review student referrals Analyze suspension data quarterly	Students referrals Suspension data

1	Implement classroom behavior plans using intrinsic motivators with fidelity	Teachers Teacher Assistants Morning New Coordinator
	Implement cafeteria behavior project with reward points for positive daily class behavior and traveling trophy for weekly class recognition	Teachers Team Leaders
	Implement positive reinforcement strategies in all classrooms	

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
CHAMPS Training	New teachers	District	New teachers	January 2013	Follow-up assignments	NESS Coaches

Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
In-house Cafeteria behavior program	Trophies that travel among winning classrooms, Behavior Charts and Grade Level buckets to track winning classes	Donations and General Fund	\$25.00
			Subtotal: \$25.00
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
CHAMPS Training	Provide substitute training if necessary	Title 1	\$300.00
			Subtotal: \$300.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Participation in District sponsored Kids of Character	Monthly trait recognition. Monthly classroom certificates	Donated by District	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$325.00

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	Trend data indicate an increase in the percentage of parents/family representatives involved in school-related activities as a 3% increase was attained from 2010-2011 (533 to 2011-2012 (549). Our volunteer hours logged increased from 1,466 hours in 2010-2011 school year to 2,447 hours in 2011-2012 school year. This is an increase of 981 volunteer hours.
--	---

2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
---	--

During 11-12, 79% of parents/family representatives participated in decisions regarding their children's education as shown by attendance at Title I Public meetings, parent trainings, other parent meetings, events and/or conferences.	By June 2013, at least 90% of parents/family representatives will participate in decisions regarding their children's education as shown by attendance at Title I Public meetings, parent trainings, other parent meetings, events and/or conferences.
---	--

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	Work schedules of parents make it difficult to attend school events due to multiple jobs, other obligations and child care	Prior to the first day of school, Preschool ESE and kindergarten parents will be invited to participate in an Orientation. In addition, grades K-5 will conduct a Meet & Greet during the day. An evening Title 1 Public meeting/Open House will take place in the first 3 weeks of school.	Administrators	Identify number of parents who attended	Sign-in sheets
2	Unaware, forget, lack of transportation and/or child care prevents parents participation in school activities	Post "Calendar of Events" in monthly newsletter and website Post newsletter on school's website Use Parent Link for weekly parent reminders Send home fliers with RSVP section to reinforce need for parent involvement and gather information if materials and snacks are included	Administrators	Review attendance data	Sign-in sheets
	Limited parent SAC participation and SAF	Send home recruitment flier Announce during Title 1	Administrators Title 1 Liaison SAC chair	Monitor SAC membership and attendance	SAC Membership List SAC sign-in

3		<p>Public Meetings/Open Houses</p> <p>Individual telephone contact follow-up with those indicating interest</p> <p>Provide parents with copy of 2011-2012 Parent Involvement Plan</p> <p>Provide parents access to the SIP via school website and/or printed copy (upon request)</p> <p>Participate via SAC/SAF in financial decisions made related to planning and use of budget</p>		Review Title 1 Parent Survey data	<p>sheets</p> <p>SAC Meeting Minutes</p> <p>Title I Parent Survey</p>
4	Increase communication regarding child/student progress	<p>Provide training for parents in use of Student Agenda/Planner</p> <p>Parents will receive individual assessment results, along with interpretation of those results through interim reports, progress reports (a.k.a. report cards) and/or FCAT student results sheets. In addition, they will receive instruction and/or instructional materials to assist during parent-teacher conferences (at least two annually)</p>	Teachers Team Leaders	Monitor daily utilization of student agenda/planner	<p>Student agenda/planner</p> <p>Student assessment documents & reports</p>
5	Increase parent knowledge in ways to help/support children at home	<p>Parent training sessions for specific subjects, skills and/or levels</p> <p>Attend District's Title 1 Parent Seminar</p>	Administrators Team Leaders Teachers Title 1 Liaison	Analyze results from parent training evaluation surveys	<p>Parent Training Evaluation Surveys</p> <p>Sign-in sheets</p>
6	Increase parent knowledge related to Title I	<p>Prior to the first day of school, Preschool ESE and Kindergarten parents will participate in an Orientation. In addition, grades K-5 will participate in a Meet and Greet event prior to the first day of school. In the first 3 weeks of school PreK-5th grade will conduct an evening Title 1 Public Meeting/Open House.</p>	Administrators Team Leaders Title 1 Liaison	Verify parent attendance	<p>Sign-in sheets</p> <p>SAC/SAF meeting agendas and minutes</p> <p>Data from Parent Surveys</p>
	Lack of home support	Monthly newsletters	Administrators	Parent attendance at	Title 1 Survey

7	Parent evening training	Team leaders Title 1 Liaison PLC Leaders	trainings Parent commitment as noted on parent training evaluation form	Parent Training Evaluation Form results
---	-------------------------	--	--	---

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
Parent participation in decisions regarding their children's education as documented by attendance at Title 1 Public Meetings, Parent Trainings and other parent meetings and/or conferences	K-5	Administrators PLC Leaders Team Leaders Title 1 Liaison	Administrators PLC Leaders Team Leaders Title 1 Liaison	Ongoing through May 2013	Parent Training Evaluations Sign-in Sheets	Administrators PLC Leaders Team Leaders Title 1 Liaison
Parent Trainings in Academic Content Areas i.e. Reading, Writing, Math and Science	K-5	Administrators PLC Leaders Team Leaders Title 1 Liaison	Administrators PLC Leaders Team Leaders Title 1 Liaison	Ongoing through May 2013 Trainings throughout the school year	Review sign-in sheets Compile results from Parent Training Evaluation Forms	PLC Leaders Team Leaders Title 1 Liaison
District Title 1 Parent Seminar	K-5	District Title 1 Staff	Parents	January 2012	Report by parent attendees during SAC, SAF or PTA meeting	Administrators Title 1 Liaison

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
District Title 1 Parent Seminar	Registration	Title 1 Parent Involvement	\$120.00
Student Agenda/Planner Parent Training	Student Agendas/Planners	Title 1 Parent Involvement	\$2,575.00

Refreshments for Parent Training Night	Refreshment items permitted by Title 1 requirements	Title 1 Parent Involvement	\$765.00
Providing take-home materials for Parent Trainings	Materials and supplies for Title 1 Parent Trainings	Title 1	\$500.00
			Subtotal: \$3,960.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$3,960.00

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:		100% of students will participate in STEM activities, presentations and competitions during school year 2012-2013			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack experience with STEM activities, presentations and competitions.	Science Resource Teacher will guide teachers in presenting STEM-based instruction resulting in activities, presentations and competitions as well as increased use of Delta Science kits.	Science Resource Teacher Science PLC	Evaluation of STEM activities, presentations and competitions with a STEM-related rubric	Lesson plans STEM-related 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
Train teachers on the philosophy and implementation of inquiry-based STEM investigations	K-5	Science Resource Teacher	Science PLC	Twice Monthly PLC meetings	Follow-up Assignment given by Science Resource teacher	Science Resource Teacher Science PLC

STEM Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Instruct teachers in-house on STEM implementations	In-house training	Title 1 (substitutes)	\$1,800.00
			Subtotal: \$1,800.00
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
Increased use of Science Delta kits (replenish materials)	Science materials needed for Science Delta Kits	General Fund	\$650.00
			Subtotal: \$650.00
			Grand Total: \$2,450.00

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	Provide leadership and support to teachers	Reading Resource Specialist	General Fund or Other	\$46,100.00
CELLA	Provide push-in support to ELLS	Teacher Assistant	General Fund/Title III	\$16,340.00
Mathematics	Teaching effective test-taking strategies	GO MATH Assessment Guides	Accountability	\$1,400.00
Science	Implement Science as a Special	All students to receive no less than 30 minutes instruction from Specialist along with classroom Science	General Fund	\$40,000.00
Writing	Teacher training on Common Core Writing	District sponsored training	Title 1 funds for subs	\$1,200.00
Writing	Teachers will model writing using multiple materials to enhance writing across grade levels	Story paper, journals, sentence strip	General Fund	\$850.00
Suspension	In-house Cafeteria behavior program	Trophies that travel among winning classrooms, Behavior Charts and Grade Level buckets to track winning classes	Donations and General Fund	\$25.00
STEM	Instruct teachers in-house on STEM implementations	In-house training	Title 1 (substitutes)	\$1,800.00
				Subtotal: \$107,715.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Increase stamina to read long passages	Accelerated Reader Renaissance Place Online Program	General Fund	\$3,000.00
CELLA	iStation	Provided to school from Title 1	Distict Title 1	\$0.00
Science	Implement use of Science Fusion	On line support Resource from adopted Science text	Included with textbook adoption	\$0.00
Writing	Teacher training on use of Power Point and Keynote programs	In house training with teacher experts	Title 1 funds for substitutes for teacher trainers to support classroom teachers	\$600.00
				Subtotal: \$3,600.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	District reading trainings	Substitutes as needed	Title 1	\$900.00
CELLA	Increase teacher proficiency in use of iStation	Training provided by school-based staff	N/A	\$0.00
Mathematics	GO MATH Training for new teachers	Substitutes for District training	Title 1	\$800.00
Science	Teachers and Science Special teacher to participate in Science and STEM District training	District training for Science Special teachers and District STEM trainings	District Funds Title 1 for subs	\$800.00
Suspension	CHAMPS Training	Provide substitute training if necessary	Title 1	\$300.00
Parent Involvement	District Title 1 Parent Seminar	Registration	Title 1 Parent Involvement	\$120.00
Parent Involvement	Student Agenda/Planner Parent Training	Student Agendas/Planners	Title 1 Parent Involvement	\$2,575.00
Parent Involvement	Refreshments for Parent Training Night	Refreshment items permitted by Title 1 requirements	Title 1 Parent Involvement	\$765.00

Parent Involvement	Providing take-home materials for Parent Trainings	Materials and supplies for Title 1 Parent Trainings	Title 1	\$500.00
				Subtotal: \$6,760.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Need for increased instructional time	After School Camps	District (pending) Accountability	\$18,000.00
Reading	Need for increased instructional time	Supplemental Educational Services (SES) tutoring	Title 1 SES Provider	\$0.00
CELLA	Implementation of the Idea Proficiency Test (IPT-2) Reading, Writing and Oral	Assessment booklets	General Budget	\$1,267.20
Suspension	Participation in District sponsored Kids of Character	Monthly trait recognition. Monthly classroom certificates	Donated by District	\$0.00
STEM	Increased use of Science Delta kits (replenish materials)	Science materials needed for Science Delta Kits	General Fund	\$650.00
				Subtotal: \$19,917.20
				Grand Total: \$137,992.20

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 10/23/2012)

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
Florida Assessment Guides for Grades K-5	\$1,468.00
Benchmark Writing Assessment, Grade 4 Teacher Training for Assistant Principal	\$564.00
GO MATH Assessment Guides for Grade K-5, Science Fusion Flip Charts Grades K-5 and Florida Science Assessment Guide for Grade 5	\$2,988.50

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

During school year 2012-2013, the SAC will be responsible for reviewing student test data, making suggestions to the SIP to increase student achievement, and collectively determine to fund the materials/programs that will yield the greatest student achievement. In addition, the SAC will continue to work within the community to develop support and or in-kind donations to benefit the school community.

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 OAKRIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	63%	67%	81%	32%	243	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	56%	57%			113	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?	49% (NO)	61% (YES)			110	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					466	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					C	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Broward School District OAKRIDGE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	76%	79%	92%	39%	286	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	69%	56%			125	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	67% (YES)	61% (YES)			128	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					539	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested