FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: SANDERS PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Broward

Principal: Rhonda Parris

SAC Chair: Nicole Davis

Superintendent: Robert Runcie

Date of School Board Approval: December 4, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/25/2012

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)
					Collins Elementary 2011-2012: Grade A Proficiency: Reading – 51%; Math – 68%; Science - 20%; Writing - 97% Learning Gains: Reading – 70%; Math – 80% Learning Gains lowest 25%: Reading – 75%; Math – 102% 2010-2011 School Grade A Mastery in Reading 65% Meeting High Standards: Math 79%; Writing 97%; Science 44% Learning Gains: Reading - 64%; Math - 76% Lowest 25% Making Learning Gains: Reading - 67%; Math - 80%
Principal	Rhonda Parris	BS in Elementary Education Ms. Ed. Leadership	1	4	School Grade B 2009-2010 3rd grade 67% in reading (increase of 20%); 5th grade 46% to 49% in reading (increase of 3%)

Role	Name	Degree(s)/Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years	Prior Performance Record
					5th grade 34% to 51% in math (increase of 17%) Overall Reading 62% Level 3 or higher, Math 74%, Writing 94% AYP - Economically Disadvantaged - reading goal met School Grade A 2008-2009 Mastery: Reading 59%; Math 70%; Science 51%; Writing 96% Learning Gains: Reading 67%; Math 67% Learning Gains Bottom 25%: 67% Reading 67%; Math 83% District Reading Coach 5 years. Decreased bottom 25% of students, Focus Schools Reading First Increase number of Level 3 students - 24%
Assis Principal	Karen Nesbeth	BA – Business Administration (FIU) MS – Ed Leadership (NSU) Certifications: Elementary Education Principal K-12	4	11	2011/2012: Grade C Proficiency: Reading – 42%; Math – 53%; Science - 44%; Writing - 63% Learning Gains: Reading – 66%; Math – 56% Learning Gains lowest 25%: Reading – 72%; Math – 66% 2010/2011 – Grade B Proficiency: Reading – 56%; Math – 71%; Science - 31%; Writing - 94% Learning Gains: Reading – 61%; Math – 69% Learning Gains lowest 25%: Reading – 58%; Math – 67% AYP Reading – Black and English Language Learners students did not make AYP. AYP Math - Black, Economically Disadvantaged and English Language Learners students did not make AYP 2009/2010 – Grade B Proficiency: Reading – 53%; Math – 71%; Science - 20%; Writing - 88% Learning Gains: Reading – 61%; Math – 68% Learning Gains lowest 25%: Reading – 68%; Math – 81% AYP Reading – Black, Economically Disadvantaged and SWD did not make AYP. AYP Math - Economically Disadvantaged and SWD did not make AYP 2008-2009: Grade - A Reading Mastery: 65%; Math Mastery: 69%; Science Mastery: 21% Writing Mastery: 93% AYP: Economically Disadvantaged and SWD did not make AYP in Math

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
					2011/2012: Grade C Proficiency: Reading – 42%; Math – 53%; Science - 44%; Writing - 63% Learning Gains: Reading – 66%; Math – 56% Learning Gains lowest 25%: Reading – 72%; Math – 66% 2010/2011 – Grade B Proficiency: Reading – 56%; Writing - 94% Learning Gains: Reading – 61% Learning Gains lowest 25%: Reading – 58%

Subject	Name	Degree/Certifications			Performance Record
Reading	Nicole Davis	BA – Elementary Education MS – Computer Science in Ed Certifications: Elementary Education, Educational Leadership, ESOL	9	9	AYP Reading: Black and English Language Learners students did not make AYP. 2009/2010 – Grade B Proficiency: Reading – 53%; Writing - 88% Learning Gains: Reading – 61% Learning Gains lowest 25%: Reading – 68% AYP Reading – Black, Economically Disadvantaged and SWD did not make AYP. 2008-2009: Grade - A Reading Mastery: 65%; 81% of students made learning gains; 77% of lowest quartile made learning gains Writing Mastery: 93% AYP Reading: All subgroups met criteria. 2007-2008: Grade - C Reading Mastery: 54% 59% of students made learning gains; 73% of lowest quartile made learning gains Writing Mastery: 85% AYP: Black and Economically Disadvantaged did not make AYP in Reading
Math	Andrea Hunt	BS –Psychology (NSU) BS – Elem Ed (NSU) MS – Ed Leadership (NSU) Certifications: Elementary Education, ESOL, Educational Leadership	8	8	2011/2012: Grade C Proficiency: Reading – 42%; Math – 53%; Science - 44%; Writing - 63% Learning Gains: Reading – 66%; Math – 56% Learning Gains lowest 25%: Reading – 72%; Math – 66% 2010/2011 – Grade B Proficiency: Math – 71% Learning Gains: Math – 69% Learning Gains lowest 25%:Math – 67% AYP Math: Black, Economically Disadvantaged and English Language Learners students did not make AYP 2009/2010 – Grade B Proficiency: Math – 71% Learning Gains: Math – 68% Learning Gains lowest 25%: Math – 81% AYP Math - Economically Disadvantaged and SWD did not make AYP 2008-2009: Grade - A Math Mastery: 69% 70% of students made learning gains; 73% of lowest quartile made learning gains AYP: Economically Disadvantaged and SWD did not make AYP in Math 2007-2008: Grade - C Math Mastery: 71% 63% of students made learning gains; 60% of lowest quartile students made learning gains AYP Math: All subgroups met criteria

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	Partnering new teachers, teachers new to a grade/subject level, or teachers with less than 3 years experience with veteran staff. Instructional coaches and team/subject level leaders will model lessons and mentor teachers identified teachers. Instructional coaches provide classroom support to all teachers	New Educator Support System Coach; Instructional Coaches	June 2013	
2	Weekly Professional Learning Community meetings.	Administration; Reading Coach; Math Coach	June 2013	
3	Teacher Leaders will be provided the opportunity to gain leadership experiences working on tasks and projects to increase student achievement	Principal	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
N/A	N/A

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
43	0.0%(0)	25.6%(11)	46.5%(20)	27.9%(12)	60.5%(26)	100.0%(43)	4.7%(2)	4.7%(2)	76.7%(33)

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
Zobeida Renteria	Shauntel Ingraham	New teacher. Ms. Renteria is the Primary Math chairperson. She is a strong instructional leader and can provide collaboration on planning, curriculum and instruction	Lesson Planning Model lesson Review curriculum and instructional practices Share best practices
Nicole Davis	Sheneque Williams	Second year teacher. Grade and subject area change. Ms. Davis is the reading coach. She is a strong instructional leader, resource provider and committed to professional growth.	Lesson Planning Model lesson Review curriculum and instructional practices Share best practices

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

Sanders Park utilizes it's Title I funds to hire additional teachers to assist students, particularly low performing students, with additional assistance during the instructional day through differentiated instruction, small group, pull out and push in. Staff Development funds are used to develop a comprehensive professional training program to improve delivery of instruction through a variety of workshops designed to move teachers to mastery and improve student achievement.
Parental Involvement Funds are utilized to fund parent trainings and activities that provide parents with new skills to support student learning at home. Improving the frequency and quality of family participation and increasing family literacy are also goals of our parental involvement component. Monies are used to purchase food, supplies/materials and provide stipends for teacher presenters. Extended learning opportunities are also supported with district Title I funds.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Students identified as migrant receive additional academic services in the form of small group, push in and pull outs. A variety of intervention programs from the struggling reader's and math chart are used to remediate students.
Additionally, these students will receive support services through the guidance counselor and social services. Collaboration with community agencies will take place to ensure that needed services such as health and nutrition are provided. Remediation and tutoring services will be provided as needed.

Title I, Part D

N/A

Title II

Teachers participate in district-developed workshops in differentiated instruction and academic standards training. Summer leadership and curriculum workshops are supported with district Title I funds.

Title III

ELL students receive reading and developmental language arts instruction by a certified ESOL teacher. The Multicultural department provides ESOL instructional materials to be used with ELL students. .

Title X- Homeless

District Homeless Social Worker provides resources (clothing, school supplies, social services referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education. In addition, academic tutoring is provided at homeless shelters. The purpose of the Homeless Education Program is to identify homeless students, remove barriers to their education, including school enrollment, provide them with supplemental academic and counseling case management services as well as linkages to their school social worker while maintaining school as the students stable environment.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI funds are used to provide additional tutoring before and after schools and for additional instructional support during the school day. SAI funds will be utilized to fund FCAT Camp to assist struggling students.

Violence Prevention Programs

Sanders Park Elementary implements the County Student Code of Conduct and follows the District Discipline Matrix. Our school enforces the District's Anti-Bullying Policy and has a zero tolerance for bullying and violence. Sanders Park builds a violence prevention culture through classroom instruction in conflict resolution, bullying prevention, and the Broward County adopted character traits. In addition to the classroom instruction, teachers and staff members received training on the Anti-Bully policy and CHAMPS I behavior/classroom management program.

Nutrition Programs

N/A

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

To ensure school readiness, the Head Start Program provides literacy, math, and science curricula that align with the K-3 national standards to improve educational outcomes. This connection between curricula and child expectations has contributed to better prepare students to succeed in Kindergarten. An end-of-the-year Creative Curriculum Continuum report, detailing students' ongoing assessment, is placed in the students' cumulative folder to familiarize Kindergarten teachers with the Head Start students' progress in the program.Sanders Park offers two Head Start programs that also features a Head

Start extended day program.

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

Other

N/A

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

> Principal, Assistant Principal, Classroom Teacher, Math, and Reading Coaches, Guidance Counselor, ESE Specialist, School Psychologist, School Social Worker, Speech and Language Pathologist.
>
> The guidance counselor will facilitate/coordinate meetings with the ESE Specialist acting as the co-facilitator as needed.
>
> Case managers will be assigned to specific grade levels in order to assist in tracking and monitoring each individual student's progress.

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 twice monthly and is facilitated by the guidance counselor. The essential role of the team is to assist teachers in the classroom with students who are struggling with academic and/or behavior problems. The RtI team uses data to determine how students are progressing and what type of interventions might be needed. The team is the primary vehicle by which interventions are planned, implemented, progress monitored, and evaluated. The team has established a method for assigning, managing and tracking cases.

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?

> As an intervention support team the RtI Leadership Team reviews current interventions and results of implementations,effective data collection, progress monitoring, evaluation of interventions to determine the most appropriate instruction and resources to increase student performance.
> The RtI Leadership team meets with the School Advisory Council (SAC) and principal to help develop the School Improvement Plan.
> The development of the RtI problem solving process is as follows:
> Tier 1 :
> Teachers will collaborate with their individual grade level team to discuss core curriculum strategies or school wide behavior plans that are used for all students.This will identify those students that need additional academic and behavioral support. Interventions will be developed and reviewed (baseline and ongoing data) by the teacher and team for over a period of 6 weeks. If Tier 1 interventions are not working move to Tier 2:
> Tier 2:
> While continuing with Tier 1 strategies teachers will meet with the CPST RtI team to review documentation graphs, test scores,(DAR, F.A.I.R, benchmarks, subject area tests) discipline data (teacher referrals, teacher reports, suspension records). Based on the above data, additional interventions and targeted strategies will be developed by the team for teacher implementation. Students who continue to make insufficient progress toward age or grade level standards with Tier 2 interventions are identified and selected for Tier 3 interventions. Timeline is dependent upon intervention /selected strategy recommended at this meeting.
> Tier 3:
> At Tier 3 highly individualized strategies and more intensive level of support is implemented. If progress monitoring data indicates that the student is not closing the performance gap with Tier 2 methods, then Tier 3 strategies showed be implemented and tried. The essential change from Tier 2 to Tier 3 is intensity. That is change in frequency of intervention(i.e from three days a week to five days a week), duration of intervention (i.e. from 30 minutes per session to 45 minutes per session), method of intervention (i.e. from group counseling for problems with anger management to a Functional Behavior

(FBA) along with individual counseling, or a combination of some or all of these increase intensity of intervention delivery.
The Struggling Readers and Struggling Math Chart are used to provide interventions for students at Tier 2 and Tier 3.

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.

Sanders Park utilizes data from (data warehouse, BATs, district assessments, school-wide and grade-level assessments, discipline referrals) to collect information on student's achievement and behavior.
At Tier 1, information is examined on a school-wide,grade level, and class-wide basis to determine overall effectiveness of core curriculum and behavior management.
At Tiers 2 and 3,the district Intervention Records (with progress monitoring graphs) are the data used to examine effectiveness of Tier 2 and 3 supports.
Baseline Data:
* Benchmark Assessment Test (BAT 1 and BAT 2 for Reading, Math and Science)
* Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test(FCAT)
* District Approved Basal Reading and Math Placement Tests
* Kindergarten- FLKRS/F.A.I.R
* ESOL- IPT
Progress Monitoring:
* Mini Benchmark Assessments
* FCAT Simulations
* Grade and subject level unit/chapter tests
* Diagnostic Assessment for Reading (DAR)
End of Year:
* Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)
* Primary Reading and Math Assessments Grades One and Two
* ESOL/CELLA

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional Development for RTI will be provided in September and as needed based on the need of the students/school as determined by data. Additional training will be provided as needed on planning days and at grade level faculty meetings throughout the school year.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The LLT will be comprised of the principal, reading coach, reading department chairpersons (primary and intermediate), and ESE team leader.

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

Under the guidance of the principal and the reading coach, the team will meet at least once a month to focus on literacy initiatives, programs, data, and literacy concerns throughout the school. The Team will regularly reflect on the focus of the group to ensure that the function and mission of the team is maintained throughout the school year.
The principal and reading coach together will guide the LLT in the creation of the team's mission and focus for the year, set the agenda for the meetings, ensure that the information and agenda points from the each meeting are shared with the staff of the school, and help implement the literacy goals and objectives of the team.

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

One of the key goals of the Literacy Leadership Team will be to ensure that all school stakeholders understand and support a

culture of reading throughout the school. They will monitor the implementation of the Comprehensive Intervention Reading Programs and scientifically based reading instruction and strategies with fidelity.

The Reading Leadership Team will:
- Engage in regular, ongoing, literacy professional development
- Participate in Professional Learning Communities and Study Groups
- Use data to analyze the effectiveness of instruction and redesign instruction and resources to meet the student's instructional and intervention needs
- Participate in ongoing literacy dialogues with peers.
- Create and share activities designed to promote literacy.
- Support and participate in classroom research
- Support and participate in classroom demonstrations and modeling of research-based reading strategies.
- Mentor other teachers and present staff development.
- Reflect on practice to improve instruction

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
View uploaded file (Uploaded on 9/6/2012)

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

To ensure school readiness, the Head Start (HS) Program has implemented a new literacy, math, and science curricula in the 119 HS classrooms. The program has aligned the literacy and math standards with the K-3 national standards to improve educational outcomes. This transparent connection between curricula and child expectations has contributed to better prepare students to succeed in kindergarten. An end of the year Teaching Strategies Gold report, detailing students' ongoing assessment, is placed in the students' cumulative folder to familiarize kindergarten teachers with the HS students' progress in the program. Regarding the logistics of registering students at the elementary schools, the Head Start Program ensures a smooth transition to kindergarten by specifying the necessary enrollment processes and timelines to all families participating in the program. The HS family services support team and the HS teachers provide ongoing guidance to the HS families by indicating the students' corresponding home school, immunization requirements, and dates scheduled for Kindergarten Roundup events at those schools.

Sanders Park holds a Kindergarten Round-up and orientation meetings are held prior to the start of the school year for kindergarten students and their families to familiarize them with the school and expectations for the coming year. Informational flyers related to the Kindergarten Roundup are given to neighboring childcare centers and posted on the school's website.

*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.

*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?

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?

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 <u>High School Feedback Report</u>

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:	By June 2013, 33% (77), of students in grades 3-5 will score at achievement Level 3 in reading on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
26% (57 students) of students in grades 3-5 scored at achievement Level 3 in reading on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.	By June 2013, 33% (77), of students in grades 3-5 will score at achievement Level 3 in reading on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students need more exposure to complex text and higher order questions.	Teachers will use lexile levels to determine appropriate levels of text complexity and will use Webb's Depth of Knowledge to develop higher order questions.	Administration Reading Coach	Administration will monitor lesson plans and implementation through classroom walkthroughs.	Benchmark Assessment Test (BAT 1 & 2) Reading Assessments will be used to determine progress.
2	Students lack vocabulary necessary to comprehend a variety of text.	teacher will incorporate intensive vocabulary strategy instruction through the use of the core reading program.	Administration Reading Coach	Student progress is assessed using the Benchmark Assessment Test (BAT 1 & 2), BEEP mini assessments and other progress monitoring tools.	Benchmark Assessment Test (BAT 1 & 2), BEEP mini assessments and other progress monitoring tools will be used to determine progress.
3	Differentiating instruction to meet the needs of individual students	Teachers will participate in learning communities to discuss and plan how to differentiate instruction and curriculum so that the needs of all students can be met. Teachers K-5 will differentiate instruction using research based strategies as determined by needs from assessment data results.	Administration Reading Coach	Student progress is assessed using the Benchmark Assessment Test (BAT 1 & 2), BEEP mini assessments and other progress monitoring tools.	Benchmark Assessment Test (BAT 1 & 2) Reading Assessments will be used to determine progress.
4	Teacher knowledge and application of new standards and materials.	All teachers in grades K-2 will implement the common core standards with fidelity. Teachers in grades 3-5 will continue to implement the New Generation Standards with partial implementation of the Common Core Standards.	Administration Reading Coach Reading PLC facilitator	Observations and Classroom Walkthroughs, lesson plans	Performance Assessments, Benchmark Assessment Test (BAT 1 & 2) Reading Assessments will be used to determine progress

| | | All teachers will engage in learning communities to discuss the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards along with the revised Reading Specifications for school-wide implementation. | | | |

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:	By June 2013, 44% (4) of the students in grades 3-5 will score at Levels 4, 5 and 6 in reading on the 2013 FAA.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29% (4) of the students in grades 3-5 will scored at Levels 4, 5 and 6 in reading on the 2012 FAA.	By June 2013, 44% (4) of the students in grades 3-5 will score at Levels 4, 5 and 6 in reading on the 2013 FAA.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teacher application of the InD Cluster standards.	All Cluster teachers will utilize the InD Cluster standards as a resource to assist with setting up classrooms for student success.	ESE Specialist	Classroom Walkthroughs	FAA
2	Utilization of the Instructional Design Guide for Teachers of Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities. Implementation of the Access Points	InD Cluster teachers will use the Instructional Design Guide for Students with Cognitive Disabilities to assist with instructional planning. Refresher training will be provided to teachers on implementing the Access Points.	ESE Specialist	Classroom Walkthroughs	FAA
3	Students have difficulty with reading comprehension	Small group instruction Unique Learning System (ULS) Program activities Teachers will use picture walks to assist students in making predictions of a reading selection	Classroom Teacher ESE Specialist	Unique Learning System program Classroom Walkthroughs	FAA Unique Learning System post test
4	Students lack vocabulary and limited ability to retain vocabulary.	Teachers will introduce vocabulary with visuals and prints. Edmark Reading Program will be used to assist with vocabulary. Give students opportunities for continuous repetition and practice	Classroom Teacher ESE Specialist	Unique Learning System program	FAA Unique Learning System post test

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement

	Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:		By June 2013, 20% (46) of the students will score at or above a Level 4 on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.		

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
15% (35 students)of the students scored at or above a Level 4 on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.	By June 2013, 20% (46) of the students will score at or above a Level 4 on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students will participate in more project learning based activities.	Teachers will provide more opportunities for students to complete project based learning activities using BEEP's Advanced Academic Programs.	Administration Reading Coach	Weekly Walkthroughs and review of lesson plans.	Performance Based Assessments
2	Differentiating lessons for high performing students	Students will be exposed to a variety of complex texts (i.e., informational text, poetry, and other texts from the common core exemplars). Students in grades K-2 will take part in the Buzz About IT! Program which exposes them to informational text.	Reading Coach Administration	Classroom walkthroughs Review of lesson plans	Mini assessments BAT1 and BAT2

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:	By June 2013, 60% (6) of students will score at or above Level 7 in reading on the 2013 FAA Reading.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
57% (8 students)of students scored at or above Level 7 in reading on the 2012 FAA Reading.	By June 2013, 60% (6) of students will score at or above Level 7 in reading on the 2013 FAA 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 have difficulty with reading comprehension.	Small group instruction Unique Learning System (ULS) Program activities. Teachers will use picture walks to assist students in making predictions of a reading selection	Classroom Teacher ESE Specialist	Unique Learning System program	Unique Learning System post test FAA
	Implementation of the Instructional Design Guide and Access Points	InD Cluster teachers will use the Instructional Design Guide for Students with Cognitive	ESE Specialist	Classroom Walkthroughs	FAA Test

| | 2 | Disabilities to assist with instructional planning.

Refresher training will be provided to teachers on implementing the Access Points. | | | | |
| | 3 | Students lack vocabulary and limited ability to retain vocabulary. | Teachers will introduce vocabulary with visuals and prints.

Edmark Reading Program will be used to assist with vocabulary.

Give students opportunities for continuous repetition and practice | Classroom Teacher ESE Specialist | Unique Learning System program | FAA
Unique Learning System post test |

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	By June 2013, 75% (122) of students will make learning gains in reading on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
70% (114) of students made learning gains in reading on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.	By June 2013, 75% (122) of students will make learning gains in reading on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
		Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	1	Students not mastering concepts from the core instruction.	Differentiated Instruction will be implemented in each classroom through small groups to meet the needs of children in all subgroups Supplemental or targeted instruction and interventions for students not responding to the core instruction will be planned. Focus of instruction is determined by review of assessment data, and will include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice.	Administration Reading or Math Coach	Student progress is assessed using the Benchmark Assessment Test, chapter tests, mini assessments and other progress monitoring tools. Data Chats	Benchmark Assessment Test (BAT), BEEP mini assessments and other progress monitoring tools
	2	Students lack skills necessary to decode grade level text.	Teachers use an intensive phonics program daily to increase decoding skills.	Administration, Reading coach	CWT, lesson plans	Phonics for Reading Assessments DAR (Diagnostic Assessment of Reading)
		Students not progressing to the proficiency target.	Each quarter, teachers will meet with administration for individual data conferences	Administration Reading Coach	Monitor all assessments on a, weekly and monthly basis to determine growth.	BAT 1&2 Grade level Reading assessments

Note: The header row of the problem-solving table spans extra columns; the first column cells appear empty except for row numbers.

3		For all Level 1 and 2 students. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence-based instruction/interventions within the reading block. Students will be referred to the Collaborative Problem Solving Team (RtI) as needed for intervention strategies. Tier 2: Plan supplemental instruction/intervention for students not responding to core instruction. Focus of instruction is determined by review of data and will include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice in the area of deficiencies. Students will be referred to the Collaborative Problem Solving Team (RtI) as needed for intervention strategies. Tier 3 Determine Intensive Research based interventions which require increase in intensity and frequency.			
4	Students lack ability to effectively use comprehension strategies.	Teachers will use incorporate "Soar to Success" into their daily reading program to target effective use of comprehension strategies.	Administration Reading Coach	Classroom Walkthroughs, Lesson Plan Review	BAT Assessments, Mini Benchmark Assessments, Treasure's Weekly Assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	By June 2013, 46% (4) of students will make learning gains in reading on the 2013 FAA Reading Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41% (4) of students made learning gains in reading on the 2012 FAA Reading Assessment.	By June 2013, 46% (4) of students will make learning gains in reading on the 2013 FAA Reading Assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Students have difficulty retaining information presented.	Give students opportunities for continuous repetition and practice.	ESE Specialist	Classroom Walkthroughs	FAA Unique Learning post test

		Present instruction using multi-sensory modalities. Teachers will utilize activities from Unique Learning.			
1					

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	By June 2013, 80% (37) of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains in reading on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
77% (35) of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.	By June 2013, 80% (37) of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains in reading on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.

		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement			
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students in the lowest 25th percentile lack time in text.	Students will be engaged in various genres of text throughout their 90 minute reading block	Administration Reading Coach	Classroom Walkthroughs	Benchmark Assessment Test (BAT 1&2) Grade level assessments.
2	Students in the lowest 25th percentile lack necessary skills to decode grade level text	Teachers will provide intensive phonics instruction using "Phonics for Reading"	Administration Reading Coach	Classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans	Phonics for Reading Assessments, ORF probes
3	Students lack skills necessary to comprehend grade level text	Teachers will provide intensive instruction to help students effectively use comprehension strategies through various genres of text.	Administration Reading Coach	Classroom Walkthroughs, Lesson Plans	
4	Students below the 25th percentile not receiving enough intensive reading instruction.	All students in the lowest quartile will receive a double dose of reading instruction a daily basis and be taught using interventions based on their individual needs. Teachers will differentiate instruction for all struggling students through utilization of research based programs and strategies.	Reading Coach	Review of data/assessments, classroom walkthroughs.	Benchmark Assessment Test (BAT 1 & 2) Reading Assessments
5	Students not participating in after/before school remediation activities.	Students will be encouraged to participate in After school Camps and SES Tutoring for remediation opportunities. Incentives for participation will be provided.	Administration Reading Coach	Classroom Walkthroughs Review of data/assessments	Benchmark Assessment Test (BAT 1 & 2) Reading Assessments

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

	Reading Goal #

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	5A :	By June 2017, Sanders Park Elementary will increase the percentage of proficient students in reading by 50% and reduce the % of non-proficient student by 50%. By June 2017, 72% of students will be proficient in Reading.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	48%	53%	57%	62%	67%	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	By June 2013, the percentage of Black students not making satisfactory progress in reading on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment will decrease to 56% (122).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
60% (131) of Black students did not making satisfactory progress in reading on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment. White: N/A; Hispanic: N/A; Asian: N/A; American Indian: N/A	By June 2013, the percentage of Black students not making satisfactory progress in reading on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment will decrease to 56% (122). White: N/A; Hispanic: N/A; Asian: N/A; American Indian: N/A

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Research-based materials needed to supplement basal program to yield larger achievement gains.	Plan differentiated instruction using evidence-based instruction and interventions within the 90-minute reading block. Utilization of research based programs for those students not demonstrating proficiency.	Reading Coach	Student progress is assessed using the Benchmark Assessment Test (BAT 1 & 2), BEEP mini assessments and other progress monitoring tools	Benchmark Assessment Test (BAT 1 & 2), BEEP mini assessments and other progress monitoring tools will be used to determine progress
2	Students not performing to grade level standards	Supplemental or targeted instruction and interventions for students not responding to the core instruction will be planned. Focus of instruction is determined by review of assessment data, and will include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice.	Reading Coach	Student progress is assessed using the Benchmark Assessment Test (BAT) 1 & 2, BEEP mini assessments and other progress monitoring tools.	Benchmark Assessment Test (BAT), BEEP mini assessments and other progress monitoring tools will be used to determine progress.

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	By June 2013, the percentage of ELL students not making satisfactory progress in reading on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment will decrease to 76% (15).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
	By June 2013, the percentage of ELL students not making

80% (17) of ELL students did not make satisfactory progress in reading on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.	satisfactory progress in reading on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment will decrease to 76% (15).

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students not attaining mastery in the core instruction	ELL students will be prescribed appropriate double and triple doses of instruction using ESOL and other instructional strategies from the Struggling Readers and/or Math Chart.	Administration Curriculum Coaches	Classroom Walkthroughs will be done weekly to provide feedback to teachers on instructional practices. Review of student assessments to monitor student progress and drive instruction.	Grade level subject area assessments Benchmark Assessment Test (BAT) Alternative subject area assessments
2	Students have limited prerequisite skills and understanding of grade level vocabulary.	Students will engage in vocabulary building activities at centers. Teachers will incorporate ESOL strategies in their daily lessons.	Reading Coach	Classroom Walkthroughs Review of student assessments	Reading assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	By June 2013, the percentage of SWD students not making satisfactory progress in reading on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment will decrease to 90% (22).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
96% (23) of SWD students did not make satisfactory progress in reading on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.	By June 2013, the percentage of SWD students not making satisfactory progress in reading on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment will decrease to 90% (22).

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are not responding to core instruction	SWD will be prescribed appropriate double and triple doses of reading instruction using alternative reading strategies from the Struggling Readers Chart.	Administration Reading Coach	Classroom Walkthroughs Review of student assessments	Reading Assessments BAT Assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	By June 2013, the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading will decrease to 56% (128).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
61% (140) of Economically Disadvantaged students did not	By June 2013, the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged

make satisfactory progress in reading on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment. | students not making satisfactory progress in reading on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment will decrease to 56% (128).

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are not responding to core instruction.	Differentiated Instruction will be implemented in each K- 5 classroom through small groups to meet the needs of children in all subgroups Supplemental or targeted instruction and interventions for students not responding to the core instruction will be planned. Focus of instruction is determined by review of assessment data, and will include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice.	Administration Reading Coach	Student progress is assessed using the Benchmark Assessment Test, BEEP mini assessments and other progress monitoring tools. Data Chats	Benchmark Assessment Test (BAT), BEEP mini assessments and other progress monitoring tools
2	Students exhibit gaps in reading acquisition.	Identified students will participate in a double dose of small group reading instruction using an appropriate reading intervention K-5 students will participate in iStation, Compass Odyssey and Accelerated Reader programs.	Reading Coach and Administration	Student progress is assessed using the Benchmark Assessment Test, BEEP mini assessments and other progress monitoring tools. Data Chats	Benchmark Assessment Test (BAT), BEEP mini assessments and other progress monitoring tools

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
Book Study - " The Book Whisperer. Awakening the Inner Reader in Every Child"	K - 5	Nicole Davis	K - 5 Reading teachers	Monthly	Book discussions	Reading Coach
Using Informational Text in Reading Instruction	K - 5	Nicole Davis	K - 5 Reading teachers	September 2012	Classroom walkthroughs	Reading Coach
Implementation of Common Core Standards/ Instructional Shifts	K - 5	Nicole Davis District	K - 5 Teachers	As scheduled: August 2012 - May 2013	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Reading Coach

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Book Study - "The Book Whisperer, Awakening the Inner Reader in Every Child"	Provide a coy of the book for teachers for monthly book study.	Title 1 Professional Development Funds	$500.00
			Subtotal: $500.00
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
Data Analysis and Curriculum Development	Substitutes	Title 1 Professional Development Funds	$2,000.00
Implementing Reading Strategies; Differentiated Instruction	Substitutes to cover teachers attending trainings	Title 1 Professional Development Funds	$3,000.00
Reading Conferences.	Registration and travel expenses for teaches to attend Reading conferences.	Title 1 Professional Development Funds	$4,000.00
			Subtotal: $9,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $9,500.00

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 June 2013, 29% (8) of students taking CELLA will score proficient in Listening and Speaking.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:	
The current percentage of students proficient in Listening/Speaking is 26% (6).	
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Lack of opportunities for English Language	Students will engage in vocabulary building	Classroom Teacher	Conversations will ELL students.	CELLA Test

		Learners (ELLS) to practice language skills in order to grow while acquiring proficiency.	activities at centers. Students will be encouraged to communicate with peers.	ELL Contact		
1						

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 June 2013, 20% (9) of students taking CELLA will score proficient in reading.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

The current percent of students proficient in Reading is 17% (10)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students have limited prerequisite skills and understanding of grade level vocabulary.	Students will engage in vocabulary building activities at centers. Teachers will incorporate ESOL strategies in their daily lessons.	Reading Coach	Classroom Walkthroughs Review of student assessments	CELLA FCAT
2	Students have language challenges that impact their attaining mastery in the reading instruction	ELL students will be prescribed appropriate double and triple doses of instruction using ESOL and other instructional strategies from the Struggling Readers Chart.	Administration Reading Coach	Classroom Walkthroughs Review of student assessments to monitor student progress.	CELLA FCAT

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 June 2013, 18% (11) of students taking CELLA will score proficient in writing.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

The current percent of students proficient in Writing is 15% (9).

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	Inability to meet writing criteria according to rubrics	Teacher will use modeling and guided writing lessons.	Classroom Teacher	Practice writing prompts will be scored and shared to show how students are meeting the rubric.	Writing samples CELLA

| 2 | Language barrier and the ability to express self when writing Peer Tutor School wide writing period. | Teachers will use ELL strategies to introduce writing technique.

Students will be able to use ELL dictionaries.

Individual student conferences. | Classroom teacher | Weekly writing samples Classroom Walkthroughs | Writing Samples

CELLA |

CELLA Budget:

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	By June 2013, 39% (90) of third, fourth and fifth grade students will score at Level 3 on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Math Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
30% (70)of third, fourth and fifth grade students scored Level 3 on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Math Test.	By June 2013, 39% (90) of third, fourth and fifth grade students will score at Level 3 on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Math Test.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="6" align="center">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>Anticipated Barrier</td><td>Strategy</td><td>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</td><td>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</td><td>Evaluation Tool</td></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Teacher knowledge and application of new standards and materials.</td><td>Weekly Professional learning communities with focus of implementation of the Next Generation Standards</td><td>Administration Math Coach</td><td>Classroom Walkthroughs will be used to provide feedback on effective implementation. Ongoing Data Chats as assessments are reviewed.</td><td>Go Math Assessments (Chapter, Big Idea, mini-benchmarks) BAT Assessments</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>Teachers new to the subject area or grade level may impact their ability to implement the Math Series.</td><td>The District developed Instructional Focus Calendar will be followed by all K-5 teachers.

Math Training for all instructional staff members aimed at the Next Generation and Common Core Standards.</td><td>Administration Math Coach</td><td>Classroom Walkthroughs will be used to provide feedback on effective implementation.</td><td>Go Math Assessments (chapter, Big Idea, minis) BAT assessments</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>Students lacking prerequisite math skills</td><td>Differentiated Instruction will be implemented in each classroom through small groups to meet the needs of children.

Additional time has been built into the math block to provide additional practice to master prerequisite skills.

Increase the use of manipulatives and hands-on activities to reinforce mathematical concepts in both large and small groups.</td><td>Administration Math Coach</td><td>Review of assessments to determine students level of mastery and reorganization of groups. Data Chats to discuss and monitor student progress.</td><td>Go Math Assessments BAT Assessments</td></tr>
</table>

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.	By June 2013, 60% (6) of students will score at Levels 4, 5

	Mathematics Goal #1b:			and 6 in Math on the 2013 FAA Math Assessment.	

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
June 2012, 57% (8)students scored at Level 4,5, and 6 in Math on the 2012 FAA Assessment.	By June 2013, 60% (6) of students will score at Levels 4, 5 and 6 in Math on the 2013 FAA Math Assessment.

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teacher application of the InD Cluster standards.	All Cluster teachers will utilize the InD Cluster standards as a resource to assist with setting up classrooms for student success.	ESE Specialist	Classroom Walkthroughs	FAA
2	Utilization of the Instructional Design Guide for Teachers of Students with Significant Cognitive Disabilities. Implementation of the Access Points	InD Cluster teachers will use the Instructional Design Guide for Students with Cognitive Disabilities to assist with instructional planning. Refresher training will be provided to teachers on implementing the Access Points.	ESE Specialist	Classroom Walkthroughs	FAA
3	Students have difficulty retaining information presented and limited ability to stay focused	Teachers will give students opportunities for continuous repetition and practice. Use manipulatives, visuals, and assistive technology to teach math concepts. Touch Math and activities from Unique Learning System will be used.	ESE Specialist Classroom Teacher	Classroom walkthrouhgs Touch Math and Moving with Math monthly assessments.	FAA Touch Math Unique Learning post test
4	Lack of pre-requisite skills due to student abilities and performing more than 2 years below grade level.	Teachers will use manipulatives, visuals, and assistive technology to teach math concepts. Unique Learning and Touch Math will be used.	Classroom Teacher ESE Specialist	Classroom walkthroughs. Assessments - Touch Math; Moving with Math; Unique Learning	FAA Touch Math Moving with Math Unique Learning post test.

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	By June 2013, 25% (57) of third, fourth, and fifth grade students will score at or above Level 4 on the 2013 FCAT Math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
21% (48)of students in third, fourth and fifth grade score at or above Level 4 on the 2012 FCAT Math.	By June 2013, 25% (57) of third, fourth, and fifth grade students will score at or above Level 4 in math on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Math.

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students not being challenged and exposed to higher level and thinking materials.	Students scoring above grade level standards will be challenged utilizing the Go Math Enriched book.	Administration Math Coach	Assessment data will reviewed to monitor student progress.	BAT Assessments Go Math Assessments
2	Lack of enrichment opportunities	PEP lessons will be used to provide enrichment opportunities to students scoring above grade level.	Math Coach	Classroom walkthroughs will be used to monitor utilization of PEP lessons and projects.	BAT Assessments Go Math Assessments (Chapter, PEP projects)

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:	By June 2013, 39% (4) of third, fourth, and fifth grade students will score at or above Achievement Level 7 in math on the 2013 FAA Math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
36% (5) of third, fourth, and fifth grade students scored at or above Achievement Level 7 in math on the 2012 FAA Math.	By June 2013, 39% (4) of third, fourth, and fifth grade students will score at or above Achievement Level 7 in math on the 2013 FAA 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	Implementation of the Instructional Design Guide and Access Points	InD Cluster teachers will use the Instructional Design Guide for Students with Cognitive Disabilities to assist with instructional planning. Refresher training will be provided to teachers on implementing the Access Points.	ESE Specialist	Classroom Walkthroughs	FAA Test
2	Students have difficulty retaining information presented and limited ability to stay focused	Teachers will give students opportunities for continuous repetition and practice. Use manipulatives, visuals, and assistive technology to teach math concepts. Touch Math and activities from Unique Learning System will be used.	ESE Specialist Classroom Teacher	Unique Learning monthly assessment.	FAA
3	Lack of pre-requisite skills due to student abilities and performing more than 2 years below grade level.	Teachers will use manipulatives, visuals, and assistive technology to teach math concepts. Unique Learning and Touch Math will be used.	Classroom Teacher ESE Specialist	Assessments: - Unique Learning; Moving with Math; Touch Math	FAA Unique Learning post test. Moving with Math Touch Math

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

of improvement for the following group:

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	By June 2013, 63% (103) of the students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
58% (95) of the students in grades 3-5 made learning gains in mathematics on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment.	By June 2013, 63% (103) of the students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment.

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students not mastering concepts from the core instruction.	Differentiated Instruction will be implemented in each classroom through small groups to meet the needs of children in all subgroups Supplemental or targeted instruction and interventions for students not responding to the core instruction will be planned. Focus of instruction is determined by review of assessment data, and will include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice.	Administration Reading or Math Coach	Student progress is assessed using the Benchmark Assessment Test, chapter tests, mini assessments and other progress monitoring tools. Data Chats	Benchmark Assessment Test (BAT), BEEP mini assessments and other progress monitoring tools
2	Effectively targeting students' specific areas of weakness so that the needs of all students can be met.	The core instructional needs of each student will be determined by reviewing FCAT, BAT, and other assessments. Plan differentiated instruction using evidence based instruction and interventions within math block	Math Coach	Student progress is assessed using the Benchmark Assessment Test (BAT) 1 & 2, Go Math assessments and other progress monitoring tools.	BAT Assessments Go Math Assessments (Chapter, Big Idea, Mid-chapter)
	Students not progressing to the proficiency target.	Daily in-class remediation will occur through materials included with the Go Math Series and materials on the Struggling Math Chart Plan differentiated instruction using evidence-based instruction/interventions within the math block. Students will be referred to the Collaborative Problem Solving Team (RtI) as needed for intervention strategies. Tier 2: Plan supplemental	Administration Math Coach Team Leader	Classroom Walkthroughs, Data Chats, Team Planning	BAT Assessments Go Math Assessments

| 3 | instruction/intervention for students not responding to core instruction. Focus of instruction is determined by review of data and will include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice in the area of deficiencies. Students will be referred to the Collaborative Problem Solving Team (RtI) as needed for intervention strategies. Tier 3 Determine Intensive Research based interventions which require increase in intensity and frequency. | | | | |

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:	By June 2013, 45% (5) of the students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains on the 2013 FAA Mathematics Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
41% (4)of the students in grades 3-5 make learning gains on the 2012 FAA Mathematics Assessment.	By June 2013, 45% (5) of the students in grades 3-5 will make learning gains on the 2013 FAA Mathematics Assessment.

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students have difficulty retaining information presented.	Give students opportunities for continuous repetition and practice. Present instruction using multi-sensory modalities. Teachers will utilize activities from Unique Learning.	ESE Specialist	Classroom Walkthroughs	FAA Unique Learning post test

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	By June 2013, 74% (36) of the students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
69% (33) of our students in the Lowest 25% made learning gains on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics Assessment.	By June 2013, 74% (36) of the students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Mathematics

		Assessment.			

		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement			

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students not participating in before/after school remediation opportunities	Students will be encouraged to participate in After school Camps and SES Tutoring for remediation opportunities. Incentives for participation will be provided.	Administration Math Coach SES Facilitator	Attendance Log	BAT, Go Math assessments and other progress monitoring tools will be used to determine progress
2	Students not having all of the prerequisite math skills needed for concept mastery	Plan supplemental or targeted instruction/ intervention using materials from the struggling math chart for students not responding to the core instruction. Focus of instruction is determined by review of assessment data, and will include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice.	Administration Math Coach	Student progress is assessed using the BAT, Go Math assessments and other progress monitoring tools	BAT, Go Math assessments and other progress monitoring tools will be used to determine progress
3	Lack of reading skills necessary for comprehension of word problems	Teachers will emphasize math vocabulary through utilizing Math word walls. Teachers will model word problems using think alouds and other comprehension strategies.	Administration Math Coach	Classroom walkthroughs Data Chats	BAT Mini Benchmark Assessment Tests 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 #
	By June 2017, Sanders Park Elementary will increase their math proficiency score by 50% and reduce their achievement gap by 50%. By June 2017, 79% of students will be proficient in Math. 5A :

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	61%	64%	68%	71%	75%	

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:	By June 2013, the percentage of students not making satisfactory progress on the FCAT 2.0 Math Assessment will decrease to 45% (98).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
49% (107)of Black students did not make satisfactory progress on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Math Assessment.	By June 2013, the percentage of Black students not making satisfactory progress on the FCAT 2.0 Math Assessment will decrease to 45% (98). White: N/A Hispanic: N/A Asian: N/A American Indian: N/A
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lacking prerequisite skills necessary for grade level.	Differentiated Instruction will be implemented in each classroom through small groups to meet the needs of children. Increase the use of manipulatives and hands-on activities to reinforce mathematical concepts in both large and small groups.	Administration Math Coach	Classroom Walkthroughs will be used to provide feedback on instructional practices. Review of assessments and Data Chats to modify instruction and target student needs.	Go Math Assessments BAT Assessments
2	Teachers not utilizing the IFC to effectively pace lessons	The District developed Instructional Focus Calendar will be followed by all K-5 teachers. Lesson pacing will be discussed and monitored at weekly PLC meetings.	Administration Math Coach	Classroom Walkthroughs to ensure that the IFC is being followed. PLC Meetings	Go Math Assessments BAT assessments

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	By June 2013, the percentage of ELL students not making satisfactory progress on the FCAT 2.0 Math Assessment will decrease to 60% (12).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
65% (13) of ELL students did not make satisfactory progress on the FCAT 2.0 Math Assessment.	By June 2013, the percentage of ELL students not making satisfactory progress on the FCAT 2.0 Math Assessment will decrease to 60% (12).

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students not attaining mastery in the core instruction	ELL students will be prescribed appropriate double and triple doses of instruction using ESOL and other instructional strategies from the Struggling Readers and/or Math Chart.	Administration Curriculum Coaches	Classroom Walkthroughs will be done weekly to provide feedback to teachers on instructional practices. Review of student assessments to monitor student progress and drive instruction.	Grade level subject area assessments Benchmark Assessment Test (BAT) Alternative subject area assessments
2	Students (K-5) have limited prior knowledge of math concepts.	Students (K-5) will be instructed utilizing ESOL strategies.	Math Coach	Assessments Data Chats	Go Math Assessments Benchmark Assessment Test
3	Deficiency in reading skills necessary for comprehension of word problems.	Teachers will emphasize math vocabulary through modeling. Instruction and evidence of word walls for students to utilize during practice and application of math skills	Administration Math Coach	Classroom walkthroughs Data Chats	Mini Benchmark Assessment Tests GO Math Assessments

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	By June 2013, the percentage of SWD students not making satisfactory progress in math on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Math Assessment will decrease to 83% (20).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
88% (21)of SWD students did not make satisfactory progress in math on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Math Assessment.	By June 2013, the percentage of SWD students not making satisfactory progress in math on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Math Assessment will decrease to 83% (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
1	Students are not meeting grade level expectations	Closely monitor the progress of the SWD; revise instruction and intervention groups as indicated by student progress. SWD students will be instructed according to the math instructional focus calendar developed by the math coach and teachers in conjunction with district guidelines Diagnostic assessment such as Key Math will be used to determine appropriate intervention needs.	Administration Math Coach ESE Teacher	Classroom Walkthroughs Data Chats	Student progress on math assessments

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	By June 2013, the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in math on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Math Assessment will decrease to 46% (105).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (113) of Economically Disadvantaged students did not make satisfactory progress in math on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Math Assessment.	By June 2013, the percentage of Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in math on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Math Assessment will decrease to 46% (105).

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 ability to differentiate instruction to meet the needs of all students.	At weekly PLC meetings, teachers will discuss how to differentiate instruction and learn strategies to better meet the needs of each child Differentiated Instruction will be implemented in each K- 5 classroom	Math Coach Team Leader	Classroom Walkthroughs Data Chats Team Planning	BAT, Go Math assessment and other progress monitoring tools

			through small groups to meet the needs of children in all subgroups. Increase the use of manipulatives and hands-on activities to reinforce math concepts.			
2		Students not meeting proficiency targets	Daily in-class remediation will occur through materials included with the Go Math Series and materials on the Struggling Math Chart Plan differentiated instruction using evidence-based instruction/interventions within the math block. Students will be referred to the Collaborative Problem Solving Team (RtI) as needed for intervention strategies. Tier 2: Plan supplemental instruction/intervention for students not responding to core instruction. Focus of instruction is determined by review of data and will include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice in the area of deficiencies. Students will be referred to the Collaborative Problem Solving Team (RtI) as needed for intervention strategies. Tier 3 Determine Intensive Research based interventions which require increase in intensity and frequency.	Administration Math Coach Team Leader	Classroom Walkthroughs Ongoing Data Chats as assessments are reviewed	BAT, Go Math assessment and other progress monitoring tools

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
Common Core Institute	Math	DISTRICT	K - 2	July 2012 - October 2012	Walkthroughs Data Chats	Math Coach Administration
Common Core Standards	Math	District	K - 5	Quarterly	Walkthroughs	Math Coach Administration
PLC - "Best					Agenda and	

| Practices Math" and Book Study | Math | Math Coach PLC Facilitator | Math Teachers K - 5 | Weekly beginning Aug. 2012 | Minutes of PLC meetings. Visits to PLC Meetings | Administration Math Coach |

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Book Study - "Common Core Mathematics in a PLC at Work"	Materials for book study.	Title 1 Professional Development	$500.00
			Subtotal: $500.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
First in Math	Integrated Learning System to assist students with math concepts.	Accountability Funds	$1,100.00
			Subtotal: $1,100.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Common Core Standards; Data Analysis; Curriculum Development; Math Trainings	Substitute teachers	Title 1 Professional Development Funds	$5,000.00
			Subtotal: $5,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $6,600.00

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:	By June 2013, 32% (20) of the 5th grade students will score at Level 3 on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28% (18) of the 5th grade students scored at Level 3 on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment.	By June 2013, 32% (20) of the 5th grade students will score at Level 3 on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment.
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Students lacking the foundation skills for mastery of science	Students will gain content knowledge through hands on	Administration CurriculumCoach	Weekly classroom walkthroughs Data Chats and Review	Benchmark Assessments; Science Journals

		concepts	activities using the the Florida Science Fusion and Hands on Science kits. Fifth grade will be departmentalized and students will receive 60 minutes of science instruction daily. Students in grades K-4 will have a minimum of 30minutes of instruction daily. Students will be exposed to content through supplemental materials such as Sciencesarus and FCAT Coach for Science Students will utilize science journals to reinforce science concepts.		of journals will occur twice monthly.	Performance Assessments
	2	Teacher's lack of knowledge regarding the Next Generation Science Standards. Teachers ability to implement the Science series with revised the benchmarks	The District developed Instructional Focus Calendar will be followed by all K-5 teachers. Science Training for all instructional staff members aimed at the Next Generation Standards and implementation of the Science series. Professional learning community meetings focusing on the implementation of the standards. Teachers will attend Professional Development for Science.	Administration Curriculum Coach	Classroom Walkthroughs will be used to provide feedback and assistance on instructional practices. Lesson Plan Book review Inservice Logs	Lesson and Unit assessments.

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b:	By June 2013, 60% (3) students who take the 2013 FAA Science test will score a level 4,5 or 6.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (2) of the students who took the 2012 FAA Science test scored a level 4,5 or 6.	By June 2013, 60% (3) students who take the 2013 FAA Science test will score a level 4,5 or 6.

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

	Students have limited understanding and background knowledge of the Scientific process and concepts.	Provide real objects for tactile exploration and recognition of basic concepts during science activities	ESE Specialist Classroom teacher	Classroom walkthroughs	FAA
1					

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	By June 2013, 17% (11) of fifth grade students will score at or above Level 4 on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
13% (8)of fifth grade students scored at or above Level 4 on the 2012 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment.	By June 2013, 17% (11) of fifth grade students will score at or above Level 4 on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 Science Assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students are deficient in higher order science thinking and processing skills.	Students will be exposed to higher order thinking and questioning through center activities and hands-on experiments. Fifth grade will be departmentalized and students will receive 60minutes of science instruction daily.	Administration Science Coach	Lesson Plans Weekly classroom walkthroughs Monthly Data Chats	Science BAT and Mini BAT's, Science Journals, Performance Assessments

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:	By June 2013, 60% (3) of students taking the 2103 FAA Science will score at or above Level 7.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50% (2) of students scored at or above Level 7 on the 2012 FAA Science Assessment.	By June 2013, 60% (3) of students taking the 2103 FAA Science will score at or above Level 7.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Students have limited understanding and	Provide real objects for tactile exploration and	ESE Specialist Classroom	Classroom Walkthroughs	FAA

	1	background knowledge of the Scientific process and concepts.	recognition of basic concepts during science activities	Teacher		

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
Using Science Journals	K-5	District	K-5 teachers	Sept. 2012 - May 2013	Classroom Walkthroughs	Science Coach Administration
Science Instructional Materials	K-5	District	K-5 teachers	Sept. 2012 - May 2013	Classroom walkthroughs	Science Coach Administration

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Materials and supplies for science kits	Science kits utilize consumable materials that need to be replaced annually	General Budget	$400.00
Science Boot Camp	Supplemental science program to assist with science instruction.	General Budget	$2,500.00
			Subtotal: $2,900.00
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
Implementing Science Boot Camp	Instructional teacher training.	Title 1 Professional Development Funds.	$1,000.00
Curriculum Development and Data Analysis	Substitutes to provide coverage for teachers to attend trainings.	Title 1 Professional Development Funds	$2,000.00
			Subtotal: $3,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $5,900.00

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:	By June 2013, 70% (42) of fourth grade students will score at Level 3.0 and higher in writing on the 2013 FCAT Writes.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
63% (50) of fourth grade students scored at Level 3.0 and higher in writing on the 2012 FCAT Writes.	By June 2013, 70% (42) of fourth grade students will score at Level 3.0 and higher in writing on the 2013 FCAT Writes.

| | 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 unfamiliarity with responding to prompts and lack of writing experiences	Students in fourth grade will be instructed during a daily 60 minute writing block on how to read, understand, and respond to narrative and expository prompts. The FLDOE anchor papers will be used as a teaching tool to promote understanding of the writing components. Small group instruction to review strategies and provide opportunities to edit, revise and publish writing samples.	Administration Reading Coach Classroom teacher	Walkthroughs will take place on a weekly basis. Administration and/or support staff will meet with teachers to provide feedback based on walkthrough observations. Monthly writing prompts will be analyzed for effectiveness of program.	The 6 Trait rubric will be used for ongoing progress monitoring and the Florida Writes rubric will be used for baseline and mid year progress monitoring.
2	Students lack necessary grammar skills	Teacher will add a grammar component to her 60 minute writing block.	Reading Coach Team Leader	Monthly writing prompts will be scored using the state of Florida's scoring rubric.	Monthly writing prompt data and student portfolios will be used to evaluate effectiveness of the writing program and student progress
3	Students not progressing or performing at grade level standards.	Small group instruction to review strategies and provide instruction in targeted areas.	Administration Reading Coach	Monthly writing prompts will be analyzed for effectiveness of program.	Monthly Writing Samples Student Portfolios

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:	Increase the percentage of students scoring at 4 or higher in writing on the 2013 FAA.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
71% (5)	75% (6)

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

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students have limited exposure to writing.	Engage students in using picture cards to create sentences and paragraphs on a topic. Students will use journals to document writing experiences.	Classroom teacher ESE Specialist	Review of journals.	FAA

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Writing Instruction	3-5	District	Teachers grades 3-5	As offered throughout the school year	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Reading Coach
Writing Instruction for Common Core	K-2	District	Teachers grades K-2	As offered throughout the school year	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration Reading Coach

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Writing Instruction	Substitutes for teachers to attend trainings.	Title 1 Professional Development Funds	$1,000.00
			Subtotal: $1,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $1,000.00

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

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

1. Attendance	
Attendance Goal #1:	To increase the attendance rate from 94% to 96% for the 2012-2013 school year. That makes a 2% increase.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
Attendance rate was 94.6%.	Students attendance rate will increase by 2%: 96%
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
In 2011-2012, there were 96 students with excessive absences.	For the 2012-2013 school year, 90 students will have excessive absences (A decrease of 9%).
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
In 2011-2012, there were 144 students with excessive tardies.	For the 2012-2013 school year, 131 students will have excessive tardies (A decrease of 9%).

	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' Tardiness	Parent Link call, staff telephone call, letter to parent or parent conference with administrator	Designated attendance staff person Assistant Principal	Attendance Record Review	Compared to previous school year: Reduction in number of days tardy and a reduction in number of tardy
2	Chronic accumulation of excused absences	Request acceptable written documentation to excuse absences after the 5th absence. Family assessment	Administrator Designated attendance staff and school social worker	Review attendance record	Decrease in number of chronic excused absences. Decrease in number of students with chronic excused absences
3	Increase in absences on days before a holiday and/or planning day	Reward and recognize good attendance. Immediately address attendance problem with parent The BTIP process will be utilized to address excessive absences with parents.	Classroom teacher Community Liaison Administrator	Attendance record review	Less incidences of absence on days immediately preceding a planned day off.

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Attendance	K-5	Guidance Counselor	School-wide	We will meet once a month and discuss attendance, as part of grade chair meetings.	Monitor attendance data.	Administration and Guidance Counselor
Attendance Symposium Training Full Review of Attendance Policy & Procedural Manual	K-5	District & Student Services Staff	Administrators IMT/Attendance clerk	August 2012	Ongoing review of attendance processes to ensure implementation	Administration

Attendance Budget:

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

End of Attendance Goal(s)

Suspension Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of suspension data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Suspension Suspension Goal #1:	Goal for 2012-2013 is to decrease the number of suspensions by 10%
2012 Total Number of In–School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
42 In-School Suspensions	38 In-School Suspensions

2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
24 students	21 students
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
20 Out of School Suspensions	18 Out of School Suspensions
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
15 students	12 students

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Fidelity of Implementation and Students not familiar with school-wide expectations	Provide Classroom Management Training to staff All students will attend an assembly during the first week of school to orient them of the school-wide expectations. Students will be reminded of the expectations on an ongoing basis by the classroom teacher.	Administrator	Classroom Walkthroughs Student referrals	Reduction in disciplinary referrals
2	Referrals increase after FCAT as student motivation drops and teachers become less tolerant	Teachers to review classroom rules, expectations and procedures daily. Implementation of a Reward/Incentive program	Administrators, Team Leader	Classroom Walkthrough Review of discipline referrals	Reduction in disciplinary referrals
3	High numbers of referrals and/or suspensions Students experiencing emotional/behavioral concerns.	Identify students most frequently referred and/or suspended and students experiencing behavioral concerns will be referred to the CPST Team. Interventions will be generated to allow for student success. Identify teachers who submit most disciplinary referrals Provide classroom management training (CHAMPs) Provide coaching/mentoring opportunities Adhere to referral	Administration CORE Behavior Team	Review of discipline referrals CPST/RTI notes and supporting documentation	Reduction in disciplinary referrals Reduction in student suspensions Increase in positive interactions with students

		procedures outlined in Schoolwide Behavior Plan			

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
Classroom Management & Rules/Expectations	K-5	Administration	School-wide training; follow-up through monthly Team Leader meetings	Monthly	Walk-throughs to ensure implementation of strategies	Administrators/Team Leaders

Suspension Budget:

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00

Technology

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00

Professional Development

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00

Other

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $0.00

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

1. Parent Involvement	
Parent Involvement Goal #1:	By June 2013, the percentage of parents participating in

Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.		school wide and Title 1 activities will increase by 10%.	
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:		2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:	
25% (75)		35% (105)	

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

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Parent Literacy Workshops	Instructional materials, Supplies, and Refreshments	Title 1 Parent Funds	$3,008.00
Parent Resource Center	Brochures and magazines. Subscription services for parenting magazines.	Title 1 Parent Funds	$300.00
			Subtotal: $3,308.00
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
Annual Parent Seminar	Registration Fees.	Title 1 Parent Funds	$160.00
			Subtotal: $160.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00

	Subtotal: $0.00
	Grand Total: $3,468.00

End of Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of familiarity with STEM	Math PLC will provide teachers with an understanding of STEM	Math Coach	Classroom walkthroughs	Projects
2	Lack of comfort with the implementation of STEM lessons.	Provide math instructors with STEM lessons, materials and time to practice the lesson	Math Coach	Classroom Walkthroughs	Projects

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

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

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Book Study - "The Book Whisperer, Awakening the Inner Reader in Every Child"	Provide a coy of the book for teachers for monthly book study.	Title 1 Professional Development Funds	$500.00
Mathematics	Book Study - "Common Core Mathematics in a PLC at Work"	Materials for book study.	Title 1 Professional Development	$500.00
Science	Materials and supplies for science kits	Science kits utilize consumable materials that need to be replaced annually	General Budget	$400.00
Science	Science Boot Camp	Supplemental science program to assist with science instruction.	General Budget	$2,500.00
Attendance	N/A			$0.00
Parent Involvement	Parent Literacy Workshops	Instructional materials, Supplies, and Refreshments	Title 1 Parent Funds	$3,008.00
Parent Involvement	Parent Resource Center	Brochures and magazines. Subscription services for parenting magazines.	Title 1 Parent Funds	$300.00
				Subtotal: $7,208.00

Technology

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Mathematics	First in Math	Integrated Learning System to assist students with math concepts.	Accountability Funds	$1,100.00
				Subtotal: $1,100.00

Professional Development

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Data Analysis and Curriculum Development	Substitutes	Title 1 Professional Development Funds	$2,000.00
Reading	Implementing Reading Strategies; Differentiated Instruction	Substitutes to cover teachers attending trainings	Title 1 Professional Development Funds	$3,000.00
Reading	Reading Conferences.	Registration and travel expenses for teaches to attend Reading conferences.	Title 1 Professional Development Funds	$4,000.00
Mathematics	Common Core Standards; Data Analysis; Curriculum Development; Math Trainings	Substitute teachers	Title 1 Professional Development Funds	$5,000.00
Science	Implementing Science Boot Camp	Instructional teacher training.	Title 1 Professional Development Funds.	$1,000.00
Science	Curriculum Development and Data Analysis	Substitutes to provide coverage for teachers to attend trainings.	Title 1 Professional Development Funds	$2,000.00
Writing	Writing Instruction	Substitutes for teachers to attend trainings.	Title 1 Professional Development Funds	$1,000.00
Parent Involvement	Annual Parent Seminar	Registration Fees.	Title 1 Parent Funds	$160.00
				Subtotal: $18,160.00

Other

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
				Subtotal: $0.00
				Grand Total: $26,468.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

○ Priority	○ Focus	○ Prevent	○ NA

Are you a reward school: ○ Yes ○ No

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

View uploaded file (Uploaded on 10/19/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

The majority of the SAC members are not employed by the school district. The SAC is composed of the principal and an appropriately balanced number of teachers, education support employees, students (for middle and high school only), parents, and other business and community citizens who are representative of the ethnic, racial, and economic community served by the school. Please verify the statement above by selecting "Yes" or "No" below.

✓ Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
Funds will be used to provide remediation and enrichment activities based on student needs.	$2,590.00

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

The SAC will monitor implementation of the School Improvement Plan. SAC meets on a monthly basis.

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Broward School District
SANDERS PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	56%	71%	94%	31%	252	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	61%	69%			130	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?	58% (YES)	67% (YES)			125	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					507	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Broward School District
SANDERS PARK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	53%	71%	88%	20%	232	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	61%	68%			129	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	68% (YES)	81% (YES)			149	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					510	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested