FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM
2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: DRIFTWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Broward

Principal: Gladys Fernandez-Donovan

SAC Chair: Gislaine Bennett and Susan Walker

Superintendent: Robert Runcie

Date of School Board Approval: December 4, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/19/2012

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)
					The school has been awarded a B. Our school has made AYP 4 out of the past 8 years. Principal of Driftwood Elementary School – 2012,Grade B: Reading:52% Math:55% Writing:70% Science:34% AYP: 2011, Grade A: Reading: 74% Math: 78% Writing: 83% Science: 45% AYP: The White subgroup made AYP in both reading and math. The Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, & Students with Disabilities subgroups did not make AYP in Reading or Math.

Principal	Gladys Donovan	Guidance & Counseling PK-12, School Leadership	17	20	2010, Grade A: Reading: 74% Math: 81% Writing: 81% Science: 41% AYP: The white, black, & Economically Disadvantaged subgroups did not make AYP in Reading. Black students did not make AYP in Math. 2009, Grade A Reading: 75% Math: 82% Writing: 87% Science: 25% AYP: School earned AYP 2008, Grade A Reading: 72% Math: 82% Writing: 87% Science: 43% AYP: The Black subgroup did not make AYP in Math. The Students with disabilities did not make AYP in Reading.
Assis Principal	Lourdes Cruz	Elementary Education 1-6, Reading Education K-12, Educational Leadership	7	4	The school was awarded a B. AYP was achieved in 2009 but not in 2010,2011 or 2012. Assistant Principal of Driftwood Elementary School – 2012, Grade B: Reading:52% Math:55% Writing:70% Science:34% AYP: 2011, Grade A Reading:74% Math:78% Writing:83% Science:45% AYP: The White subgroup made AYP in both reading and math. The Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, & Students with Disabilities subgroups did not make AYP in Reading or Math. 2010, Grade A: Reading: 74% Math: 81% Writing: 81% Science: 41% AYP: The white, black, & Economically Disadvantaged subgroups did not make AYP in Reading. Black students did not make AYP in Math. 2009, Grade A Reading: 75% Math: 82% Writing: 87% Science: 25% AYP: School earned AYP 2008, Grade A Reading: 72% Math: 82% Writing: 87% Science: 43% AYP: The Black subgroup did not make AYP in Math. The Students with disabilities did not make AYP in Reading.

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Gislaine Petigny-Bennett	Varying Exceptionalities K-12, Elem Education 1-6, Reading Endorsement	15	3	The school received a B for the 2011-2012 school year. Reading Coach at Driftwood Elementary School – 2012, Grade B: Reading: 52% Math: 55% Writing: 70% Science: 34% AYP: 2011, Grade A: Reading: 74% Math: 78% Writing: 83% Science: 45% AYP: The White subgroup made AYP in both reading and math. The Black, Hispanic, Economically Disadvantaged, & Students with Disabilities subgroups did not make AYP in Reading or Math. 2010, Grade A: Reading: 74% Math: 81% Writing: 81% Science: 41% AYP: The white, black, & Economically Disadvantaged subgroups did not make AYP in Reading. Black students did not make AYP in Math.

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

Describe the school-based strategies that will be used to recruit and retain high quality, effective teachers to the school.

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	1. Partnering of new teachers with Veteran teachers.	NESS Liaison	June 10, 2013	
2	2. Partnering of new teachers to a grade level with an experienced teacher on that grade level.	Leadership Team	June 10, 2013	
3	3. NESS Induction & Orientation	NESS Liaison	June 10, 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
One	Joseph Boylan will take the Elementary Subject Area Exam.

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
37	2.7%(1)	8.1%(3)	48.6%(18)	37.8%(14)	45.9%(17)	97.3%(36)	5.4%(2)	16.2%(6)	89.2%(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
Clare Uribe	Tara Biesel and Nicole Guffey	Mrs. Biesel is new to kindergarten and will partner with Mrs. Uribe. Miss Guffey is new to the Head Start Program and will also partner with Mrs. Uribe.	Mentor and mentees will meet on a weekly basis to plan and discuss researched based strategies to be utilized across all areas of the curriculum. In addition, release time will be provided for the mentor to observe, coach, and provide feedback to the mentees.
Sheryl Munoz	Joyce Hill	Mrs.Hill is new to kindergarten and will partner with Mrs. Munoz	Mentor and mentee will meet on a weekly basis to plan and discuss researched based strategies to be utilized across all areas of the curriculum. In addition, release time will be provided for the mentor to observe, coach, and provide feedback to the mentee.
Eileen Quinones	Ligia Estrada	Mrs. Estrada is new to Kindergarten and will partner with Mrs. Quinones.	Mentor and mentee will meet on a weekly basis to plan and discuss researched based strategies to be utilized across all areas of the curriculum. In addition, release time will be provided for the mentor to observe, coach, and provide feedback to the mentee.
Teresa Akel	Ana Alonso	Ms. Alonso is new to fifth grade and will partner with Mrs. Akel	Mentor and mentee will meet on a weekly basis to plan and discuss researched based strategies to be utilized across all areas of the curriculum. In addition, release time will be provided for the mentor to observe, coach, and provide feedback to the mentee.
Ronnie Leff	Joseph Boylan	Mr. Boylan are new to our ESE department and will partner with Ms. Leff.	Mentor and mentee will meet on a weekly basis to plan and discuss researched based strategies to be utilized across all areas of the curriculum. In addition, release time will be provided for the mentor to observe, coach, and provide feedback to the mentee.
Susan Walker	Lynn Fortaleza	Ms. Fortaleza is new to third grade and will partner with Ms. Walker.	Mentor and mentee will meet on a weekly basis to plan and discuss researched based strategies to be utilized across all areas of the curriculum. In addition, release time will be provided for the mentor to observe, coach, and provide feedback to the mentee.

Dianne Rosati	Joseph Lamonica	Mr. Lamonica is new to second grade and will partner with Ms. Rosati.	Mentor and mentee will meet on a weekly basis to plan and discuss researched based strategies to be utilized across all areas of the curriculum. In addition, release time will be provided for the mentor to observe, coach, and provide feedback to the mentee.

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

Please describe how federal, state, and local services and programs will be coordinated and integrated in the school. Include other Title programs, Migrant and Homeless, Supplemental Academic Instruction funds, as well as violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, career and technical education, and/or job training, as applicable.

Title I, Part A

Title I funds provided 3.22 teachers to assist students, particularly low performing students. Staff Development funds are used to develop a comprehensive professional training program to improve delivery of instruction through a variety of workshops designed to move teachers to mastery and improve student achievement. Parental Involvement Funds are utilized to fund quarterly academic parent nights that provide parents with new skills to support student learning at home. Through the use of our school agendas provided by Title 1 monies we are 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 supported with district Title I funds.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

na

Title I, Part D

na

Title II

na

Title III

na

Title X- Homeless

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

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

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

Violence Prevention Programs

Our school builds a violence prevention culture through classroom instruction in anger management, conflict resolution bullying prevention, and the Broward County adopted character traits. In addition to the classroom instruction, all teachers and staff members received training on the Anti-Bully policy and CHAMPS I training.

Nutrition Programs

Nutritional programs and health education are an integral part of our curriculum, specifically through the Physical Educational curriculum. The Physical Education curriculum is implementing a new program called Healthy Generation.

Housing Programs

na

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.

Adult Education

na

Career and Technical Education

na

Job Training

na

Other

na

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Linda Justin (Guidance Counselor/Meeting Coordinator/Facilitator, Case Manager grades 3-5), Gislaine Petigny Bennett (Reading Coach/Case Manager K-2), Ronnie Leff (ESE Specialist/Case Manager Behavior), Lourdes Cruz (Assistant Principal), Gladys Donovan (Principal) (School Psychologist), Heidy Carmel(School Social Worker). The school's Leadership Team will include additional personnel as resources to the team, based on specific problems or concerns as warranted, such as:
• School reading, math, science, and behavior specialists
• Member of advisory group
• Community stakeholders

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?

RTI is an extension of the school's Leadership Team, strategically integrated in order to support the administration through a process of problem solving issues and concerns as they arise through an ongoing, systematic examination of available data with the goal of impacting student achievement, school safety, school culture, literacy, attendance, student social/emotional well being, and prevention of student failure through early intervention. The RTI Leadership Team functions as follows:
1. Monitor academic and behavior data evaluating progress by addressing the following important questions:
• What will all students learn? (curriculum based on standards)
• How will we determine if the students have learned? (common assessments)
• How will we respond when students have not learned? (Response to Intervention problem solving process and monitoring progress of interventions)
• How will we respond when students have learned or already know? (enrichment opportunities)
2. Gather and analyze data to determine professional development for faculty as indicated by student intervention and achievement needs.
3. Hold regular team meetings
4. Maintain communication with staff for input and feedback, as well as updating them on procedures and progress
5. Support a process and structure within the school to design, implement, and evaluate both daily instruction and specific interventions
6. Provide clear indicators of student need and student progress, assisting in examining the validity and effectiveness of program delivery
7. Assist with monitoring and responding to the needs of subgroups within the expectations for adequate yearly progress

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

1. The Leadership Team will monitor and adjust the school's academic and behavioral goals through data gathering and data analysis.
2. The Leadership Team will monitor the fidelity of the delivery of instruction and intervention.
3. The Leadership Team will provide levels of support and interventions to students based on data.

MTSS Implementation

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

1. Data will be used to guide instructional decisions and system procedures for all students to:
• adjust the delivery of curriculum and instruction to meet the specific needs of students
• adjust the delivery of behavior management system
• adjust the allocation of school-based resources
• drive decisions regarding targeted professional development
• create student growth trajectories in order to identify and develop interventions

2. Managed data will include:
Academic
• FAIR assessment
• Benchmark, Mini BATS, Q-BATS Assessments
• State/Local Math and Science assessments
• FCAT
• Student grades
• School site specific assessments

Behavior
• Discipline Management System data
• Attendance
• Referrals to special education programs

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Professional Development will be provided on Planning Days and Professional Learning Communities will take place throughout the school year. The school psychologist along with the RtI team will train staff on RtI.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

This plan will be supported by collegial sharing and monthly team leader meetings to ensure our school plan is being followed. Administration will monitor for areas of needs or concerns.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Clare Uribe (K Grade Chair), Eileen Quinones (Grade 1 Chairperson), Lois Jones (Grade 2 Chairperson), Susan Walker (Grade 3 Chairperson), Kim Whitaker(Grade 4 Chairperson), Teresa Akel (Grade 5 Chairperson), Albert Leonardis (Specials & ESE Grade Chair), Gislaine Bennett (Reading Coach), Linda Justin (Guidance Counselor), Ronnie Leff (ESE Specialist), Gladys Donovan (Principal), Lourdes Cruz (Assistant Principal)

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

The LLT meets on a monthly basis to discuss recent effective research strategies, classroom practices, and mentor new teachers to best meet the needs of all students. Minutes will be kept for all meetings. Chairpersons from each grade level will share meeting information with their grade level team.

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

To assist teachers in administering diagnostic assessments, analyzing test results, and implementing differentiated instruction. The overall goal of the LLT is to increase the number of students meeting high standards in reading. Implementing the Common Core State Standards will also be a part of the LLT function.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
No Attachment

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

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 the Creative Curriculum Continuum report, detailing students' ongoing assessment, is placed in the students' cumulative folder to familiarize kindergarten teachers with the HS students' progress in the program.

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

In addition to Head Start, we met with local daycares in the area to invite prospective students to tour our campus during Kindergarten Roundup.

*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 High School Feedback Report

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	Trend data indicates that the percentage of students scoring a Level 3 or above has decreased an average of 12.2% from last year. The previous four years demonstrated a maintance of approximately 69% proficiency.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Results on the 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment indicated that 24.8% (68) of our students in grades 3-5 scored a level 3 with a total of 52.5% (144) students scoring a level 3 or higher.	By May 2013, at least 55% (136) of our students in grades 3-5 will score a minumum of level 3 on the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment.

	Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Test Taking Strategies	All students in grades K-5 (including all AMO subgroups) will receive training and instruction on FCAT test taking preparation strategies and skills.	Administration Reading Coach Teachers	FCIM	BAT Mini BAT District assessments Formative assessments
2	FCAT Data Analysis	Utilize district resources such as BEEP, Virtual Counselor, and data chats to assist with driving instruction for students in all sub groups (ESE,ESOL,etc)	Administration Teachers Support Staff	FCIM	District assessments Formative assessments
3	Limited background knowledge	Use of graphic organizers/thinking maps Read alouds Anthologies	Teachers	Teacher observation, utilization of and training students in use of graphic organizers to develop language skills/background knowledge and Classroom Walk Throughs(CWT)	Graphic organizers Thinking maps
4	Limited Vocabulary	Use of non-linguistic representations to reinforce vocabulary	Teachers Reading Coach	Teacher observation through CWT	Literacy assessments in Treasures series that measures vocabulary achievement FAIR and Pre/Post Literacy Assessments
5	Limited Test taking strategies	All students in grades K-5 (including all AMO subgroups) will receive training and instruction on FCAT est taking preparation strategies and skills.	Administration/Reading Coach/Teachers	Quarterly Data Chats (Teacher/Administrator) Bi-Monthly Team Meetings	BAT, Mini BAT, District Assessments, Formative assessments, FAIR testing
	Limited understanding of FCAT Data Analysis	Utilize district resources such as BEEP, Virtual	Administration, Teachers, Reading	Quarterly Data Chats (Teacher/Administrator)	District Assessments,

		Counselor, and Data Chats to assist with driving instruction for students in all sub groups (ESE, ESOL, etc)	Coach	Bi-Monthly Team Meetings	Formative Assessments
6					
7	Limited Vocabulary	Use of non-linguistic representations to reinforce vocabulary, Vocabulary Pop, K-1 Rainbow Reading Words	Administration Reading Coach Teachers Staff	Bi-weekly Teacher observations through Classroom Walk-Throughs, conducted by Administration and Reading Coach CWT Classroom reports are shared with grade levels on a monthly basis.	Literacy assessments in Treasures/Triumphs series that measures vocabulary achievement FAIR and pre/post literacy assessments
8	Limited background knowledge	Use of graphic organizers/thinking maps, Read Alouds/Anthologies	Teachers	Teacher observation, utilization of and training students in use of graphic organizers to develop language skills/background knowledge and Classroom Walk-throughs (CWT).	Graphic Organizers/Thinking Maps Anthology Book Read Aloud from various genres

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	n/a
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
n/a We do not currently have any students registered for the Florida Alternate Assessment.	n/a

<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
No Data Submitted				

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	Trend data indicate that the percentage of students scoring at or above Level 4 has decreased by approximately 27%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Results on the 2012 FCAT Reading Assessment indicated that 27.7% (76) of students in grades 3-5 scored at or above Level 4.	By June 2013, 30% (74) of students in grades 3-5 will score at or above Level 4.

<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	Vocabulary	Use of non-linguistic representations to reinforce vocabulary	Teachers Reading Coach	CWT	Literacy assessments in Treasures/Triumphs series that measures vocabulary achievement FAIR Pre/Post literacy assessments
2	Opportunities for Higher Order Thinking	Utilizing higher order thinking skills will be implemented	Teachers	CWT Analysis of weekly tests	Weekly math test Benchmark Assessments FCAT
3	Limited Reading comprehension skills (reference/research, details, fact questions)	Students will utilize newspapers and/or news-type magazines (such as Time For Kids) to enhance reading skills, research skills, and comprehension skills	Administration /Reading Coach/Teachers	FCIM Quarterly Data Chats (Teacher/Administrator) Bi-monthly team meetings	BAT, Mini BAT, District Assessments, Formative Assessments
4	Level 4 and 5 students have limited materials to accelerate learning.	Use Junior Great Books for our above level students (gifted classrooms) Vocabulary Workshop workbooks - gifted classes 3-5 Differentiated reading centers/work stations	Administration Reading Coach Teachers	Data Chats (Teacher/Administrator) CWT by Administration and Reading Coach	Data binder chats Plan Book Record
5	Self-imposed stress	Practice relaxation and test taking strategies	Teacher/Guidance Counselor	Teacher observation	Plan book record of relaxation practice and test taking strategies

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading. Reading Goal #2b:	n/a
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
n/a	n/a

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

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

of improvement for the following group:

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	Trend data indicate that the percentage of students making learning gains decreased from 64% in 2008 and 66% in 2009 to 63% (221) in 2010. However, students making learning gains in reading for 2011 increased to 67% (152), and has decreased for 2012 by 0.3% (36).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on 2012 FCAT in reading, 66.7% (121) of students made learning gains in reading.	By June 2013, 70% (173)of students will make learning gains in reading.

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</th></tr>
<tr><th></th><th>Anticipated Barrier</th><th>Strategy</th><th>Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring</th><th>Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy</th><th>Evaluation Tool</th></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>Achieving and maintaining learning gains</td><td>Data chats between students, teachers and administrators

Differentiated instruction through small group model</td><td>Teachers Administrators</td><td>FCIM-data disaggregation

Data chats (student/teacher) (teacher/administration)</td><td>Data Binder

Response to Intervention</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>Limited background knowledge</td><td>Use of graphic organizers/thinking maps

Read Alouds/Anthologies</td><td>Teachers</td><td>Teacher observation, utilization of and training students in use of graphic organizers to develop language skills/background knowledge and CWT</td><td>FAIR

Wilson for Reading

Text Talk

Rewards</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>Limited vocabulary</td><td>Use of non-linguistic representations to reinforce/enhance vocabulary

Vocabulary Pop

Rainbow Word Reading (K-1)</td><td>Administrative Staff

Teachers</td><td>Teacher Observations

CWTs</td><td>Literacy assessments in Treasures/Trophies series that measures vocabulary achievement

Response to Intervention

FAIR

Text Talk

Rewards

Soar to Success</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:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in reading. Reading Goal #3b:	n/a
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
n/a	n/a

<table>
<tr><th colspan="6">Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement</th></tr>
</table>

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	Trend data indicates in 2012, an increase of 10% in the percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains from 68% in 2009 to 63% in 2010 and a 4% decrease in 2011 to 59%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on 2012 FCAT Reading, 69.4% (34.7) of students in lowest 25% made learning gains in reading.	By June 2013, 72% (178) of students in lowest 25% will make learning gains.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Performing below grade level	Intervention reading groups, double dosing	Teacher, ESE Teacher, Reading Coach	On-going progress monitoring assessments	Assessments (BAT-1, BAT-2, FAIR, FCAT
2	Oral reading fluency, phonics, comprehension skills/strategies, vocabulary development	Students(in all AMO subgroups), identified as substantially deficient, will receive additional support through supplemental materials in small group delivery in intervention reading programs and intensive reading skills.	Administration Reading Coach Teachers	FCIM Process	BAT, Mini-BAT District Assessments, Formative Assessments FAIR
3	Performing below grade level	Differentiated reading groups and small group model Additional reading program support within the classroom (ESE & Reading Coach)	Administration Reading Coach Teachers	FCIM On-going monitoring assessments	Assessments (BAT 1 & 2, FAIR, FCAT, DRA's) Response to Intervention

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal # 5A :	Our expected level of performance for grades 3-5 for the 2012/2013 FCAT Reading Assessment will demonstrate a greater comprehension of concepts through hands-on exploration with both literary and informational texts.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	56%	60%	64%	68%	72%	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black,

Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:			The subgroup that did not make AMO in Reading on the 2012 FCAT Assessment are those classified as White, Asian, Indian, Black and Hispanic.		
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
The current level of performance for our Black population is 54.3% (25), Hispanic 49.6% (69), White 39% (23), Asian 23.1% (3), and Indian 57.1% (4) not proficient in Reading on the FCAT Assessment.			Our expected level of performance for the 2013 FCAT in reading will reflect Black population is 57.3%, Hispanic 51%, White 41%, Asian 25%, and Indian 59% scoring at or above grade level.		

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	Student motivation/lack of interest in reading.	Adopt reading incentive programs (Book-It) (K-2) Catch the Reading Habit	Reading Coach Teachers	Reading logs, book reports	Data Binder and reading logs, graphic organizers
2	Limited background knowledge	Use of graphic organizers/thinking maps Read alouds/anthologies	Administration Teachers	Teacher observation,utilization of and training students in use of graphic organizers to develop language skills/background knowledge and CWT	Graphic organizers/thinking maps Read alouds/anthologies
3	Limited Vocabulary	Use of non-linguistic representations to reinforce vocabulary Vocabulary Pop (K-1) Rainbow Word Reading	Administrative Staff Reading Coach Teachers	FCIM Teacher Observations CWT	Literacy assessments in Treasures/Trophies series that measures vocabulary achievement FAIR

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	NA
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
NA	NA

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:
5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making

satisfactory progress in reading.

Reading Goal #5D:

Trend data indicates a decline in the percentage of SWD students scoring proficiently as this subgroup was deemed proficient in 2009.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on 2012 FCAT in reading results, 25.4% (16) of Students With Disabilities(SWD) scored at or above level 3.	By June 2013, 28% of the Students With Disabilities (SWD) student subgroups in fourth and fifth grade and retained third graders will demonstrate adequate yearly progress in reading on the FCAT in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Personalization of individual student instructional needs.	Data chats between student/teacher and administrator/teacher Differentiated instruction through small group	Administrators Teachers Support Staff	Data disaggregation	Data Binder
2	Learning gaps in content areas	Differentiated instruction through small group.	Teachers Support Staff	CWT Quarterly data chats	Related assessments
3	Lack of basic reading skills (phonics, vocabulary development, reading comprehension skills/strategies)	Students with Disabilities will receive additional reading support within the classroom utilizing programs such as Wilson, Phonics for Reading, and/or Quick Reads based on the students' specific areas of weakness.	ESE Specialist, ESE Teacher, Reading Coach, Administration	Progress monitoring of IEP goals, CWT	Weekly assessments, Mini BATs, Benchmark Assessment II, Response to Intervention (RtI)
4	Personalization of individual student instructional needs	Data chats between students/teachers and/or administrators Differentiated instruction through small group Tumble Books (computer based)	Administration Teachers	Data Disaggregation	Data Binder Destination Reading
5	Learning gaps in content areas	Differentiated instruction through small group	Teachers Administration	CWT Quarterly data chats (teacher/administration)	Related on-going progress monitoring 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:	There was a decline in the percentage of students scoring proficiently in the Economically Disadvantaged subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on 2012 FCAT in reading, 50.8% (99) of Economically Disadvantaged students scored at or above Level 3.	By June 2013, 53% of Economically Disadvantaged students will demonstrate proficiency in reading to attain Safe Harbor or 66% will attain proficiency to meet the AMO benchmark.

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

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	Personalization of individual student instructional needs	Data Chats between students/teachers and/or administrators Differentiated instruction through small group Tumble Books (computer based)	Administrative Staff Teachers	Data disaggregation	Data Binder Destination Reading
2	Learning gaps in content areas	Differentiated instruction through small group model	Administrative Staff Teachers	CWT, Quarterly data chats (teacher/administration)	Related ongoing progress monitoring assessments
3	Lack of basic reading skills (phonics, vocabulary development, reading comprehension skills/strategies)	Students with Disabilities will receive additional reading support within the classroom utilizing programs such as Wilson, Phonics for Reading, and/or Quick Reads based on the students' specific areas of weakness.	ESE Specialist, ESE Teacher, Reading Coach, Administration	Progress monitoring of IEP goals, CWT	Weekly assessments, Mini BATs, Benchmark Assessment II, Response to Intervention (RtI)

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
Reading programs that focus on effective reading strategies, small group differentiated instruction, and in setting up effective Literacy Centers (The Daily Five & CAFE)	K-5	Eileen Quinones Susan Walker	School-wide	Early Release Day	Grade level meetings	Administration Leadership team
Reading Intervention Strategies	K-5	Reading Coach	All grade levels	Teacher Planning Days	CWT	Reading Coach Administration
K-2 teachers will participate in the Common Core Training provided by the district.	K-2	District trainer	All K-2 teachers	As scheduled by the district throughout the year	Team Meetings i-Observations	Administration Reading Coach
Daily Five PLC	Grade 1	First grade chairperson	First grade teachers	Bi-weekly meetings	i-Observations Weekly team meetings	Administration Grade chairperson Reading Coach

Reading 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
Daily Five Professional Learning Community	Monthly PLC meetings	Title 1 Staff Development Funds	$3,000.00
Common Core State Standards Professional Learning Community & Inservice Training	Monthly PLC meetings and county provided training	Title 1 Staff Development Funds	$3,000.00
Improve collaboration and communication within grade level teams	Quarterly team meetings (1/2 day)	Title 1 Staff Development Funds	$5,000.00
Daily 5 Books	Materials to support Daily Five PLC	Title 1 Staff Development Funds	$510.00
			Subtotal: $11,510.00

Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
After school tutorials	Twice weekly, 1 hour sessions for four months	Accountability	$5,000.00
			Subtotal: $5,000.00
			Grand Total: $16,510.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:	By 2013, 52% (55) of ELL students will demonstrate proficiency in listening/speaking.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:

In 2012,K=8% (2), 1=53% (21), 2 = 89% (25), 3=14% (1), 4=33% (1), 5=100% (2) students were proficient in listening/speaking.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of prerequisite skills	Utilize ESOL strategies in classroom and small group instruction	Administrations Reading Coach ESOL Contact Teacher	FCIM	IPT, CELLA and Informal assessments

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

CELLA Goal #2:	By 2013, 32% (34) of ELL students will be proficient in reading.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

In 2012, K= 0%, 1= 23% (9), 2= 64% (18), 3= 14% (1), 4= 33% (1), 5= 50% (1) of ELL students were proficient in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack academic terminology due to limited language skills.	Pair ELL students with English proficient, higher level students for peer tutoring.	Administration Reading Coach Teacher	Analysis of Florida Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)	CELLA, BAT 1 & 2, FAIR
2	Students have limited understanding of vocabulary in context, language usage, and comprehension skills needed to obtain proficiency in reading.	Increase time on computer based program to develop vocabulary and comprehension skills (Riverdeep, FCAT Explorer, etc.)	Adminstration Reading Coach Teacher	Analysis of management reports	Management Reports

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	By 2013, 28% (30) of ELL students will demonstrate proficiency in writing.

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

In 2012, K= 0%, 1= 28% (11), 2= 46% (16), 3= 29% (2), 4= 0%, 5= 50% (1) of ELL students were proficient in writing.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack writing proficiency due to limited writing fluency, grammar skills, and writing conventions.	Increase time with teacher to develop writing fluency, grammar, and writing conventions	Administration Reading Coach Teacher	Analysis of CELLA along with the Idea Proficiency Test - Form G (IPT)	CELLA IPT Form G

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
Implementation of the Idea Proficiency Test (IPT-2) Reading, Writing, and Oral	Assessment Booklets	General Budget	$1,267.20
			Subtotal: $1,267.20
			Grand Total: $1,267.20

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:	Trend data indicate that student mathematics proficiency scores decreased by approximately 11% from the previous year. We have had a slow decrease for the past two years, however, an increase was demonstrated in 2009.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on 2012 FCAT in mathematics, 26.9% (75) of students scored a Level 3 with a total of 55% (152) scoring a Level 3 or higher.	By June 2013 57% (142) students will score at or above Level 3 on the FCAT in mathematics.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Test Taking Strategies	All students in grades K-5 (including all AMO subgroups) will receive training and instruction on FCAT test taking preparation strategies and skills.	Administration Reading Coach Teachers	FCIM	BAT Mini BAT District assessments Formative assessments
2	FCAT Data Analysis	Utilize district resources such as BEEP, Virtual Counselor, and data chats to assist with driving instruction for students in all sub groups (ESE,ESOL,etc)	Administration Teachers Support Staff	FCIM	District assessments Formative assessments
	Meeting individual needs of all students	Provide a minimum 60 minute math block Implement Calendar Math (K-2) Implement differentiated instruction through small groups, as well as push-in or pullout services model for SWD & ELL students, as needed. Students level 3 and above will be challenged using the enrichment materials and strategies with Florida Go Math. Tier 1: Determine core instructional needs via review of Florida GO MATH assessments, FCAT and BAT. Plan differentiated instruction using research-based instruction/interventions within math block for all level 1 and 2 students. Students referred to Collaborative Problem	Administrators Teachers Support Staff	Data Chats CPST meetings CWT Assessments made by teacher	Florida GO MATH assessments Math interactive journal

3		Solving Team (RtI)for interventions as needed.

Tier 2:
Plan supplemental instruction/intervention for students not responding to core instruction. Focus of instruction is determined by review or mini-assessment data, and will include explicit instruction, modeled instruction, guided practice and independent practice. Supplemental instruction is in addition to core instruction. Students will be referred to the CPST (RtI) as needed for intervention strategies.

Tier 3:
Strategies include increasing the frequency and intensity of small group instruction. Instruction will include the use of Florida GO MATH intervention program. | | | |
| 4 | Lack of knowledge regarding Next Generation Sunshine State Standards and bridging to Common Core State Standards CCSS (NGSSS) | Team planning and discussion Workshop on CCSS | Administrators Teachers Workshop Facilitators | Team Feedback CWT | Florida GO MATH assessments Math interactive journal |
| 5 | Lack of technology training for teachers and students | Learning communities, district workshops, classroom use of projectors, and one- on-one hands on training | Teachers Workshop facilitators | Teacher and administrator observations | Reports from on-line programs (FCAT Explorer) |

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment:
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics.

Mathematics Goal #1b: | n/a |
| 2012 Current Level of Performance: | 2013 Expected Level of Performance: |
| n/a | n/a |

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	Trend data indicates that student mathematics at or above proficiency scores has steadily decreased over the past several years. This year there was a greater decrease than previous years.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Based on 2012 FCAT in mathematics, 28.4% (78) of students scored a Level 4 or higher.	By June 2013, 30% (74) students will score a Level 4 or 5 on the FCAT in mathematics.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Opportunities for Higher Order Thinking	Utilizing higher order thinking skills will be implemented	Teachers	CWT Analysis of weekly tests	Weekly math test Benchmark Assessments FCAT
2	Lack of student motivatioa	Use manipulatives and math centers with a hands-on learning approach Math games Broward Enterprise Education Portal (BEEP) on-line textbooks & resources	Teachers Administration	Teacher observation of on task behavior Participation in Superstars	Florida GO MATH assessments, Mini benchmark exams
3	Gain and maintain mathematics skills	Students grades 4-5 will utilize FCAT Explorer and Destination Math (3-5) before school. Using challenging materials provided by Florida Go Math Small group instruction	Administration Support staff Teachers	Monthly monitoring reports and teacher observation	FCAT Explorer report Rubrics
4	Distraction due to early completion	Centers with math games Computer programs (BEEP, Riverdeep, etc.) Peer assistance Accelerated learning	Teacher	Analysis computer reports and center results	Florida Go Math assessments and computer reports
5	Lack of vocabulary	Use of non-linguistic representations to reinforce vocabulary BEEP on-line textbooks Math journal	Administration Teachers	CWT Analysis of Florida Go Math mid-chapter checkpoints and review chapter tests	Florida Go Math mid-chapter checkpoints and review chapter tests Math Journal

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

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

n/a	n/a

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	Trend data indicates that students making learning gains in mathematics scores decreased slightly by approximately 4.3% in 2012 after a 10% gain was demonstrated in 2011. The year prior demonstrated a decrease by 10%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Results on the 2012 FCAT in mathematics indicated that 69.7% (127.6) of our students made adequate learning gains in mathematics.	By June 2013, 72% (117) of our students will make learning gains in mathematics.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Meeting individual needs	Implement Florida Go Math differentiated instruction Small group instruction	Teacher	Ongoing progress monitoring	Flordia Go Math assessments Teacher made assessments
2	Learning gaps	Florida Go Math Intensive or Strategic Intervention Florida Go Math Reteach	Teacher	Periodic informal assessments and checklists	Florida 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 group:	
3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3b:	n/a
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
n/a	n/a

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	Trend data indicates a decrease of 9% in the number of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains from 70% in 2009 to 60% in 2010. However, an increase of 8% was achieved in 2011, and a decreased of 9% on 2012.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
Results on the 2012 FCAT in mathematics indicated that 59.6% (30) of our students scoring in the lowest 25% made learning gains in mathematics.	By June 2013, 63% (32) of students scoring in lowest 25% on FCAT in mathematics will make learning gains.

<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>Lack of parental support/involvement</td><td>We will increase parental invovement by providing Family Night, Parent Training and Community partnership with Publix</td><td>Administration Teachers</td><td>Parent surveys and feedback Docuent attendance records</td><td>Parent surveys and feedback Document attendance records</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>Gaps in math skills</td><td>Small groups Florida Go Math interventions On-line BEEP Lessons</td><td>Teacher</td><td>Teacher monitoring</td><td>Florida Go Math assessment BAT</td></tr>
</table>

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Elementary School Mathematics Goal # 5A : Our expected level of performance for grades 3-5 for the 2012/2013 FCAT in mathematics will demonstrate a greater comprehension of math concepts through hands-on exploration with real world problems.

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	60%	63%	67%	71%	74%	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	The subgroups that did not make AMO in mathematics on the 2012 FCAT are those classified as Black, White, Asian, Indian, and Hispanic.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	**2013 Expected Level of Performance:**
The current level of performance for our Black population is 47.8% (22), Hispanic 47.1% (66), White 39%(23), Asian 3% (23.1), and Indian 4% (57) proficient in mathematics on the 2012 FCAT.	Our expected level of performance for the 2013 FCAT in mathematics will reflect Black 50%, Hispanic 50%, White 41%, Asian 5%, and Indian 6% scoring at or above grade level.

<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></td><td>Lack of prerequisite skills</td><td>Use of computer lab before school for all students (mathematics</td><td>Administration Support Staff Teachers</td><td>Analysis FCAT Explorer reports Informal observations</td><td>Florida Achieves report & FCAT Explorer report</td></tr>
</table>

1		websites and/or FCAT Explorer) Students not able to attend before school will have an opportunity to use the media computers during media time for a minimum of once per week for 30 minutes.			
2	Performing below grade level	Individual interventions Florida Go MATH Grab and Go activities	Teachers Administration	Ongoing progress monitoring of Florida Go Math assessments Teacher made tests	Florida Go Math assessments Teacher made tests

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:	Presently we do not have an English Language Learners sub-group.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Presently we do not have an English Language Learners sub-group.	Presently we do not have an English Language Learners sub-group.

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	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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:	Our Students with Disabilities (SWD) continued to demonstrate profiency in mathematics for the previous 3 years according to the FCAT in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
The current level of performance for our Students with Disabilities population is 71.9% (46) proficient in Mathematics on the 2012 FCAT.	By June 2013, Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroups in fourth and fifth grade and retained third graders will demonstrate adequate yearly progress in mathematics on the 2013 FCAT. We expect 74% (47) of student subgroups will make AMO.

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	Personalization of individual student instructional needs.	Data chats between student/teacher and administrator/teacher Differentiated instruction through small group	Administrators Teachers Support Staff	Data disaggregation	Data Binder
2	Learning gaps in content areas	Differentiated instruction through small group.	Teachers Support Staff	CWT Quarterly data chats	Related assessments

3	Lack of skills reinforcement	Students with Disabilities will receive a double dose of mathematics instruction	Administration ESE Specialist ESE Teacher	CWT Progress Monitoring of IEP Goals Quarterly data chats	Classroom assessments Mini BATs Benchmark Assessment II
4	Number sense	Students with Disabilities will utilize Touch Math to reinforce previously taught skills and teach new ones.	Administration ESE Specialist ESE Teacher	CWT Progress Monitoring of IEP Goals Quarterly Data Chats	Classroom assessments Mini BATs Benchmark Assessment II

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	Trend data analysis indicates a sharp decline in SWD making satisfactory progress in mathematics since 2011. Analysis of the 2010 & 2009 FCAT in mathematics indicate an increase of 5% from 2009 to 2010.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
Results on the 2012 FCAT in mathematics indicated that 51.3% (100) of our students in the subgroup of Economically Disadvantaged made learning gains in mathematics.	By June 2013, 53% (103) of economically disadvantaged students will demonstrate proficiency in mathematics on the 2013 FCAT in mathematics.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Fidelity of instruction	Provide inservice for teachers on the Florida Go Math series to ensure teachers have necessary skills to deliver lessons with fidelity.	Administration Leadership Team	CWT Data chats Analysis of assessments	iObservations Assessment data

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Big Idea 1,2, and 3 math trainings	New teachers	District personnel	New teachers	As scheduled by district	CWT, i-Observations	Administration Leadership team
Big Idea podcasts	K-5	Math contact	Teachers	Monthly meetings	Data chats	Administration Math contact
Review Curriculum Frameworks for student mastery of NGSSS and Common Core Standards	K-2	PLC Leader	K-2 teachers	Twice monthly	Review of lesson plans for alignment with Curriculum Framework	Administration

Mathematics Budget:

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

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

Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Common Core State Standards Professional Learning Community & Inservice Training	Monthly PLC meetings and county provided training	Title 1 Staff Development Funds	$2,500.00
			Subtotal: $2,500.00

Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
After school tutorials	Twice weekly, 1 hour sessions for four months	Accountability	$5,000.00
			Subtotal: $5,000.00
			Grand Total: $7,500.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:	Trend data indicates a drop in the percentage of students scoring a level 3 on the 2012 Science FCAT after slight increases in the previous two years.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On the 2012 Science FCAT, 22.3% (23) of the students achieved proficiency (FCAT Level 3) in science. A total of 45% (35) scored a level 3 or higher.	It is expected that on the 2013 Science FCAT, 47% (37) of the students taking the 2013 Science FCAT will achieve a proficiency of level 3 or higher.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Test Taking Strategies	All students in grades K-5 (including all AMO subgroups) will receive training and instruction on FCAT test taking preparation strategies and skills.	Administration Reading Coach Teachers	FCIM	BAT Mini BAT District assessments Formative assessments
2	FCAT Data Analysis	Utilize district resources such as BEEP, Virtual Counselor, and data chats to assist with driving instruction for students in all sub	Administration Teachers Support Staff	FCIM	District assessments Formative assessments

		groups (ESE,ESOL,etc)			
3	Students lack background knowledge	Science instruction will be taught with fidelity at all grade levels as per the district's guidelines Incorporate use of Science Fusion digital lessons and labs Instruct students using the Five "E" Model (engage, explore, explain, evaluate and extend), throughout Science Fusion lessons	Administration Teachers	Use of science journals to assess student understanding Use of science journals when incorporating hands-on kit science activities Science journals will be evaluated with student/teacher feedback.	Science Fusion assessments Science journals Rubrics
4	Students lack reflective thinking skills	Journaling to allow time for reflection Think-alouds during instruction	Teachers	Review of science journals	Student science journals

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b:	na

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

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

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:	Trend data indicate the slightest decrease of 0.3% from last year's Science FCAT. An increase during the previous 2 years of 2% to 5% more students achieving above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in science from 2008 to 2011.

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On the 2012 Science FCAT, 11.7% (12) of the students achieved above proficiency (FCAT Levels 4 and 5) in science.	It is expected that on the 2013 Science FCAT, 14% (14.4) of the students will achieve proficiency or higher in science.

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

1	Opportunities for Higher Order Thinking	Utilizing higher order thinking skills will be implemented	Teachers	CWT Analysis of weekly tests	Weekly math test Benchmark Assessments FCAT
2	Students need an emphasis on enrichment with real-world applications using additional hands-on, inquiry based investigations.	Engage students weekly in hands-on, inquiry based experiments. Scaffold learning in grades K-5 so that students can eventually design and execute their own experiments. Use of science journals to assess student understanding and misconceptions.	Administration	Use of science journals to assess student understanding and misconceptions. Use of science journals when incorporating hands-on kit science activities. Science journals will be evaluated with student/teacher feedback.	Science journal Rubrics Monitoring of Florida Achieves Focus program

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in science. Science Goal #2b:	na
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
na	na

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

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
Share best practices using Science Fusion.	K-5	Team leaders	K-5 Teachers	Monthly during team meetings	iObservation	Administration Team leaders

Science Budget:

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Aligning Elementary Science and the Core	District Professional Development	Title 1 Professional Development	$500.00
			Subtotal: $500.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $500.00

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	Trend data indicate a decrease of 13% on the 2012 writing assessment. However, an increase of 2% in the percentage of 4th grade students meeting high standards (level 4) in writing for 2011.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
On the 2012 FCAT Writing 2.0, 69.7% (53) of the fourth grade students met high standards (Level 4) in writing.	By June 2013, 72% (54.72) of fourth grade students will meet high standards (level 4) in writing.

		Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement			
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of writing gains	Integrate writing in curricular content areas.	Teachers Administrators	Teacher evaluation of student writing samples (journals and prompts)	6-Traits Writing Rubric
	Limited vocabulary skills	Recognize student writing achievement school wide on a monthly basis Vocabulary POP—teach new vocabulary words, including, but not limited to adjectives, adverbs, etc., to be used in their writing assignments Streets & Avenues—create interactive	Administration Teachers Reading Coach	Publish student writing samples in our school wide newsletter on a monthly basis Team meetings Data chats Teacher/Parent conferences Teacher/Student conferences	Monthly writing prompts FCAT Writing 2.0

2		"roads" in our schools' hallways that display high level vocabulary for all grade levels across the curriculum (ex.: Adjective Avenue, Singular Noun Street, Plural Noun Place, High Level Word Highway) Fourth Grade Writing Superstars---school wide program that encourages students to participate in a monthly challenge to answer a creative, grade level appropriate writing prompt, using the six writing traits--voice, conventions, organization etc.			
3	Implement anchor standards for writing across all content curriculum areas	Develop and strengthen writing as needed by planning, revising, editing, rewriting in all subject areas.	Administration Teachers Reading Coach	Teachers will analysis student writing samples.	Student samples with writing rubrics

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:	na
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
na	na
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

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

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
Collegial Sharing	3 & 4	Team Leaders	Writing for grades 3 & 4	Monthly	Monthly Meeting Notes	Administration

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Improve collaboration and communication within grade level teams	Monthly grade level meetings	Title 1 Staff Development	$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:	The attendance rate for school year 2012 continued to demonstrate a slight rise in attendance rates. Trend data indicates a decrease in the number of students with excessive tardies and the number of students with excessive absences.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
The attendance rate for school year 2011-2012 shows an attendance rate of 95.8%.	The expected attendance rate for the school year 2013 is 98%.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
In 2012, the number of students with excessive absences was 55.	For school year 2013 the number of students with excessive absences will decrease 25%.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
In 2012, the number of students with excessive tardies was 228.	For the school year 2013 the number of students with excessive tardies will decrease by 25%.
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	

			Person or	Process Used to	

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of parental understanding and/or commitment to the district's attendance policy	Communicate district's attendance policy during Title 1 Public Meeting/Open House, parent/teacher conferences, school news letter, and school's website. Individual letters are sent home monthly to students with five or more tardies.	Assistant Principal School Social Worker Guidance Counselor	Attendance reports (daily, weekly, monthly)	Comparison of yearly attendance reports

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Integrated writing process	K-5	Grade Chairs	School-wide Fourth Grade	Faculty meetings Early release days Teacher planning days	Data chats	Administration Grade Chairs

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			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:	Our goal is to decrease suspension rates by 20% during the 2013 school year. Our total number of Alternative to External Suspension during 2012 was 0.
2012 Total Number of In—School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
The total number of internal suspensions for the 2012 school year was 5.	Our expected number of in-school suspensions for the 2013 school year is to decrease by 20%
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
The total number of students suspended in-school for the 2012 school year was 5.	Our expected number of students suspended for the 2013 school year will decrease by 20%.
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
The total number of out-of-school suspensions for the 2012 school year was 7.	Our expected number of students suspended for the 2013 school year will decrease by 20%.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
The total number of students suspended out of school for the 2012 school year was 6.	Our expected number of students suspended out of school for the 2013 school year will decrease by 20%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of training in behavior management for teachers.	Implement CHAMPs training, RTI, PBIP and PBIS school-wide program. Infusion of the District's 8 Character Education Traits into the classroom and school culture.	Administration Leadership Team	Classroom Walkthroughs Observation Data chats (behavior) Teacher surveys	Data collected from Classroom Walkthroughs & observations Feedback from teacher surveys

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						

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
CHADD Conference	3 teachers will attend the conference and will inservice remaining staff	TDIF Grant	$3,000.00
			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: $3,000.00

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

Based on the analysis of parent involvement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement:	
1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: **Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.*	Trend data indicates an increase in the percentage of parents/family representatives involved in school related activities as a 48% increase.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
During 2012, 89% of parents/family representives participated in decisions regarding their children's education as shown by attendance at Title I public meetings, parent trainings, other parent meetings, events, and/or conferences.	By June 2013, 93% of parents will participate in decisions regarding their children's education as shown by attendance at Title I public meetings, parent trainings, other parent meetings, events, and/or conferences.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Parents attending scheduled workshops such as parent nights, Open House, conferences, etc.	Use parent link, flyers, school newsletter and website to inform parents of scheduled workshops. Train	Administration	Parent sign-in sheets	Parent survey

		parents in the use of student agendas as a communication tool in which to provide information regarding their child's homework and class activities.			
1					
2	Lack of child care services	Provide child care services for parents attending workshops.	Administration	Parent sign-in sheets	Parent survey

---

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Parent participation in decisions regarding their children's education as documented by attendance at Title 1 public meetings, parent trainings and other parent meetings and/or conferences	K-5	Administrators Title 1 Liaison	Administrators Team Leaders Title 1 Liaison	Ongoing through May 2013	Parent training evaluations Sign-in sheets	Administrators Team Leaders Title 1 Liaison

---

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Student Planners	Planners are used on a daily basis to provide communication between home and school.	Title 1 Funds	$2,924.00
			Subtotal: $2,924.00

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:	Based on the analysis of school data, improvements in the area of technology need to be made. Classrooms are struggling to keep up with the 21st century. Classrooms are in need of Promethean Boards, document readers, and projectors.

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 funds	Locate technology grants to purchase additional document readers and appropriate projectors. Grant writing workshops School-wide fundraisers	Teachers grades K-5 Computer Technician	Review grant with on-site grant writing experts	Grade Chair meetings Grade level meetings

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
Grant Writing	K-5	Leonardis Administration	Representative from each grade level K-5.	Monthly	Representatives collaborate with other team members and administration.	Administration

STEM Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Improve collaboration, communication, and critical thinking skills	Problem Based Learning	Title 1 Professional Development	$250.00
			Subtotal: $250.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

School Fundraiser	Various School Fundraisers	PTA	$5,000.00
			Subtotal: $5,000.00

Professional Development

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Teachers attend inservice in science, math, and technology	County provided inservice	Title 1 staff development	$2,000.00
			Subtotal: $2,000.00

Other

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	$0.00
			Subtotal: $0.00
			Grand Total: $7,250.00

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
STEM	Improve collaboration, communication, and critical thinking skills	Problem Based Learning	Title 1 Professional Development	$250.00
				Subtotal: $250.00

Technology

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
STEM	School Fundraiser	Various School Fundraisers	PTA	$5,000.00
				Subtotal: $5,000.00

Professional Development

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Daily Five Professional Learning Community	Monthly PLC meetings	Title 1 Staff Development Funds	$3,000.00
Reading	Common Core State Standards Professional Learning Community & Inservice Training	Monthly PLC meetings and county provided training	Title 1 Staff Development Funds	$3,000.00
Reading	Improve collaboration and communication within grade level teams	Quarterly team meetings (1/2 day)	Title 1 Staff Development Funds	$5,000.00
Reading	Daily 5 Books	Materials to support Daily Five PLC	Title 1 Staff Development Funds	$510.00
Mathematics	Common Core State Standards Professional Learning Community & Inservice Training	Monthly PLC meetings and county provided training	Title 1 Staff Development Funds	$2,500.00
Science	Aligning Elementary Science and the Core	District Professional Development	Title 1 Professional Development	$500.00
Writing	Improve collaboration and communication within grade level teams	Monthly grade level meetings	Title 1 Staff Development	$1,000.00
Suspension	CHADD Conference	3 teachers will attend the conference and will inservice remaining staff	TDIF Grant	$3,000.00
STEM	Teachers attend inservice in science, math, and technology	County provided inservice	Title 1 staff development	$2,000.00
				Subtotal: $20,510.00

Other

Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	After school tutorials	Twice weekly, 1 hour sessions for four months	Accountability	$5,000.00
CELLA	Implementation of the Idea Proficiency Test (IPT-2) Reading, Writing, and Oral	Assessment Booklets	General Budget	$1,267.20
Mathematics	After school tutorials	Twice weekly, 1 hour sessions for four months	Accountability	$5,000.00
Parent Involvement	Student Planners	Planners are used on a daily basis to provide communication between home and school.	Title 1 Funds	$2,924.00
				Subtotal: $14,191.20
				Grand Total: $39,951.20

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

○ Priority	○ Focus	○ Prevent	● NA

Are you a reward school: ○ Yes ● No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 10/18/2012)

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.

If NO, describe the measures being taken to Comply with SAC Requirement

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

AYP DATA

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Broward School District
DRIFTWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2010-2011

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	74%	78%	83%	45%	280	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	67%	74%			141	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	59% (YES)	68% (YES)			127	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					548	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Broward School District
DRIFTWOOD ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
2009-2010

	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	74%	81%	81%	41%	277	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	63%	64%			127	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?	63% (YES)	60% (YES)			123	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					527	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested