

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



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

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

School Name: RIVERSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Broward

Principal: Merideth Weiss

SAC Chair: Michelle King

Superintendent: Robert W. Runcie

Date of School Board Approval:

Last Modified on: 10/17/2012

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)
Principal	Merideth Weiss	Certification: Elementary Education 1-6 ESOL Certification Educational Leadership K-12	1	7	Ms. Weiss started at Riverside Elementary in January 2012, was previously an Assistant Principal at Heron Heights. Heron Heights was an "A" school for 3 years and met AYP in all areas. Riverside Elementary has maintained an "A" school grade since 2003. During the 2011-12 school year 73% were proficient in reading, 71% were proficient in math. Riverside Elementary's 2011-12 FCAT scores indicate 65% of students demonstrated reading learning gains, 62% demonstrated learning gains in math, 65% of the lowest 25% of students made learning gains in reading, 48% of the lowest 25% of students made gains in math.
		BA-Elementary			

Assis Principal	Sherry Rosen	Education MA-Gifted, Talented and Creative Education Certification: Elementary Education 1-6 Certification-Math Grades 5-9 Certification-Educational Leadership K-12 ESOL Endorsement Gifted Endorsement	8	8	Riverside Elementary has maintained an "A" school grade since 2003. During the 2011-12 school year 73% were proficient in reading, 71% were proficient in math. Riverside Elementary's 2011-12 FCAT scores indicate 65% of students demonstrated reading learning gains, 62% demonstrated learning gains in math, 65% of the lowest 25% of students made learning gains in reading, 48% of the lowest 25% of students made gains in math.
-----------------	--------------	--	---	---	---

INSTRUCTIONAL COACHES

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

Subject Area	Name	Degree(s)/ Certification(s)	# of Years at Current School	# of Years as an Instructional Coach	Prior Performance Record (include prior School Grades, FCAT/Statewide Assessment Achievement Levels, Learning Gains, Lowest 25%), and AMO progress along with the associated school year)
Reading	Nancy Klareich	MS-Elementary Education K-6 MA-Science K-6 Reading Endorsement ESOL Endorsement	8	7	Riverside Elementary has maintained an "A" school grade since 2003. During the 2011-12 school year 73% were proficient in reading, 71% were proficient in math. Riverside Elementary's 2011-12 FCAT scores indicate 65% of students demonstrated reading learning gains, 62% demonstrated learning gains in math, 65% of the lowest 25% of students made learning gains in reading, 48% of the lowest 25% of students made gains 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	Our NESS Learning Community meets monthly and invites all staff to participate in small group discussion.	NESS Liaison	June 2013	
2	New teachers are paired with a veteran teacher to share and model best practices and to collaborate during lesson planning and instructional delivery preparation.	NESS Liaison/Team Leader	June 2013	
3	Grade level teams meet weekly to collaborate, plan lessons, and support each other to meet the individual needs of students.	Team Leader	June 2013	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

Number of staff and paraprofessional that are teaching out-of-field/ and who are not highly effective.	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
none	

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
47	6.4%(3)	17.0%(8)	19.1%(9)	59.6%(28)	42.6%(20)	100.0%(47)	6.4%(3)	12.8%(6)	100.0%(47)

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
Irene Bove	Kassandra Gaffoglio	Ms. G is a new teacher to Riverside. Mrs. Bove is a veteran teacher with the experience to guide her through her first year.	Mrs. Bove will review Riverside procedures with Ms. G during pre-planning week. Mrs. Bove will assist Ms. G with lesson planning and instructional delivery. She will also train Ms. G in Go Math.
Natalie Brantley	Greer Robinson	Ms. Robinson is new to Riverside. Ms. Brantley is our ESE resource teacher.	Ms. Brantley will meet with Ms. Robinson to review writing strategies and B.E.E.P. lesson plans. Ms. Brantley will assist Ms. Robinson with planning for guided reading groups as well as assist with behavior management.
Ginny Garcia	Jerelle Robinson	Ms. Robinson is new to Riverside. Ms. Garcia is an ESE teacher.	Ms. Garcia will review Riverside procedures with Ms. Robinson during pre-planning week. Ms. Garcia will assist Ms. Robinson with lesson planning and instructional delivery. She will also train Ms. Robinson in Go Math and assist with behavior management.

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.

N/A

Title I, Part C- Migrant

N/A

Title I, Part D

N/A

Title II

N/A

Title III

N/A

Title X- Homeless

N/A

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

N/A

Violence Prevention Programs

N/A

Nutrition Programs

N/A

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

Other

N/A

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

School Counselor, ESE Specialist, Reading Coach, Psychologist, Social Worker, Principal, Assistant Principal, Speech and Language Pathologist

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

The school-based MTSS Leadership Team meets weekly. Our school counselor assigns each member an individual case. Classroom teachers submit the cases after they follow the MTSS protocol. Individual cases are discussed and reviewed

thoroughly by the MTSS team members. The committee analyzes, discusses, and problem-solves the areas of need based on data provided. Observations are made, additional data is analyzed, and the team creates a further plan of action for the student. To determine Tier 1 success and/or possible needs for Tier 2 or 3 interventions, the team will graph and analyze data collected from behavior check lists, attendance records, chapter tests, standardized tests, FAIR Assessments, running records, and fluency assessments over a 6 week period. The MTSS Leadership Team utilizes a wide variety of behavioral interventions and the Struggling Reader/Math Chart to address any academic interventions. Our school-wide approach to behavior management is based on CHAMPs and the Whale Done programs. Data is tracked and recorded using MTSS graphs, Excel graphs, and Chart Dog (to create graphs) and kept in Data Notebooks. Virtual Counselor/BASIS through the Data Management System is utilized to track data for discipline referrals.

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?

Student achievement data is analyzed and aligned with the School Improvement Plan including intervention plans for individual student progress.

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.

We analyze data from the DAR, FCAT, BAT, FAIR, Rigby PM Benchmark, ORF and DRA to evaluate our intervention programs.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Classroom teachers are trained in specific supplemental interventions to be used with identified students. The classroom teacher and Reading Coach collaborate to analyze DARs/FAIR that are given to all Level 1, 2 and 3 students or students about whom teachers have a concern. Part of the training assists teachers to use the DAR/FAIR results to determine the areas of weakness and the intervention program which will be most effective in assisting the struggling student. Teachers are trained in the use of all supplemental interventions that are needed to be used from the Struggling Reader Chart and Struggling Math Chart. In addition, the Riverside MTSS team collaborates with staff members throughout the year by discussing individual students and identifying students who might be at risk of not meeting target goals. All teachers will continue to participate in school wide presentations about MTSS and will brainstorm grade level appropriate strategies to meet the needs of all RtI tiered levels.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

All instructional staff were trained in the school-wide titled "Response to Instruction" progress monitoring system that incorporates the multi-tiered system. The progress monitoring system includes a content area blueprint for teachers to use as a guide for differentiated instruction.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The school-based Literacy Leadership Team consists of the Team Leaders, Reading Coach, Guidance Counselor, ESE Specialist, Assistant Principal, and Principal.

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

The Literacy Leadership Team meets on a regular basis to plan, develop, and align our curriculum and instruction for the school. The team plans professional development and various parent and student activities throughout the year. In addition, the team provides an effective instructional program to infuse literacy in all curriculum areas. During LLT meetings, the team shares strategies, programs, and hot topics that will help our students improve through differentiated instruction. Each team member is responsible to meet with their respective grade level to collaborate and share best practices to increase literacy proficiency.

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

The goal of the LLT is to support and train teachers to use data to drive differentiated instruction. The team created an instructional literacy blue print for teachers to use as a guide and resource for analyzing data and matching curriculum to individual student needs.

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.

N/A

*Grades 6-12 Only

Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S.

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

N/A

*High Schools Only

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

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

N/A

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

N/A

Postsecondary Transition

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

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

N/A

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in reading. Reading Goal #1a:	By June 2013, 29% (107 out of 369) of students in grades 3-5 will achieve proficiency in reading.
---	---

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

26% (107 out of 407) of students in grades 3-5 achieved proficiency as determined by the 2012 Reading FCAT.	By June 2013, 29% (107 out of 369) of students in grades 3-5 will achieve proficiency as determined by the 2013 Reading FCAT.
---	---

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	Computer access	We are providing additional time during the school day for students to work on Destination Reading/Math.	Classroom Teachers	We monitor the Destination usage reports.	Embedded Destination assessments
2	Time for double dose	Implemented a school-wide parallel block schedule which includes a Walk to Read block for daily interventions to meet individual needs with specific intervention programs.	Classroom Teachers Team Leader	Intervention Data will be monitored and evaluated quarterly. Progress monitoring assessment tools to show growth will also be administered.	Treasures Oral Fluency Assessment Running Records Treasures Unit Assessments Specific Intervention assessment (pre-, mid-, and post-)

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in reading. Reading Goal #1b:	
--	--

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

--	--

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	By June 2013, 50% (217, out of 369) of students will achieve above proficiency in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
47% (190, out of 407) of students in grades 3-5 achieved above proficiency as determined by the 2012 Reading FCAT.	By June 2013, 50% (184, out of 369) of students will achieve above proficiency as determined by the 2013 Reading FCAT.

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	Time for enrichment	Implemented a school-wide parallel block schedule which includes a Walk to Read block for daily intervention to meet individual needs with specific enrichment programs.	Classroom Teacher Team Leader	On-going Progress Monitoring	DRA/Rigby Assessment BAT 1 and BAT 2 Treasures Assessments
2	Not all students have access to non-fiction texts.	Teachers implement reading in the content area throughout the day. Teachers access the Curriculum Resource Room gathering a wide variety of non-fiction texts.	Reading Coach Classroom Teachers	Data will be collected from weekly reading assessments.	Treasures Assessments Small group teacher observation and formative assessments

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	By June 2013, 73% (187, out of 257) of students in grades 4-5 will achieve learning gains in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
70% (192, out of 274) of students in grades 4-5 achieved learning gains as measured by the 2012 Reading FCAT.	By June 2013, 73% (187, out of 257) of students in grades 4-5 will achieve learning gains as measured by 2013 Reading FCAT.

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 reading books at their independent level.	Teachers and the Reading Coach will instruct students on how to choose a "Just Right" book for independent reading. Teachers will access the Curriculum Resource Room to provide a wide variety of books for students to read. Also classroom libraries are being utilized.	Reading Coach Classroom teachers	Teacher will monitor daily student book choice during independent reading time and throughout the day .	DRA/Rigby PM Benchmark Assessments Treasures Assessments Treasures Oral Reading Fluency Alternative assessments such as book reports, and reading response logs
2	Opportunities for higher level thinking strategies	Teachers will be trained on how to effectively model higher level thinking strategies, based on CCSS.	Reading Coach Classroom teachers	Snap Shots and observations	iObservation

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #4:	By June 2013, 68% (43 out of 64) of students in the lowest 25% will achieve learning gains in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
65% (46 out of 71) of students in the lowest 25% achieved learning gains as measured by the 2012 Reading FCAT.	By June 2013, 68% (43 out of 64) of students in the lowest 25% will achieve learning gains as measured by the 2013 Reading FCAT.

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 reading level may be significantly below grade level.	Students will participate in double and triple dose (Walk to Read) guided reading groups. Triumphs, a Tier 2 intervention, will be utilized during reading instruction. After 6 weeks if success is not met, students will be placed in an appropriate Tier 3 intervention based on DAR results such as Rewards, Phonics for Reading, Quick Reads, Great Leaps, and/or Foundations.	Reading Coach Team Leader Classroom Teacher	Continuous review of student data and progress monitoring.	Triumphs Intervention Assessment Foundations Assessment Great Leaps Assessment BAT 1 and BAT 2 DRA/Rigby PM Benchmark Assessment Rewards Assessment Phonics for Reading Assessment Quick Reads Assessment
2	Opportunities for higher level thinking strategies	Train teachers on how to effectively model higher level thinking strategies.	Reading Coach Classroom teachers	Snap Shots and observations	Observation

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal #					
	In 2016-17, students will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017

	78%	80%	82%	84%	86%	
--	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	--

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5B:	By June 2013, we will increase the number of students making satisfactory progress in reading; 78% (282 out of 362) of students in the White subgroup, 64% (48 out of 129) of students in the Black subgroup, 74% (108 out of 146) of students in the Hispanic subgroup, and 89% (32 out of 36) students in the Asian subgroup.
---	---

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

78% (170 out of 219) of students in the White subgroup, 60% (45 out of 75) of students in the Black subgroup, 68% (54 out of 80) of students in the Hispanic subgroup, and 89% (17 out of 19) of students in the Asian Subgroup made satisfactory progress in reading according to the 2012 FCAT.	By June 2013, we will increase the number of students making satisfactory progress in reading; 78% (282 out of 362) of students in the White subgroup, 64% (48 out of 129) of students in the Black subgroup, 74% (108 out of 146) of students in the Hispanic subgroup, and 89% (32 out of 36) students in the Asian subgroup as measured by the 2013 Reading FCAT.
---	--

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 reading level may be significantly below grade level.	Students will participate in double and triple dose (Walk to Read) guided reading groups. Triumphs Tier 2 intervention will be utilized during reading instruction. After 6 weeks if success is not met, students will be placed in an appropriate Tier 3 intervention based on DAR results such as Rewards, Phonics for Reading, Quick Reads, Great Leaps, and/or Foundations	Reading Coach Team Leader Classroom Teacher	Continuous review of student data and progress monitoring.	Triumphs Intervention Assessment Foundations Assessment Great Leaps Assessment BAT 1 and BAT 2 DRA/Rigby PM Benchmark Assessment Rewards Assessment Phonics for Reading Assessment Quick Reads Assessment
2	Opportunities for higher level thinking strategies	To train teachers on how to effectively model higher level thinking strategies.	Reading Coach Classroom Teacher	Snap Shot and observations	iObservation

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	By June 2013, we will increase the number of ELL students proficient in reading to 52% (6 out of 12)
---	--

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

48% (5 out of 7) of ELL students made satisfactory progress in Reading on the 2012 FCAT.	By June 2013, we will increase the number of ELL students proficient in Reading to 52% (6 out of 12) as measured by the 2013 FCAT Reading results.
--	---

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	Difficulty understanding content vocabulary, increases complexity of text based on CCSS.	Provide explicit vocabulary instruction and authentic opportunities for reading and language use. Model and practice reading strategies. Supplement core curriculum instruction with curriculum classroom libraries for ELL	ESOL contact Classroom Teacher	Informal and Formal assessments	BAT scores FAIR scores Reading assessments

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	By June 2013, 57% (88 out of 155) of students with disabilities will achieve AYP.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
54% (42 out of 78) of students with Disabilities achieved AYP as measured by the 2012 Reading FCAT.	By June 2013, 57% (88 out of 155) of students with disabilities will achieve AYP as determined by the 2013 Reading FCAT.

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' disability may interfere with the learning process.	Understand and utilize the students' IEP.	LLT ESE Specialist	Weekly Assessments Parental Support Collaboration and Teaming	Treasures Weekly Assessments
2	Students may require excessive teacher time	Provide additional assistance through ESE Resource teacher	ESE Specialist	Weekly Assessments	Treasures Weekly Assessments

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	By June 2013, 45% (72 out of 161) of students on Free and Reduced Lunch will achieve AYP.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
42% (61 out of 147) of students on Free and Reduced Lunch achieved AYP as measured by the 2012 Reading FCAT.	By June 2013, 45% (72 out of 161) of students on Free and Reduced Lunch will achieve AYP as measured by the 2013 Reading FCAT.

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
	Limited parent	To build parent	Guidance Counselor	Tracking parent	Sign-in sheets

1	involvement	involvement through "Bring Your Parent to School" program-availability of parent resource room, increased communication, and parent trainings	Reading Coach	participation	
2	Inadequate exposure to reading materials	Provide a variety of informational text through available use of the media center, classroom libraries, Reading Resource room, and Book Exchange Program	Classroom Teacher Reading Coach	Digital Programs Weekly Tests	Treasures Assessments Running Records Teacher Observation

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
Text Complexity	K-2, Reading	Mari Crawford	K-2	Monthly, August through May	iObservation Activities implemented in the classrooms	Reading Coach Inservice Facilitator
CCSS A balance between informational text and literature	3-5, Reading	Merridith Mongone	3-5	Monthly, August through May	iObservation Activities implemented in the classrooms	Reading Coach Inservice Facilitator
Reading and Writing Connections	All grades	Nancy Klareich	K-5	Monthly, August through May	iObservation Activities implemented in the classrooms	Reading Coach Inservice Facilitator
FAIR	K-5	Nancy Klareich and district trainers	1-2, select 3-5	September, October	Data monitoring	Principal, Asst. Principal
Common Core State Standards (ELA)	1-2	District Trainers	1-2 teachers	September/October	iObservation	Principal, Asst. Principal, 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
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 Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. CELLA Goal #1:		By June 2013, 33% (3 out of 9) of students will score at the proficiency level in listening/speaking on the 2013 CELLA Assessment.			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
30% (6 out of 20) of students scored at the proficiency level in listening/speaking on the 2012 CELLA 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	Strong influence of primary language and home environment.	Build upon prior knowledge and existing language skills; incorporate familiar topics to introduce academic concepts	ESOL Contact Classroom Teacher	Formal and informal student data	Teacher observation and reports IPT-1 (Listening/Speaking) LEP Committee meetings
2	Difficulty understanding and using grade-level vocabulary and limited knowledge of English grammar and conventions	Provide explicit vocabulary instruction and authentic opportunities for social and academic language use across the curriculum.	ESOL Contact Classroom Teacher	Formal and informal student data	Teacher observation and reports IPT-1 (Listening/Speaking) LEP Committee meetings

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading. CELLA Goal #2:	23% (2 out of 9) of students will score at a proficient level in reading on the 2013 CELLA Assessment.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	
20% (4 out of 20) of students scored at a proficient level in reading on the 2012 CELLA 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	Difficulty understanding content-area/grade-level vocabulary; increased text complexity to meet CCSS	Provide explicit vocabulary instruction and authentic opportunities for language use; introduce, model, and practice reading strategies; supplement core curriculum materials with the classroom libraries for English Language Learners; utilize technological resources and data reports: Destination Riverdeep	Esol Contact Classroom Teacher Administration	Informal and formal student assessment data	IPT-1 & IPT-2 (Reading) LEP Committee meetings CELLA Benchmark data points (FAIR, BAT)

Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:	13% (1 out of 9) of students will achieve a proficient score in writing on the 2013 CELLA Assessment.
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:	
10% (2 out of 20) of students achieved a proficient score in writing on the 2012 CELLA 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	Difficulty understanding grade-level vocabulary and limited knowledge and application of English grammar and conventions	Provide explicit vocabulary instruction and incorporate language objectives across the content areas, provide on-going modeling of the writing process and authentic purposes for writing	ESOL Contact Classroom Teachers	Informal and formal student assessment data	Benchmark data points (writing prompts) IPT-1 & IPT-2 (Writing) LEP Committee meetings

CELLA Budget:

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

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

End of CELLA Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1a:	By June 2013, 29% (107 out of 369) of students will achieve proficiency in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
26% (107 out of 407) of students in grades 3-5 achieved proficiency as determined by the 2012 Math FCAT Assessment.	29% (107 out of 369) of students in grades 3-5 will achieve proficiency as determined by the 2013 FCAT Math 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	Lack of Problem Solving and higher level thinking strategies	Students will utilize math journals to explain and problem solve.	Classroom Teacher	Snap Shots, observations Utilization of Math journals	iObservation Big Idea Assessments Quality of work in journals
2	Computer Access	We are providing additional time during the school day for students to work on Destination Math.	Classroom Teachers	We will monitor the Destination usage reports.	Embedded Destination assessments
3	Go Math intervention knowledge	Train staff on the differentiation components of GO Math	Principal	Progress Monitoring	Grades, BAT, iObservations

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal # 1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	By June 2013 48% (177 out of 369) of students will achieve above proficiency in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
45% (183 out of 407) of students in grades 3-5 achieved above proficiency as determined by the 2012 FCAT Math Assessment.	By June 2013 48% (177 out of 369) of students in grades 3-5 will achieve above proficiency as determined by the 2013 FCAT Math 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	Teacher training for Go Math technology.	Use technology of Go Math Beyond program to reinforce benchmarks after reviewing data.	Principal	Snap Shots, observations, progress monitoring	Chapter tests iObservation
2	Comprehending word problems	Teachers will model written responses promoting higher level thinking skills for word problems and students will be given time to practice and solve.	Classroom Teachers Administration	Snap Shots, observations, progress monitoring	Chapter tests iObservation

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	By June 2013, 65% (167 out of 257) of students in grades 4-5 will achieve learning gains in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

62% (170 out of 275) of students in grades 4-5 achieved learning gains on the 2012 FCAT Math Assessment.			By June 2013, 65% (167 out of 257) of students in grades 4-5 will achieve learning gains as determined by the 2013 FCAT Math 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	Many students have difficulty understanding and explaining mathematical procedures and formulas.	Hands on manipulatives and a quick draw strategy will be utilized to introduce new math concepts. Utilize Destination Math online activities and train students to use math reference sheet.	Team Leader Classroom Teacher	During weekly grade level team meetings, student data will be analyzed and strategies will be discussed to differentiate instruction. Observations will be conducted during the 60 minute math block.	Formative Chapter Assessments BAT 1 and BAT 2 iObservation
2	Students have difficulty with auditory instruction.	Provide sensory support using manipulatives, environmental print (charts, graphs, tables). Picture support and quick draw will be used during math instruction. Different sensory modalities will be infused into daily math lessons.	Classroom Teacher	Quarterly Go Math Assessments and BAT 1 and BAT 2 will be utilized to determine progress. Teachers will plan for different learning styles as noted in daily lesson plans.	Go Math Assessments BAT 1 and BAT 2 iObservation

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

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

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	By June 2013, 51% (33 out of 64) of students in the lowest 25% will achieve learning gains.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

48% (35 out of 72) of students in the lowest 25% achieved learning gains as measured by the 2012 FCAT Math Assessment.	By June 2013, 51% (33 out of 64) of students in the lowest 25% will achieve learning gains as measured by the 2013 FCAT Math 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	Low reading levels impact students' ability to complete mathematical problem solving questions.	Infuse math vocabulary into word banks and incorporate writing into problem solving lessons.	Reading Coach Classroom Teacher	Continuously monitor progress of students in the lowest 25%.	Formative Chapter Assessments Math Big Idea Assessments
2	Difficulty understanding problems requiring Higher Level thinking.	Math journals, Grab and Go centers, Writing throughout the curriculum	Reading Coach Classroom Teacher	Monitoring of daily work	Chapter Assessments Big Idea Assessments

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.		Elementary School Mathematics Goal # In 2016-17, students will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	74%	77%	79%	81%	84%	

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

5B. Student subgroups by ethnicity (White, Black, Hispanic, Asian, American Indian) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5B:	By June 2013, we will increase the number of students making satisfactory progress in reading: 80% (289 out of 362) of students in the White Subgroup, 62% (80 out of 129) of students in the Black Subgroup, 73% (106 out of 146) of students in the Hispanic Subgroup, and 74% (26 out of 36) students in the Asian Subgroup.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
76% (166 out of 219) of students in the White Subgroup, 59% (44 out of 75) of students in the Black Subgroup, 70% (56 out of 80) of students in the Hispanic Subgroup, and 74% (14 out of 19) of students in the Asian Subgroup made satisfactory progress in mathematics according to the FCAT 2012 Assessment.	By June 2013, we will increase the number of students making satisfactory progress in reading: 80% (289 out of 362) of students in the White Subgroup, 62% (80 out of 129) of students in the Black Subgroup, 73% (106 out of 146) of students in the Hispanic Subgroup, and 74% (26 out of 36) students in the Asian Subgroup will make satisfactory progress on the 2013 Math FCAT Assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students may have difficulty understanding math vocabulary.	Vocabulary instructional strategies will be utilized, such as creating graphic representations into words. Students will also have the opportunity to create math journals to write questions and justify answers using math vocabulary.	Team Leader	Teachers will utilize Go Math assessments throughout daily instruction. Observations focusing on instruction and the needs of all learners.	Go Math Assessments iObservation

2	Students may have difficulty making connections and solving problems.	Teachers will use appropriate instructional strategies such as engaging in dialogue, graphical displays, use of tables, concrete or pictorial representations, verbal and written words.	Team Leader	On-going progress monitoring weekly will take place throughout the year. Observations focusing on instruction and the needs of all learners.	Go Math Assessments iObservation data focusing on instruction and the needs of all learners.
3	Due to budget cuts, loss of additional support personnel for interventions.	Team teaching among teachers. Classroom teachers will implement ability grouping (low, middle, high).	Team Leader	Data will be disaggregated during weekly team meetings.	Go Math Assessments EOY assessment BAT 1 and BAT 2

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	By June 2013 we will increase the number of ELL students making satisfactory progress in math to 54% (6 out of 12)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
52% (3 out of 7) of ELL students made satisfactory progress in math based on the 2012 Math FCAT.	By June 2013 we will increase the number of ELL students making satisfactory progress in math to 54% (6 out of 12) based on the Math FCAT 2013 data.

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 may have difficulty understanding math vocabulary and reading math word problems.	Provide explicit vocabulary instruction (visual and auditory) and authentic opportunities for vocabulary use in math problem solving activities	ESOL contact Classroom Teacher	Informal and Formal assessments	Go Math Big Idea assessments BAT Assessments

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5D:	By June 2013, 66% (102 out of 155) of our Students With Disabilities will make satisfactory progress in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
63% (49 out of 78) of Students With Disabilities achieved AYP as measured by the 2012 FCAT Math Assessment.	By June 2013, 66%(102 out of 155) of Students With Disabilities will make satisfactory progress in mathematics as measured by the 2013 FCAT Math Assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	Students do not have prior knowledge of mathematical concepts.	Teachers will need to include instructional strategies such as modeling math literature,	Math Cadre Team Leader	On-going will be utilized to determine progress. IEP's will be monitored throughout the year to	Go Math Assessments BAT 1 and BAT 2

1		think alouds, peer mentoring, picture representations and real life math environmental print.		determine instructional strategies and progress.	
2	Students have difficulty with auditory instruction.	Provide sensory support using manipulatives, environmental print (charts, graphs, tables). Picture support and quick draw will be used during math instruction. Different sensory modalities will be infused into daily math lessons.	Team Leader	IEP's will be monitored throughout the year to determine instructional strategies and progress. Observations focusing on instruction and the needs of all learners. On-going assessments will be utilized to monitor progress.	Go Math Assessments BAT 1 and BAT 2 iObservation data focusing on instruction and the needs of all learners. Administration Observation

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	By June 2013, 43% (69 out of 161) of students on Free and Reduced Lunch will make satisfactory progress in mathematics.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
40% (58 out of 147) of students on Free and Reduced Lunch made satisfactory progress in mathematics as measured by the 2012 FCAT Math Assessment.	By June 2013, 43% (69 out of 161) of students on Free and Reduced Lunch will make satisfactory progress in mathematics as measured by the 2013 FCAT Math 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	Not all students have access to on-line interventions at home.	Teachers will provide on-line time at school for students to access intervention technology in the classroom and computer lab.	Team Leader Math Cadre	Progress will be monitored on a weekly basis to track specific skills.	Destination Math Big Idea Assessments BAT scores
2	Meeting the needs of all students and bridging the achievement gap.	Goal setting and progress monitoring with students. Continuous monitoring through CPST, providing Tier 2 and 3 intervention as needed.	Principal Assistant Principal Reading Coach Rtl Team	Monthly review of data MTSS/Rtl	BASIS Virtual Counselor

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
Soar to Success	K-5	Reading Coach	K-5 Instructional Staff	October 16, 2012	Progress Monitoring of data	Principal, Asst. Principal

Go Math Intervention	K-5	Reading Coach	K-5 instructional Staff	October 2, 2012	Observations, Progress Monitoring, Lesson Plan Checks	Principal, Asst. Principal
Destination Learning Math	All grades	Reading Coach	New Students	September 25, 2012	Data Reports	Principal, Asst. Principal

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
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Rocky Review Math	Personnel to tutor after school	Accountability Dollars	\$1,000.00
			Subtotal: \$1,000.00
			Grand Total: \$1,000.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.		By June 2013, 40% (60 of 150) of students in grade 5 will achieve proficiency in science.			
Science Goal #1a:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
37% (47 of 128) of students in grade 5 achieved proficiency as measured by the 2012 Science FCAT.		By June 2013, 40% (60 of 150) of students in grade 5 will achieve proficiency as measured by the 2013 Science FCAT.			
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	Reading and writing levels of students may be below grade level.	Students will write daily in science journals to enhance understanding of scientific concepts.	Team Leader Classroom Teacher	Sharing samples of science journals during grade level team meetings. Observations of	Minutes of grade level meetings iObservation

		Students will read non-fiction books on their reading level during independent reading time.		students during independent reading time	
2	Time is needed to plan and organize lessons and materials to provide for differentiated instruction	Grade level teams will participate in a rotation, each teacher will become an expert in one area and teach each class through the rotation	Team Leader	Classroom assessment data will be analyzed and discussed during team meetings	Classroom assessment data Team meeting minutes
3	Teacher knowledge of Science content	Teachers will be responsible for one Science unit. Students will rotate amongst teachers	Team Leader	iObservations, team meetings	Data chats iObservation

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	By June 2013, 14% (21 out of 150) of students will achieve above proficiency in science.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
11% (14 out of 128) of students in grade 5 achieved above proficiency as measured by the 2012 Science FCAT.	By June 2013, 14% (21 out of 150) of students will achieve above proficiency as measured by the 2013 Science FCAT.

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
	Time needed to plan and organize lessons and materials to provide for differentiated	Monthly grade level team meetings will focus on planning scientific experiments using the Delta	Team Leader classroom Teacher	Classroom assessment data will be disaggregated and analyzed by grade level teams.	Classroom Assessment Data iObservation data

1	instruction.	curriculum.		Observations focusing on instruction and the needs of all learners. Feedback with follow-up .	
2	Abundance of scientific concepts and curriculum for teachers to learn and be able to teach with expertise	Grade level teams will participate in a rotation, each teacher will become an "expert" in one strand and teach each class through the rotation	Team Leader Classroom Teachers	Classroom assessment data will be analyzed and discussed during team meetings Classroom Observations	Classroom assessment data iObservation

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

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

Science Goal #2b:

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Science Journals	K-5	District Trainers	K-5	January, 2013	Observations	Science Cadre
Science Fusion	K-5	Grade level trainers	New K-5 teachers	August, 2013	iObservation	Principal, Asst. Principal

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
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 Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3.0 and higher in writing. Writing Goal #1a:	By June 2013, 91% (97 out of 107) of students in fourth grade will achieve a Level 4.0 and higher.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
88% (133 of 151) of students in fourth grade achieved an FCAT Level 3.0 and higher as measured by the 2012 FCAT Writes.	By June 2013, 91% (97 out of 107) of students in fourth grade will achieve a Level 3.0 and higher as measured by the 2013 FCAT Writes.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Time constraints; more time must be allotted for writing.	Students will have opportunities for writing across the curriculum, based on CCSS.	Administration Team Leader	Writing samples will be analyzed quarterly and during articulation, Utilize classroom observations to provide feedback to teachers	Writing in all areas Writing pieces Writing Response Logs iObservation Data Writing Prompts
2	Teacher training for new writing standards	Teachers will be trained on the new standards and how to incorporate them into their daily writing lessons	Reading Coach Team Leaders	Lessons incorporate new standards	iObservation data
3	Knowledge of CCSS	PLC-writing across all content area	Leadership Team	iObservation PLC Agenda	iObservation Data PLC Feedback
4	Continuity amongst the grade levels	Vertical planning and use of Instructional Focus Calendars	Team Leaders Administration	iObservation	Monthly writing prompts

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:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Read Like a Writer, Write Like an Investigative Reporter PLC (CCSS Reading & Writing Connection)	K-5	Klareich, Mongone, Crawford, Clark	K-5 instructional staff	Monthly	iObservation	Principal, Asst. Principal

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
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 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:	By June 2013, the expected attendance rate will be 97%.				
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:				
The 2012 attendance rate is 96%.	By June 2013, the expected attendance rate will be 97%.				
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)				
The 2012 current number of students with excessive absences is 32.	By June 2013, the expected number of students with excessive absences will not exceed 25.				
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)				
The 2012 current number of students with excessive tardies is 82.	By June 2013, the expected number of students with excessive tardies will not exceed 75.				
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 with excessive absences miss instructional time.	Discussions at Open House focusing on the importance of being at school for instruction. Written communication to parents and phone calls home when students are absent	Classroom Teacher Guidance Counselor	Attendance reports will be pulled on a quarterly basis and parents will be contacted as necessary.	School Attendance Reports
2	Tardy students miss instructional time	Students arriving early can read, "Begin With A Book" program starts at 7:30 and ends at the first bell	Reading Coach Administration	Students that attend Begin With A Book on a regular basis will be in class on time.	Participation and Tardy records

(PLC) or PD Activity

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

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

Attendance Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			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:	By June 2013, the expected number of in-school suspensions will be 40.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
The 2012 total number of in-school suspensions is 54.	By June 2013, the expected number of in-school suspensions will be 40.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
The 2012 total number of students suspended in school is 28.	By June 2013, the expected number of students suspended in school will be 20.

2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions		2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions			
The 2012 number of out-of-school suspensions is 11.		By June 2013, the expected number of out-of-school suspensions will be 5.			
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School		2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School			
The 2012 total number of out of school suspensions is 9.		By June 2013, the expected number of students suspended out of school will be 5.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Suspended students miss critical instruction.	The CHAMP's classroom management strategy with appropriate and aligned strategies will continue to be used school-wide to reduce disruptive behavior.	Assistant Principal	Classroom Observation	CHAMP's Rubric and the Basic 5.

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC,subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g. , early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
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
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00

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

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

1. Parent Involvement Parent Involvement Goal #1: <i>*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.</i>	By June 2013, 53% (357) of Riverside students had their families participate in at least activities or more.
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:	2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:
At least 50% (388) of Riverside students had their families participate in at least two activities during the 2011-2012 school year.	By June 2013, Riverside's goal is to have at least 53% or more of Riverside families to participate in at least two activities or more.

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	Parents are not able to attend night meetings because of child care and work schedules.	We will provide child care for parents who attend the meetings.	Assistant Principal	Attendance will be taken at night activities.	Attendance Log
2	Not all parents are able to attend PTO/SAC/SAF meetings.	PTO and SAC meetings will be held after school.	PTO and SAC Chair Administration	Attendance will be taken at each meeting.	Attendance Logs
3	City events/sports games	Plan around scheduled events.	Assistant Principal	Attendance Logs, Survey of End at Year	Sign in sheet

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

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

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

Parent Involvement Budget:

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

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

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

Based on the analysis of school data, identify and define areas in need of improvement:					
1. STEM STEM Goal #1:			Technology will be used to integrate science, math, reading and 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 computers for student use	We broke up computer carts for individual class use. This gives students the opportunity to access Destination Reading/Math in class on a daily basis. Also opened a computer lab for daily use.	Principal Assistant Principal	Monitor minutes for Destination Reading/Math	Destination Reports
2	Lack of teacher understanding of STEM based learning and application with technology.	The fifth grade team will serve as the pilot for the implementation of concepts with technology, learning about STEM through the zone.	Teachers Administration Support Team	Data Chats Classroom Observation	iObservation

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Mathematics	Rocky Review Math	Personnel to tutor after school	Accountability Dollars	\$1,000.00
				Subtotal: \$1,000.00
				Grand Total: \$1,000.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

No Attachment (Uploaded on 9/9/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
We will be having after school math intervention small group clubs for struggling math students. The clubs will differentiate math curriculum to meet individual needs of the students. Students will be in flexible groupings to build skills in a variety of areas of need.	\$1,000.00

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

The activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year will include the following: Discuss ways to raise funds, reviewing the SIP, school beautification, increasing technology in the school, student achievement, and safety.

AYP DATA

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

SCHOOL GRADE DATA

No Data Found

Broward School District RIVERSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	92%	90%	100%	63%	345	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	73%	61%			134	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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?	64% (YES)	56% (YES)			120	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					599	
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 RIVERSIDE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	88%	89%	97%	70%	344	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	71%	67%			138	3 ways to make gains: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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?	72% (YES)	59% (YES)			131	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					613	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested