

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: WESTCHESTER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Broward

Principal: Melissa Geraine

SAC Chair: Mary Ann Nixon

Superintendent: Robert Runcie

Date of School Board Approval: December 4, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/22/2012

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	Melissa Geraine	Elementary Education 1 - 6 and Educational Leadership all levels	3	7	<p>2011-2012 Westchester Elementary Grade A: Reading: 28% of students scored Level 3 and 52% of students scored at or above a level 4 Mathematics: 31% scored level 3, 42% scored at or above level 5. Writing: 92% scored level 3 or higher Science: 39% scored level 3, and 22% scored level 4 or higher</p> <p>2010-2011 Westchester Elementary Grade A: 88% of students reading at or above grade level and 90% of students at or above grade level in Math, 96% of students met state requirements in Writing, and 68% of students were at or above grade level in Science. 2010-2011 met AYP in all subgroups except Black students in Math and Economically Disadvantage students in Reading.</p>
					<p>2011-2012 Westchester Elementary Grade A: Reading: 28% of students scored Level 3</p>

Assis Principal	Avis Goodman	Educational Leadership all levels Elementary Education 1-6	8	8	<p>and 52% of students scored at or above a level 4 Mathematics: 31% scored level 3, 42% scored at or above level 5. Writing: 92% scored level 3 or higher Science: 39% scored level 3, and 22% scored level 4 or higher</p> <p>2010-2011 Westchester Elementary Grade A: 88% of students reading at or above grade level and 90% of students at or above grade level in Math, 96% of students met state requirements in Writing, and 68% of students were at or above grade level in Science. 2010-2011 met AYP in all subgroups except Black students in Math and Economically Disadvantage students in Reading. 2009-2010 Grade A, met AYP 89% Proficient in Reading, 89% Proficient in Math, 93% Proficient in Writing, 60% Proficient in Science. 74% made Learning gains in Reading, 71% Learning gains in math, 63% of lowest 25% in Reading made gains and 71% of the lowest 25% made gains in Math.</p>
-----------------	--------------	---	---	---	---

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	Kristina Watson	Bachelor in Elementary Education Master in Curriculum and Instruction National Board Certified Teacher Elementary Education Certification 1-6 Reading Endorsement	12	3	<p>2011-2012 Westchester Elementary Grade A: Reading: 28% of students scored Level 3 and 52% of students scored at or above a level 4 Mathematics: 31% scored level 3, 42% scored at or above level 5. Writing: 92% scored level 3 or higher Science: 39% scored level 3, and 22% scored level 4 or higher</p> <p>2010-2011 Westchester Elementary Grade A: 88% of students reading at or above grade level and 90% of students at or above grade level in Math, 96% of students met state requirements in Writing, and 68% of students were at or above grade level in Science. 2010-2011 met AYP in all subgroups except Black students in Math and Economically Disadvantage students in Reading. 2009-2010 Grade A, met AYP 89% Proficient in Reading, 89% Proficient in Math, 93% Proficient in Writing, 60% Proficient in Science. 74% made Learning gains in Reading, 71% Learning gains in math, 63% of lowest 25% in Reading made gains and 71% of the lowest 25% made gains in Math.</p>

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	New educators receive support from a highly qualified mentor, Administrators, and grade level Team Leader, and the program liaison.	NESS Liaison and Administration	On-going from August - June	
2	Continuous Professional Development: educators are encouraged to participate in professional development to help improve their craft or to receive strategies and techniques that will help them better perform their job.	Assistant Principal and support Staff	On-going from August - June	

3	Grade level teams and Team Leaders provide support to new educators or educators that are new to the grade level. Each team meets weekly. Team Leaders meet with Administration monthly and act as a liaison between administration and their team.	Team Leaders and Administration	on-going from August - June	
---	---	---------------------------------	-----------------------------	--

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
No data submitted	

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
72	2.8%(2)	18.1%(13)	51.4%(37)	27.8%(20)	41.7%(30)	100.0%(72)	5.6%(4)	8.3%(6)	91.7%(66)

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
Collette Hobbs	Arianna Valin and Dolly Garg	New teacher to school and new to grade level First Grade Team Leader will provide support in the area of curriculum	Mentor and mentee will meet and plan weekly. Mentee will participate in staff development activities and learning communities.
Diane Driscoll	Kailin Alex and Kimberly Moore	New teacher to school and new teacher to grade level Kindergarten Grade Team Leader will provide support in the area of curriculum	Mentor and mentee will meet and plan weekly. Mentee will participate in staff development activities and learning communities.
Stacie Poritz	Jasha Jean-Dorvil and Amber Dowling	Teacher new to grade level: Second Grade Team Leader will provide support	Mentor and mentee will meet and plan weekly. Mentee will participate in staff development activities and learning communities.
		New Teacher and veteran teacher new	

Adele Albahae	Gabrielle Chapel, Michelle Fentress and Melissa Fallon	to grade level: The team leader will provide support on curriculum and operations of Westchester.	Mentor and mentee will meet and plan weekly. Mentee will participate in staff development activities and learning communities.
Beth Reinhard	Elisa Campbell	Veteran teacher new to Westchester: The team leader will provide support regarding the operations of Westchester.	Mentor and mentee will meet and plan weekly. Mentee will participate in staff development activities and learning communities.
Doreen Klein	Craig Saban and Lisa Murphy	Veteran teachers that are new to the fifth grade team. The team leader will provide support on curriculum and the operations of the team.	Mentor and mentee will meet and plan weekly. Mentee will participate in staff development activities and learning communities.

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

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)

Identified level 1 and level 2 students receive remediation provided by our instructional staff. Students are also provided with after school FCAT tutorial camps. Identified students will receive additional services including but not limited to push in/push out small groups. These groups will be skill specific to provide intensive remediation. Supplemental materials will be provided based upon identified need.

Violence Prevention Programs

(G.R.A.D.E) Gang Resistance and Drug Education program is taught by the school's resource officer to all fifth grade students.

Grade level assemblies are also conducted to teach students the district's anti-bullying policy. Classroom anti-bullying lessons are also taught by the Guidance counselor.

Nutrition Programs

Third grade students participate in the "Commit to Be Fit" nutritional program, which is a wellness initiative designed to encourage better nutrition and increase physical activity. Commit to Be Fit offers a solution in the prevention of childhood obesity and promotion of overall wellness of children and families.

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

N/A

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

Grade levels conduct Career Day Programs and students have an opportunity to learn about different career options . Additionally, all fifth grade students participate in the Junior Achievement curriculum which is a 20-hour economic curriculum focused on career opportunities.

Job Training

N/A

Other

N/A

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Principal, Assistant Principal, ESE Specialist, Reading Specialist, ESE Teacher, Guidance Counselor, School Social Worker, School Psychologist, Speech Pathologist, Classroom teacher of identified student and/or selected general education who will provide information about the core curriculum and will collect student data to document the effectiveness of the interventions.

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

The RtI Team reorganizes our resources to provide support to the teacher(s) to increase student achievement. RtI is a process including the provision of systematic, research-based instruction and interventions for struggling learners. RtI intervention plans are designed, implemented, and monitored by the multi-disciplinary team of professionals. All interventions are data driven. The role of the school-based RtI Team is to meet on a regular basis to address teachers' concerns about struggling students and to help design intervention plans. The RtI Leadership Team will meet weekly in ESE office. The ESE Specialist will coordinate the meetings and ensure fidelity of implementation. The team will collaborate on students as they move through a tiered system. At the first tier, teachers will present their student cases, behavioral or academic, at their weekly team meetings with the intent of collaborating on interventions for student success. The teacher(s) will document the progress of the intervention. If the interventions do not lead to success after ample time, the student moves to the next tier. At Tier 2, the teacher(s) will present his/her student case along with the documented interventions to the RtI team. At this meeting, the team will assist with providing research-based interventions and/or support. Teachers will keep anecdotal records on the student and quantitative data will be collected to document the intervention implementation. The ESE specialist will schedule a follow up meeting in six weeks. During the six weeks, a team appointed designee will follow up with the student's progress. At the six-week meeting, the RtI Team will review the data and anecdotal to determine the next step. Depending upon the data situation, additional interventions and support can be suggested or the student can move to Tier 3. At Tier 3, the process is intensified. A determination will be made to move forward with further evaluation, refer to the CORE team, or repeat a cycle of assistance and further interventions.

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

The RtI Leadership team will provide essential information regarding successful interventions and necessary assessment and resources that provide critical information and data trends. This information will help to frame student activities and/or staff actions in the development and modification of the school improvement plan.

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.

The RTI team looks at each student's profile to determine the referred student's area of weakness. The student's progress is tracked based on their needs. Data is also disaggregated to determine appropriate programs, placement, interventions, and accommodations. Data collected may include, Pre/Post Assessments, Mini-BATS, informal or formal observations, Progress Monitoring and Progress Network (PMRN), FCAT, DAR, RIGBY, FAIR data.

READING: Tier 1 students will participate in the Reading Benchmark Assessment Test given in November. Data provided from this test will drive our instructional focus calendar and provide ongoing student progress monitoring. Monthly Broward County Mini Reading Assessments will be administered and students identified as Tier II will receive small group instruction utilizing the Reading Series intervention system. Quick Reads will be utilized with these students and data will be tracked on the school's database. End of story and unit chapter tests will be given for the core reading series in grades K-5. Quarterly Diagnostic reports will be generated in Accelerated Reader by class. Data Analysis Assessments will be conducted three times per year for grades K-5. Students in grades 1-5 will engage in mini benchmark testing to determine progress on benchmark skills. Results will be used to assist in meeting individual student needs. Students in grades 3-5 will utilize Compass Odyssey and take Pre/Posttest. Teachers and administration will monitor Odyssey reports. Administration and the support staff will monitor teaching and learning by conducting classroom walk-throughs. In addition, administration will conduct quarterly data conferences with teachers regarding student achievement data. Tier III students will participate in small group lessons. Results from pre/post tests will be reviewed at monthly data chats. Students in grades 2 – 5 will also utilize Study Island, a web based program that test students on the Florida Standards and benchmarks.

MATH: Tier 1 students will participate in BAT II during November. All of the Go Math Assessments will be administered based on the District Instructional Focus Calendars. Students in grades 3-5 will utilize Compass Odyssey and take Pre and Post tests. Teachers will utilize school's data base for ongoing progress monitoring. Data base includes mini BATS, and GO Math Assessment results. Students in grade 5 will use FCAT Explorer Math . Tier II students will utilize the Go Math Intervention Program based on the student individual needs (Strategic or Intensive). Tier III students will utilize V-Math (Grades 4-5) and/or Content Academic Vocabulary System (Grades K-5) based on the individual students needs.

SCIENCE: BAT II is administered in November to all fifth grade students. Students will be assessed utilizing the FCAT Science mini-assessments as a guide, diagnostic, and remediation tools. Teachers will utilize school's database for ongoing progress monitoring including BAT data, Mini BAT results, and ongoing classroom assessments.

WRITING: All students will participate in monthly writing prompts. Results will be entered into school data base to be reviewed at Data Chats and to identify Tier II and III students.

BEHAVIOR: All staff will utilize Virtual Counselor to document referrals based on district Discipline matrix. Virtual Counselor is also used by Administrators to track the number of referrals, and suspensions. The use of Struggling Behavior Chart will be utilized by instructional staff as a resource. School is also implementing use of CHAMPS behavioral program.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

All teachers are participating in a refresher/review staff development on RtI on the second day of the preplanning week. Support will be provided throughout the year to teachers by RtI team. Also shared other resources with teachers such as Teacher's Guide to Behavioral Interventions by Wunderlich and Teacher's Resource Guide which includes common learning and behavior problems and suggestions for dealing with those issues. These resources are kept in Assistant Principal's and ESE Specialist Office for staff to utilize if needed.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Melissa Geraine - Principal, Avis Goodman - Assistant Principal, Kristina Watson - Reading Specialist, Linda Myers - Guidance Counselor, Wendy Merrill - ESE Specialist, Summer Leadership Team: Adele Albahae, Craig Saban, Beth Reinhard, Cathy Marwood, and Jean Planco

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

The literacy team will meet monthly to develop school wide literacy initiatives. Additionally, the team will facilitate professional development, mentoring new teachers, and assist in building school-wide capacity and literacy initiatives. They will help to develop goals in the School Improvement Plan, and will participate in and facilitate literacy focused Professional Learning Communities.

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

1. Participate actively in literacy focused Professional Learning Communities
2. Use data to analyze the effectiveness of instruction and to redesign instruction and resources to meet the student's instructional and intervention needs
3. Support the school wide implementation of the Comprehensive Core Reading Program and scientifically based reading instruction and strategies with fidelity
4. Participate in ongoing literacy dialogue with peers.
5. Create and share activities that promote literacy, School wide Accelerated Reader Program
6. Participate in classroom demonstrations and modeling of strategies.
7. Mentor other teachers and present staff development.

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.

*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:	The percentage of students mastering a level 3 and above will increase through the participation of a ninety minute uninterrupted reading block utilizing differentiated instruction. Our goal is to move 5% of Level 1 or 2 students to Level 3.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 28% (161/570) of students in grades 3-5 scored at Achievement Level 3 in Reading on FCAT 2.0	In 2013, 30% (171/570) of students in grades 3-5 will achieve proficiency (FCAT level 3) on FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students need to increase critical thinking skills to answer higher order questions.	Incorporate more complex questions into daily lessons.	Classroom teacher, Reading Coach, Administration	Student Data	2013 FCAT 2.0 and Teacher Assessments
2	Communicating school and individual student goals and expectations with all students and parents effectively	Provide individual "coaching" to review student goals and data; review school goals/expectations at all parent meeting and conferences.	Administrative Team; Leadership Instructional Coaches, and Classroom teachers	Data conferences, school wide database and Leadership meetings	2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading scores
3	Teachers' knowledge of Common Core	PLCs will address Common Core	Administration	Data Conferences	2013 FCAT 2.0 and Snpashots (Walkthroughs)

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:

<p>2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading.</p> <p>Reading Goal #2a:</p>	<p>The percentage of students mastering a level 4 or above will increase through an enriched literacy based curriculum. FCAT Explorer will be utilized. Small group instructional activities are implemented. Westchester utilizes the comprehensive core reading program</p> <p>Treasures to provide guidance to teachers in delivering differentiated instruction for students scoring FCAT Levels 4 or 5. Small group instructional activities are organized to meet the needs of advanced learners.</p> <p>Instructional delivery is planned to move from cognitively simple skills and strategies to more complex skills and strategies. Daily lessons for small group differentiated instruction revolve around using leveled materials to provide numerous practice opportunities on advanced levels.</p>
--	--

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

In 2012, 52.3% (298/570) of students achieved a Level 4 or 5 on FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.	The percentage of students scoring level 4 or 5 will increase to 60% (342/570) on 2013 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.
--	---

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of experience providing Enrichment opportunities	Enrichment opportunities need to be increased. PLCs on Differentiated Instruction	Reading Specialist and Administration	Snapshots (Walkthroughs) and Data Conferences and school wide database	Mini BATs District BAT 1 & 2
2	Students limited exposure to various literary genres such as: poetry, myths, and nonfiction	Through collaborative lesson planning and PLCs teachers will incorporate into IFCs. Teacher modeling of higher order thinking strategies. Students will read and analyze various genres through literature and integrating content materials as part of the reading program	Classroom teacher, Reading Specialist, and Administration	Classroom Observations, Data chats with teachers and students,	MiniBenchmarks, BAT, curriculum assessments, FCAT

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

<p>2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in reading.</p> <p>Reading Goal #2b:</p>	
--	--

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

--	--

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	The percentage of students making learning gains in Reading will increase through participation in 90 minute reading block utilizing strategies from Comprehensive Core Reading Plan.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
77% (287/371) of students made learning gains in Reading on 2012 FCAT 2.0 Reading.	In 2013, 80%(297/371) of students will make learning gains on FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Appropriate utilization of student data	Provide training on strategies that increase student achievement	Literacy Team and Administration	Data Conferences	Reading Assessments, BAT.
2	Differentiated Instruction during the 90 minute reading block.	Differentiated Instruction is implemented in the teacher-led group. The teacher will form small, flexible groups based on student data and observations.	Reading Specialist and Administration	Snapshots (Walkthroughs) will focus on evidence of flexible small group instruction.	Mini Assessments Treasures Assessments STAR Reading Reports

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following 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:	The percentage of students in the lowest 25% will increase through participation in 90 minute reading block, double dose, and participation in after school FCAT tutorial camps. Teachers will also differentiate instruction to meet the needs of the various levels.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
76.5% (65/85) of students in lowest 25% made learning gains in Reading on 2011 FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment	In 2013, 80% (68/85) of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on FCAT 2.0 Reading Assessment.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	All students may not be able to attend after school tutorials	Utilize support staff and paraprofessionals to give additional small group and one on one instruction to students.	Literacy Team, Reading Specialist and Administration	Data conferences, school database and classroom walkthroughs	BAT, mini BATS and classroom walkthroughs
2	Providing Differentiated Instruction during 90 minute Reading Block	Differentiated Instruction during the 90+ minute reading block. Differentiated Instruction is implemented in the teacher-led group. The teacher will form small, flexible groups based on student data and observations.	Reading Specialist and Administration	Snapshots (Walkthroughs) will focus on evidence of flexible small group instruction.	Mini Assessments Treasures Assessments FAIR and STAR Reading Reports

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Reading Goal #					
	In six years Westchester will reduce our achievement gap by 50%. The AMO in Reading by year 2017 will be 88%					
5A :						
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:	The number of students that did not make satisfactory progress in reading will decrease in each subgroup through the use of an enriched literacy based curriculum which utilizes: chapter books, small group instruction with differentiated instruction, and technology based computer programs.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
As of June 2012, 16% (38/242) of subgroup White did not make satisfactory progress in reading. As of June 2012, 29% (36/124) of subgroup Black did not make satisfactory progress in reading.	June 2013, only 10% (24/242) of Whites not making satisfactory progress in reading. As of June 2013 only 19% (24/124) of Blacks not making satisfactory progress in reading.

As of June 2012, 21% (33/155) of subgroup Hispanic did not make satisfactory progress in reading. Asia: N/A American Indian: N/A	As of June 2013 only 15%(23/155) of Hispanics not making satisfactory progress in reading. American Indian: N/A Asian: 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	Differentiated Instruction during the 90 minute reading block.	Differentiated Instruction is implemented in the teacher-led group. The teacher will form small,flexible groups based on student data and observations.	Administration	Snapshots (Walkthroughs) will focus on evidence of flexible small group instruction.	Treasures Assessments STAR Reading Reports
2	Appropriate utilization of student data	Provide training on strategies that increase student achievement and Common Core	Administration and Literacy Team.	Data Conferences	Reading Assessments, such as BAT, Chapter and Unit Test

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	The percentage of English Language Learners not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease through the participation of a ninety minute uninterrupted reading block utilizing differentiated instruction, and school wide reading strategies.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
As of June 2012, 57.90% (11/19) of English Language Learners (ELL) students did not make satisfactory progress in Reading as evident on FCAT Reading 2.0.	By June 2013 the number of ELL students not making progress in Reading will decrease from 57.90% (11/19) to 30% (6/19)%

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 dose 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 BAT 1 and BAT 2, RIGBY, DRA
2	Students reading level may be significantly below grade level.	Students will participate in double dose 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	Reading Coach, Team Leader, Classroom Teacher	Continuous review of student data and progress monitoring	Triumphs Intervention BAT 1 and BAT 2, RIGBY, DRA

	Rewards, Phonics for Reading, Quick Reads, Great Leaps, and/or Foundations		
--	--	--	--

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

5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5D:	The percentage of students with disabilities not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease through the participation of a ninety minute uninterrupted reading block utilizing differentiated instruction, school wide reading strategies, and the push in/ pull out model intervention.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
As of June 2012, 64.80% (35/54) of students with disabilities did not make satisfactory progress in Reading.	As of June 2013, the number of students with disabilities not making progress in reading will decrease from 64.80% to 55% (30/54) on FCAT 2.0 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' 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 Reading Specialist Administration	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:	The percentage of Economically disadvantage students not making satisfactory progress in reading will decrease through the participation of a ninety minute uninterrupted reading block utilizing differentiated instruction, and school wide reading strategies.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
As of June 2012, 28.60% (71/248) of Economically Disadvantaged students did not make satisfactory progress in reading on FCAT 2.0	By June 2013, the number of Economically Disadvantaged students that will not make satisfactory progress in reading will decrease from 28.60% to 20% (50/248) on 2013 FCAT 2.0

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Teachers training in differentiated instruction	Teachers sharing best practices and PLCs	Administration, and Literacy Team	Data conferences	mini BATS, BAT, end of unit test, end of chapter test.
2	Personnel to provide push-in/pullout remediation groups	common school wide reading block during this time there are no Specials and we will utilize Specials teachers to give additional support in Reading groups.	Administration	Weekly CWT to monitor small group instruction and data chats with individual teachers and teams.	Chapter test, mini BATS, unit test, RIGBY, and other reading assessments
	Student commitment and motivation to Accelerated Reader	Increase incentives for participation in program and inform and remind	Teachers, Administrators and Tech Specialist	Accelerated Reader reports, Reading logs	Accelerated Reader reports, Reading logs

3	Program	parents of program during Open House, Reading Night and through school's newsletter and website.			
4	Staff knowledge of how to use diagnostic assessment data to determine appropriate interventions for reading.	Staff development and/or PLC will be provided	ESE Specialist and Support Staff	Follow Up Activities	Bi-Mini Assessments DAR Assessments
5	The impact of a student's disabilities on the specific areas of Reading.	Use of diagnostic assessment data to determine appropriate interventions. Provide daily instruction in research based multi sensory reading program.	ESE Specialist Reading Specialist	Mini Assessments DAR Assessments	Bi-Weekly Mini Assessments

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core (Reading)	K - 5	Reading Coach	K-2	Ongoing August – June	Coaching and Modeling Teacher Observations	Reading Coach
FLKRS	K	Reading Coach	Kindergarten	August 24, 2012	PMRN FLKRS reports Data chats	Reading Coach
Word Wall Activities	K-5	Reading Coach	1-5 and Reading Intervention Teachers	September 6, 2012	Coaching and Modeling Teacher Observations	Reading Coach
Active Learning	K-5	Reading Coach	K-5 and Reading Intervention Teachers	September 13, 2012	Coaching and Modeling Teacher Observations	Reading Coach
Virtual Counselor/Data Warehouse (DWH)	K-5	Reading Coach	K-5 and Reading Intervention Teachers	Ongoing September 2012-June 2013	Data chats Virtual Counselor Data Warehouse	Reading Coach
DRA	Grades 1 -2	Team Leaders/ Mannarino and Horenstein	Grades 1 and 2 teachers Reading Teachers	September 13, 2012	Data chats Virtual Counselor	Reading Coach
Benchmark Rollout	Grades 3-5	Reading Coach	Teachers in grades 3-5	August 2012– June 2013	Coaching and Modeling Teacher Observations	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 Spring 2013, 50% (50 out of 103) of students will score at proficiency level in listening/speaking on 2013 CELLA Assessment.			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
46% (47 out of 103) of students scored at a 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 and classroom teacher	Formal and informal student data	Teacher observation and reports. IPT-1 (Listening/speaking) and LEP Committee meetings
2	Parent Involvement and attendance at ESOL district meetings and classes	Provide parents with notices/invitations in home language.	ESOL Contact	ESOL Contact and Teacher followup with parents	Spring CELLA
3	Students and parent knowledge of second language acquisition.	Teachers will use ESOL Matrix which includes ESOL strategies.	Administration and classroom teachers	Classroom walkthroughs	Spring CELLA
4	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 and classroom teacher	Formal and Informal student assessments/data	Teacher observations and reports. 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:		By Spring 2013, 35% (36 out of 103) of students will score at a proficient level in Reading on 2013 CELLA Assessment.			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:					
29% (30 out of 103) of students scored at a proficient level in Reading on 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 vocabulary instruction and authentic opportunities of language use; model and practice reading strategies, supplement core curriculum materials with classroom libraries for English Language Learners, also use technology resources.	ESOL Contact Administration Classroom teachers	Informal and formal student assessments and data	CELLA LEP Committee meetings IPT1 and IPT 2 (Reading) FAIR and 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:		By Spring 2013, 30% (31 out of 103) of students will score at proficiency level in Writing on 2013 CELLA Assessment.			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:					
27% (28 out of 103) of students scored at a proficiency level in Writing on 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 content areas, provide ongoing modeling of the writing process and provide use of language dictionaries.	ESOL Contact Classroom teachers	Informal and formal assessment data	BAT Writing Prompts LEP Committee meetings IPT1 and IPT 2 Spring CELLA

CELLA Budget:

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:	Teachers will provide Mathematics instruction using the Go Math Basal Series K-5. Teachers will follow district instructional focus calendars, which identifies specific grade level skills for daily instruction in Grades K-5. Word walls will be used to build math vocabulary skills in K-5. The percentage of students mastering a level 3 and above will increase through the participation in new math series and new math standards and through the use of differentiated instruction.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
30.60% (174/569) of students achieved a level 3 on FCAT Math Assessment.	In 2013, 40% (228/569) of students will achieve a level 3 on FCAT 2.0 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	Knowledge of GO Math intervention program	Staff training/best practices	Team Leaders and Administration	Progress Monitoring, iObservation	Chapter test, Big Idea Tests, BAT
2	Difficulty with application of problem solving strategies to solve one step and multi-step problems	Teachers in K-5 will use various strategies such as instructing students to draw a picture, act it out, work backwards and guess and check to solve word problems.	Leadership Instructional Team and Administration	teachers will review student math journals on a weekly basis	Mini BATS, Data chats will be scheduled based upon immediate needs. Student progress will be reviewed during quarterly data chats with administration, teachers and support staff
3	Communicating school and individual student goals and expectations with all students and parents effectively.	Provide individual "coaching" to review student goals and data, review school goals/expectations at all parent meetings and conferences.	Leadership Instructional Coaches and Administration	An increase in 2013 FCAT Math scores	2013 FCAT 2.0 Math scores

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:	Percentage of students achieving level 4 and above will increase through the use of the district's math series and enrichment activities. Computer programs, such as Riverdeep, FCAT Explorer, will be used to enhance and enrich math skills for high achieving students.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
42% (240/569) of students achieved a level 4 or above on 2012 FCAT Math Assessment.	In 2013, 60% (341/569) of students will achieve a level 4 or above on FCAT 2.0 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	Implementation of new math series and utilizing enrichment and supplemental materials	Go Math training and team planning	Administrative Leadership Team	Data Conferences and Math assessments and CWTs	Math Chapter Test and mini BATS
2	Practice needed to apply mathematics concepts	All 5th grade students will utilize FCAT Explorer Mathematics	Leadership Coaches and Administration	Monitoring and reviewing FCAT Explorer data and Data chats will be scheduled based upon immediate needs. Student progress will be reviewed during quarterly data chats with administration, teachers, and support staff	Mini BATs, Chapter Test and Unit test
3	Students do not have concrete understanding of concepts.	Teachers in grades K-5 will use Hands On instruction when introducing new concepts and will continue using manipulatives when teaching math.	Administration and Support Staff	CWT Focus: Are students using manipulatives with teacher guidance and modeling.	Mini BATs, chapter and unit assessments.

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

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:	Students will continue making learning gains in math through grouping students by level. The percentage of students making learning gains will increase to 82%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
77% (286/371) of students made learning gains in Math on 2012 FCAT Math Assessment.	In 2013, 82% (304/371) of students will make learning gains on FCAT 2.0 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	New Math Standards	Training on New generation standards	Administration and Support staff	Data conferences, and IFC and curriculum maps	Chapter test and mini BATS
2	Students do not have concrete understanding of concepts.	Teachers in grades K-5 will use Hands On instruction when introducing new concepts and will continue using manipulatives when teaching math.	Administration and Support Staff	CWT Focus: Are students using manipulatives with teacher guidance and modeling.	Mini BATs, chapter and unit assessments.
3	Practice needed to apply mathematics concepts	All 5th grade students will utilize FCAT Explorer Mathematics	Leadership Coaches and Administration	Monitoring and reviewing FCAT Explorer data and Data chats will be scheduled based upon immediate needs. Student progress will be reviewed during quarterly data chats with administration, teachers, and support staff	Mini BATs, Chapter Test and Unit test

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

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:	The percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains will continue to increase through small group instruction, differentiated instruction and FCAT tutorial camps.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
75.2 (72/96) of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in math on 2011 FCAT Math Assessment.	In 2013, 80% (77/96) of students in the lowest 25% will make learning gains on FCAT 2.0 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	Effectively utilizing data to create math groups	Training on utilizing student data to appropriately make small groups	Leadership Team and Administration	Data Conferences and classroom walkthroughs	Math Assessments
2	Gaps in prerequisite mathematics skills	Students will participate in small group Strategic or Intensive Intervention lessons of the GO MATH! RtI system. Students will alternate participation in small group instruction and GO Math online intervention lessons based on weaknesses identified during team data chats.	Administration, Support Staff and Instructional Leadership Coaches	Data Chats Biweekly CWT Focus: Evidence of implementation of Intervention lessons and online resources	GO MATH! Intervention Student work GO MATH online intervention report Mini Benchmark Assessments

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Elementary School Mathematics Goal #					
	In six year Westchester will reduce our achievement gap by 50%. By 2016-2017, Westchester will attain an AMO of					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	76	78	81	83	85	

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:	Students will continue making learning gains in math through grouping students by level.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
19.50% (47/241) of White students, 41.90% (52/124) of Black students, 30.30% (47/155) of Hispanic students, 3.80% (1/26) Asian students did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics.	By June 2013, only 15% (36/241) of White students, 35% (43/124) of Black students, 25% (39/155) of Hispanic students, and 0% of Asian students will not make satisfactory Progress on 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	Students do not have concrete understanding of concepts.	Teachers in grades K-5 will begin instruction of new concepts with Hands On focus lessons using manipulatives.	Leadership Instructional Coaches	CWT Focus on instruction-Hands on experiences; and Focus on the learner-Working with hands-on materials	Mini BATS
2	GO Math! Alternative Assessments Mini Benchmark Assessments	Teachers in K-5 will implement Calendar Math daily.	Leadership Instructional Coaches	CWT and Data chats	Go Math Assessments Mini Benchmark Assessments
3	Insufficient prerequisite skills necessary for the specific grade level	Students will participate in small group Strategic or Intensive Intervention lessons of the GO Math! RtI system. Students in K-5 will utilize Destination Math	Administration and Instructional Coaches	CWT Focus: Evidence of implementation of intervention lessons	GO Math! Alternative Assessments Mini Benchmark Assessments

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

5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5C:	Students will continue making learning gains in math through grouping students by level.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
52.60% (10/19) of ELL students did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics	The percentage of ELL students not making progress in math will decrease from 52% to 45% (8.5/19) on 2013 FCAT Math

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students do not have concrete understanding of concepts.	Teachers in grades K-5 will begin instruction of new concepts with Hands On focus lessons using manipulatives.	Leadership Instructional Coaches	CWT Focus on instruction-Hands on experiences; and Focus on the learner-Working with hands-on materials	Mini BATS and Chapter and Unit test
2	Insufficient prerequisite skills necessary for the specific grade level	Students will participate in small group Strategic or Intensive Intervention lessons of the GO Math! RtI system. Students in K-5 will utilize Destination Math	Administration and Instructional Coaches	CWT Focus: Evidence of implementation of intervention lessons GO Math!	Alternative Assessments Mini Benchmark 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:	Students will continue making learning gains in math through grouping students by level.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
66.70% (36/54) of Students with disabilities did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics.	60% (32/54) of students with disabilities will not make satisfactory progress in math which is a 6.70% decrease from 2012.

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	Insufficient prerequisite skills necessary for the specific grade level	Students will participate in small group Strategic or Intensive Intervention lessons of the GO Math! RtI system. Students in K-5 will utilize Destination Math.	Administration and Instructional Coaches	CWT Focus: Evidence of implementation of intervention lessons GO Math!	Alternative Assessments Mini Benchmark Assessments

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	Students will be grouped according to their level in math and will participate in small group instruction.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
38.3% (95/248) of Economically Disadvantaged students did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics.	There will be a decrease from 38% to 30% of Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in math on 2013 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 do not have concrete understanding of concepts.	Teachers in grades K-5 will begin instruction of new concepts with Hands On focus lessons using manipulatives.	Leadership Instructional Coaches	CWT Focus on instruction-Hands on experiences; and Focus on the learner-Working with hands-on materials	Mini BATS and Chapter and Unit test

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
GO MATH INTERVENTION	K - 5	Reading Specialist	K-5 Instructional Staff	October Planning Day	Observations, Progress Monitoring, Lesson Plan Checks	Principal and Assistant Principal

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Go Math Intervention	Utilizing expertise of Westchester staff	Instructional Staff	\$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 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:		The percentage of students demonstrating a level 3 will increase to 45% through the participation of daily science instruction aligned with hands on learning activities and participation in Science Specials every six days.			
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
38.70% (72/186) of students in grade 5 scored a level 3 on FCAT Science Assessment.		In 2013, 45%(84/186) of students in grade 5 will score a level 3 on FCAT Science Assessment.			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Accessing resources and materials for activities	Teachers are trained in utilization of BEEP to access lesson plans	Leadership Coaches and Administrators	Snapshots (walkthroughs) and data chats	science mini assessments and Science BAT.

		and activities for science.			
2	Teacher knowledge of performance tasks assessments	Implement hands on science activities based on on district's Instructional Focus Calendars.	Leadership Team and Administrators	Data Chats with team and instructional coaches.	chapter assessments and Delta Kits.

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:	The percentage of students mastering a level 4 or above on FCAT Science will increase through hands on activities and enrichment activities and project based learning and by participating in a Science special every six days.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
22% (41/186) of students achieved a level 4 or above on 2012 FCAT Science Assessment.	The percentage of students achieving a level 4 or above on FCAT Science will increase to 40% (74/186) on 2013 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	Technology training	Training on the use of BEEP and other technology resources such as laptop carts and Smart and Promethean Boards. Also student use of FCAT Explorer.	Administrators and Team Leader	Classroom Walkthroughs and data chats and use of school wide data base	Science FCAT and Science BAT and mini assessments and Program reports.
2	Insufficient background knowledge to spiral curriculum	All K to 5 students will receive science instruction aligned with the district IFCs.	Leadership Instructional Coaches	CWT Focus: Ensure learning objective is on target for instructional pacing guide and grade level standards	Mini Benchmark Assessments

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

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

Science Goal #2b:

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
No Data Submitted						

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:	The percentage of students demonstrating progress in writing will increase through the participation in a structured writing program. Writing curriculum will be spiraled from K-5 and instruction based on Sunshine State Standards and district writing plan using the Six Traits of Writing.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
In 2012, 91.90% (170/185) of students scored a Level 3.0 or higher on FCAT Writing.	96% (177/185) of students will score a level 3 or higher 2013 FCAT 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	Continuity amongst the grade levels	Vertical planning and use of Instructional Focus Calendars	Team Leaders and Administration	iObservation, lesson plans and and data conferences	Monthly writing prompts
2	Knowledge of CCSS	PLC-writing across all content areas	Leadership Team	iObservation	PLC notes

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
Common Core Reading and Writing Connection	K - 5	Reading Specialist and Literacy Team	Instructional staff monthly PLCs	Monthly	iObservation	Administration

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Common Core Reading/Writing Connection	using expertise of Westchester Staff	staff members facilitating workshops/PLCs	\$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:	The average daily attendance rate will to 98% through monitoring process by teachers, administration, and guidance services.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
The 2011 average daily attendance rate for students is 95.6.	96%

2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
Students with excessive absences in 2011 - 2012 was 43.	The number of students with excessive absences will decrease by 10% in 2012-2013.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
The number of students with excessive tardies for 2011 was 118.	The number of students with excessive tardies will decrease by 10% during 2012-2013 school year.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Cultural Diversity, many parents leave the country during times in the school year when there is no school in their native country. Also a transient community.	Students with excessive absences miss critical instructional time. Promote student achievement being correlated with attendance through educating parents through newsletters, website and parent conferences.	IMT, classroom teacher, administrators, school social worker	Review daily attendance report	Attendance reports through Data Warehouse

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

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

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

Attendance Budget:

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			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:	The number of students serving internal, external and alternative to suspensions will decrease in 2012-2013. The school as adopted CHAMPS as the school wide discipline plan.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
2012 Internal suspensions was 4.	Internal suspensions will decrease by 20% in 2012 - 2013.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
Total number of students serving internal suspensions during 2012 was 2.	The number of students serving internal suspensions in 2012-2013 will decrease by 50%
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
Total number of out of school suspensions for 2011-2012 was 12.	The total number of out of schools suspensions will decrease by 20% during 2012-2013.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
Total number of students serving out of school suspensions in 2011-2012 was 9.	In 2012-2013, the total number of students serving out of school suspensions will decrease by 50%.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Implementation of a school wide discipline plan	Teachers who are trained in CHAMPS will facilitate workshops to the staff (new teachers to Westchester)	Administrators will monitor. Workshop facilitated by district Prevention Programs Dept	Discipline Management system	Discipline Management System
2	Students displaying inappropriate behavior	Tier II Students will have individualized behavior plans that will provide interventions to	CORE Team	CORE Team meetings	Discipline Management System

		redirect negative behavior		
--	--	----------------------------	--	--

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
CHAMPS	All Grade levels	Teachers	all teachers new to Westchester	Preplanning week	Snapshots and monitoring of behavior referrals	Administration

Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Utilizing school staff	Teachers previously trained in CHAMPS.		\$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:

*Please refer to the percentage of parents who participated in school activities, duplicated or unduplicated.

By June 2013, 70% of parents will participate in decisions regarding their child's educational program as evidenced by attendance at conferences, Open House, PTA meetings and school sponsored events such as BINGO Night, Fall and Spring Book Fair, Reading Night and McTeacher Night at McDonalds.

2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:		2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:			
Based on data collected from Open House, Reading Night, BINGO Night, and other school events, 60% of parents participated in school related events.		During 2012-2013, 70% (820) of parents will participate in school related events as evidence by our attendance logs.			
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	Night conflicts	Do not schedule events on Wednesday Nights	Administration	surveys and attendance logs	attendance logs

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 integrated in Science, Reading, Math 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	Not enough computers for student use.	Distribute laptop carts equally amongst grade levels for sharing. This gives the students the opportunity to access internet based programs for all subject areas. Also more students can access AR, Destination Reading and Math.	Principal and Assistant Principal	Monitor/view reports of AR and Destination Reading/Math	AR Reports and Destination Reports
2	All classrooms are not SMART classrooms	Focusing on upgrading technology in all classrooms with document cameras and Smart boards. All PTA fundraisers have been slated for upgrading technology. We are upgrading by starting with intermediate grades and then primary.	Principal, Assistant Principal and Micro Tech	School inventory	inventory checklist
3	Lack of teacher understanding of STEM based learning and application with technology	Teachers attending tech trainings/staff development and PLCs	Administration	Data chats, classroom observations	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
Mathematics	Go Math Intervention	Utilizing expertise of Westchester staff	Instructional Staff	\$0.00
Writing	Common Core Reading/Writing Connection	using expertise of Westchester Staff	staff members facilitating workshops/PLCs	\$0.00
Suspension	Utilizing school staff	Teachers previously trained in CHAMPS.		\$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
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
				Grand Total: \$0.00

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

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.

Describe projected use of SAC funds	Amount
No data submitted	

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

SAC will hold monthly meetings. Each meeting is held on the last Tuesday of each month.

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 WESTCHESTER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	88%	90%	96%	68%	342	Writing and Science: Takes into account the % scoring 4.0 and above on Writing and the % scoring 3 and above on Science. Sometimes the District writing and/or science average is substituted for the writing and/or science component.
% of Students Making Learning Gains	70%	72%			142	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?	63% (YES)	73% (YES)			136	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					620	
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 WESTCHESTER ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	89%	89%	93%	60%	331	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	74%	71%			145	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?	63% (YES)	71% (YES)			134	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					610	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested