

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN



School Name: CHAPEL TRAIL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Broward

Principal: Teresa Lipkins

SAC Chair: Johanna Giunta

Superintendent: Robert Runcie

Date of School Board Approval: December 4, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/18/2012

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

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	Teresa Lipkins	MS Elementary Education School Principal (all levels) Educational Leadership	4	14	2012--School Grade A, 2011--School Grade A, 100% AYP Met. 2010--School Grade A, 100% AYP Met. 2009--School Grade A, 100% AYP Met. School Grade A, 100% AYP past 6 years
Assis Principal	Alisia Coachman-Williams	MS Florida Certification in Ed Leadership K-12	4	8	2012--School Grade A, 2011--School Grade A, 100% AYP Met. 2010--School Grade A, 100% AYP Met. 2009--School Grade A,

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	Johanna Giunta	Elementary Education M.S. Reading (December 2010)	8	3	8 Years A School, 7 years AYP 100% Met.

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	Continuous comprehensive professional development through the use of Professional Learning Communities and reflective instructional feedback based on Marzano's Art and Science of Teaching Framework. These Learning Communities empower teachers to collaboratively design PLC's that align to staff/ school targeted areas of need.	Principal Professional Development Committee Instructional Staff	Ongoing	

Non-Highly Effective Instructors

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

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

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

Staff Demographics

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

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

Total Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers	% of Teachers with 1-5 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading Endorsed Teachers	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
51	0.0%(0)	0.0%(0)	49.0%(25)	45.1%(23)	37.3%(19)	100.0%(51)	5.9%(3)	5.9%(3)	100.0%(51)

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
Geraldine Matthews -K	Susana Spencer, Michele Tse	New to the grade level	Team planning and assistance with lesson plans, curriculum, etc. Mentor is a veteran teacher and she is meeting with her weekly or more if needed to model and discuss best practices.
Marisela Lopez-1	Vicky Kimbro		
Patricia DellaPace-2	Karol Turco		
Lourdes Carrillo-3	Maria Marcos Dones		Team planning and assistance with lesson plans, curriculum, etc.

Yolanda Rodriguez-4	Marlene Warheit Kim Reynolds	New to the grade level	Mentor is a veteran teacher and she is meeting with her weekly or more if needed to model and discuss best practices.
Annemarie White-5	Nury Montano		
Rosie Garcia-5th grade Math Chair	Annmarie White	New to the grade level	Team planning and assistance with lesson plans, curriculum, etc. Mentor is a veteran teacher and she is meeting with her weekly or more if needed to model and discuss best practices.

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

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.

The MTSS team is comprised of Alisia Coachman Williams, Administration; Pat Rapplean, ESE Specialist; Johanna Giunta, Reading Coach and ELL contact; Esta Ross, Guidance Counselor; and Jacqueline Mendieta, School Psychologist. The classroom teacher assigned to the student who is being considered is also involved in the process. Esta Ross, Guidance will create the agendas and Pat Rapplean, ESE Specialist, will keep the minutes from the meetings.

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?

MTSS Leadership Team meets twice a month to discuss students who are in need of additional interventions, behaviorally and/or academically, and monitors their progress in response to the intervention(s). The MTSS Leadership Team works in collaboration with the Literacy Leadership Team and the Staff Development Committee to include staff development on MTSS and interventions that are often used in the MTSS process.

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?

Members of the MTSS team participate in the Professional Learning Communities and Vertical Planning Teams which develop progress monitoring points as a means to monitor individual student progress. THE MTSS Team assists in developing, reviewing, and monitoring the school improvement plan. This practice aligns with the strategies identified in our SIP in assisting the lowest quartile to meet learning gains.

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.

Data sources include DAR, FAIR, Go Math Big Ideas Tests, Benchmark Assessments 1 and 2, Mini-BATs, Wilson Foundations, Rigby, ORF's, monthly writing prompts, frequency charts and anecdotal. Data is managed in Excel, Chartdog, and BASIS.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Staff receives yearly training on the MTSS process.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Administration allows calendar time for the MTSS members to meet.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

The Literacy Leadership team is comprised of Johanna Giunta: reading coach and ELL Contact, Alisia Coachman-Williams: Assistant Principal, Roxana Gross: Teacher of the Gifted, and one or more representative from each grade level(to include

teachers of Exceptional Student Education) who have received district level training in Reading and Writing.

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

The LLT, acting as a school-wide vertical team, meets monthly to plan, develop, and monitor the literacy portion of the school improvement plan and to provide feedback to grade level teams for the implementation and delivery of instruction. The LLT also suggests staff development related to the goals in the school improvement plan.

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

The LLT will work with the Professional Development Team and Administration to plan staff development that focuses on implementation of Common Core Standards, FCAT 2.0, through small group instruction in reading and math as well as higher order thinking skills.

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% (118) of our students in grades 3-5 will perform at level 3 on the FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
As of June 2012, 28%(125) of our students in grades 3, 4, and 5 performed at Level 3 on the FCAT 2.0.	By June 2013, 29% (118) of our students in grades 3-5 will perform at level 3 on the 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	Increased scoring requirements of FCAT 2.0.	Reading: Increased exposure to higher text complexity passages in Reading. Math: Increased use of manipulatives and progress monitoring of skills taught	Classroom teachers LLT Vertical Planning Team Administration	Data analysis through progress monitoring and data chats	Beginning of Year Assessments, BAT1 and BAT2 Mock FCAT FCAT 2.0 results
2	As a result of the disaggregated data, the areas of needs improvement may not align with the timeline set forth in the IFC.	Implement the district's Instructional Focus Calendar (IFC) and incorporate strategies to address the needs as a result of the disaggregated data by differentiating instruction.	Administration Reading Coach Team Leaders	Administration will be aware of the IFC's upcoming focus and monitor implementation through data disaggregation and classroom walkthroughs.	Benchmark Assessments 1 and 2 Mini-BATs Classroom WalkThrough, Formative Assessments
3	Identify students who are predicted proficient at level three and above as indicated by the BAT scores, and provide differentiated instruction for maintenance and enrichment.	Identify students who are predicted proficient at level three and above as indicated by the BAT scores, and provide differentiated instruction for maintenance and enrichment	Administration Reading Coach Team Leaders	Data Chats, Disaggregation and analysis of Benchmark data	Benchmark Assessments 1 and 2, Mini-BATs
4	Teachers do not have availability of appropriate complex texts to support increased rigor of FCAT 2.0	Offer teachers training in identifying grade appropriate complex text and strategies for Close Reading. Purchase supplemental materials when possible.	Reading Coach LLT Vertical Planning Team Administration	Increased use of complex text in classroom instruction.	Data analysis and data chats.

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.	N/A
---	-----

Reading Goal #1b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	By June 2013, 50% (205) of our level 4 and 5 FCAT Reading students will demonstrate learning gains.
---	---

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

As of June 2012, 49% (215) of our 3, 4, and 5th, grade students performed at levels 4 and 5 on the FCAT Reading.	By June 2013, 54% (205) of our level 4 and 5 FCAT Reading students will demonstrate learning gains.
--	---

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Availability of appropriate complex texts to support increased rigor of FCAT 2.0	Offer teachers training in identifying grade appropriate complex text and strategies for Close Reading. Purchase supplemental materials when possible.	Reading Coach LLT Vertical Planning Team Administration	Increased use of complex text in classroom instruction.	Data analysis and data chats.
2	Increased cut-off scores for FCAT 2.0	Train teachers in new FCAT 2.0 Cut-off scores Monitor "bubble" students and offer additional support	Administration, Reading Coach, Team Leaders Classroom teachers	Classroom Walk Through Data Chats	Benchmark Assessments 1 and 2, Classroom Walk Through Mini-BATs Formative Assessments
3	Not all level 4 and 5 students can be in the Gifted/High Achievers classroom.	Provide common planning times for teachers of the gifted/high achievers classes to share lessons and enrichment strategies with their teams.	Administration, Reading Coach, PEP Teachers	Formative assessments, Classroom Walk Throughs, Data Chats, Team Planning	Benchmark Assessments, Projects, Classroom Walk Throughs

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, 77% (315) of students in grades 3, 4, and 5 will demonstrate learning gains on the Reading FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
As of June 2012, 73% (244) of students in grades 3, 4, and 5 demonstrated learning gains on the Reading FCAT.	By June 2013, 77% (315) of students in grades 3, 4, and 5 will demonstrate learning gains on the 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 lack the foundational skills necessary to read and comprehend complex text found on FCAT 2.0	Train teachers on remediation and scaffolding of foundational skills in reading and comprehending complex text.	Reading Coach Reading Vertical Planning Team Administration	Increased used of differentiation and small group instruction.	Data analysis of progress monitoring check-points
2	Students are not motivated to read independently at home	School will make books available for check out and promote AR Reading Program.	Classroom teachers Media specialist AR Team	AR progress monitoring program	Data analysis of progress monitoring check-points.

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

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

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, 77% (59) of our students in the lowest quartile in grades 3-5 will demonstrate learning gains in reading.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
As of June 2012, 73%(51) of the students in grades 3-5 in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading.	By June 2013, 77% (59) of our students in the lowest quartile in grades 3-5 will demonstrate learning gains in reading.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students promoted are not performing at current grade level expectations.	Students will be remediated through small group instruction, push-in and pull-out based on student specific needs.	Classroom teachers Reading Coach MTSS Administration	Progress monitoring check points.	BAT1- BAT2 Mock FCAT FCAT 2.0
2	Providing necessary push-in; pull out intervention programs for students in the RTI Process	Train paraprofessionals in selected scripted intervention programs to address needs of students. Invite lowest 25% to FCAT Camp.	Administration, Reading Coach, ESE Specialist, Classroom Teacher	MTSS Process	Assesments as determined by the MTSS and teacher data chats.

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 we will reduce the achievement gap to 13%.					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	27%					

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:	Each Ethnic subgroup will decrease by 2%.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

19% of white students not making satisfactory progress in reading. 33% Of black students not making satisfactory progress in reading.24% of Hispanics did not make satisfactory progress in reading.			17% of white students not making satisfactory progress in reading. 31% Of black students not making satisfactory progress in reading.22% of Hispanics did not make satisfactory progress in reading.		
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of data available due to state waiver	Identify students in each subgroup and monitor their progress. Implement appropriate interventions to address student individual needs.	Classroom teachers Reading Coach Administration	Progress monitoring of check-point data	BAT1 & BAT2 FAIR Mid and EOY tests

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following subgroup:	
5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5C:	Decrease the number of students not make satisfactory progress in reading by 2% (61%).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
63% of the ELL students did not make satisfactory progress in reading.	Decrease the number of students not make satisfactory progress in reading by 2% (61%).

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 mastery of skills necessary for school success.	Teachers will implement ESOL teaching strategies to scaffold language acquisition.	ESOL Contact Classroom teachers Administration	Student progress on check-point assessments	IPT and CELLA

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:	Decrease the number of students not make satisfactory progress in reading by 2% (43%).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
45% of the students with disabilities did not make satisfactory progress in reading.	Decrease the number of students not make satisfactory progress in reading by 2% (43%).

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	FCAT 2.0 expectations do not reflect student present level of performance	Scaffold instruction for SWD to close achievements gaps	Classroom Teachers ESE specialist	Analysis of progress monitoring check points	Data from Big Idea tests, Mini BATs, Unit tests, BAT1 and BAT2

2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
---	----	----	----	----	----

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in reading. Reading Goal #5E:	Decrease the number of students not make satisfactory progress in reading by 2% (27%).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
29% economically disadvantage did not make satisfactory progress in reading.	Decrease the number of students not make satisfactory progress in reading by 2% (27%).

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack exposure to experiences that build background knowledge.	Teachers will access and build background knowledge when introducing new material.	Classroom teacher Vertical planning teams Administration	Progress monitoring of checkpoint data	Classroom and District Assessments
2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Content Specific Vertical Planning teams to address staff needs as it relates to CCSS and NGSS.	All grade levels	Reading and Math Coaches	Grade level teacher representative	One-time per month	Teacher feedback Progress monitoring	Reading coaches Administration

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Increase non-fiction reading across grade level.	Non-fictional reading materials for all grade levels	Fund raising, school budget(non-state adopted), media budget	\$2,500.00
Provide after school FCAT reading camp to lowest quartile students	Supplemental FCAT materials	School accountability	\$1,000.00
			Subtotal: \$3,500.00

Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
To motivate students to read for recreation and independently.	AR web-based program	PTA	\$3,500.00
			Subtotal: \$3,500.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
To incorporate increased text complexity and integrate Common Core State Standard	Brainspark, Defining the core, FCRR	N/A	\$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: \$7,000.00

End of Reading Goals

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA) Goals

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

Students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.					
1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking.		55% of our students will meet proficiency in listening and speaking			
CELLA Goal #1:					
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
53% of our students meet proficiency in listening and speaking					
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of resources in the student's native language	Contact ESOL department to obtain materials in student's native language such as but not limited to Japanese and Urdu	ESOL Contact Classroom teacher Administration	Development of English proficiency	IPT, CELLA, FCAT

Students read in English at grade level text in a manner similar to non-ELL students.	
2. Students scoring proficient in reading.	69% of the students will score proficient in reading.
CELLA Goal #2:	
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:	
67% of student scored proficient in reading	

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Student's lack academic reading language	Scaffold small group instruction, content specific vocabulary	Classroom teacher ESOL contact Administration	Progress monitoring tool	IPT, CELLA, FCAT

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

25% will score proficient in writing

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

20% of the student's scored proficiency in writing

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Difficulty for students to express themselves in written form.	Incorporate increased opportunities for writing across the curriculum.	Classroom teacher Writing vertical planning team ESOL Contact	Progress Monitoring Checkpoints	CELLA, FCAT Writes

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

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, 31% (127) of students in grades 3, 4, and 5 will score a level 3 on the Math FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
As of June 2012, 30% (126) of students in grades 3, 4, and 5 scored a level 3 on the Math FCAT.	By June 2013, 31% (127) of students in grades 3, 4, and 5 will score a level 3 on the Math 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	Increased scoring requirements of FCAT 2.0.	Reading: Increased exposure to higher text complexity passages in Reading. Math: Increased use of manipulatives and progress monitoring of skills taught	Classroom teachers LLT Vertical Planning Team Administration	Data analysis through progress monitoring and data chats	Beginning of Year Assessments, BAT1 and BAT2 Mock FCAT FCAT 2.0 results
2	Increased scoring requirements of FCAT 2.0.	Math: Increased use of manipulatives and progress monitoring of skills taught	Classroom teachers LLT Vertical Planning Team Administration	Data analysis through progress monitoring and data chats	Beginning of Year Assessments, Mid-Chapter check point Math Big Idea Assess BAT1 and BAT2 Mock FCAT FCAT 2.0 results
3	Parents need training in the Go Math series and accessing materials from home.	During Open House, classroom teachers will familiarize parents on how to access the Go Math resources from home. Additional training sessions to be offered later in the year.	Administration, Math Contact, Team Leaders	Classroom walk through	Parent Survey

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #2a:	By June 2013, 50% (205) of students in grades 3, 4, and 5 will score a level 4 or 5 on the FCAT Math Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
As of June 2012, 48% (205) of students in grades 3, 4, and 5 scored level 4 and 5 on the FCAT Math Assessment.	By June 2013, 50% (201) of students in grades 3, 4, and 5 will score a level 4 or 5 on the 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	Teachers familiarity with facilitating exploratory learning for students as they solve math problems.	Teachers require training in the art of facilitating students in problem solving.	Classroom teachers Math Vertical Planning Team Administration	Classroom observations	Data Analysis and data chats
2	First-fourth grade teachers have difficulty implementing Science labs with fidelity.	Science Vertical Planning Team will identify specific lessons and accompanying labs that grade levels must teach per quarter. Science Vertical Planning Team will identify progress monitoring data points	Science Vertical Planning Team Administrators	Classroom observations and Monitoring of data points	Progress monitoring data
3	Teachers do not utilize Higher Order questioning strategies when solving real world math problems	Include higher order questions in lesson plans, task cards, and Webbs Complexity Wheel through the integration of technology in the classroom such as document cameras, Promethean Boards, laptops, etc.	Administration Math Vertical Planning Team	Classroom Walk Through Data Chats	BAT1 & BAT2 Classroom Walkthrough Mini-BATs Formative Assessments
4	Availability of enrichment materials.	Teachers will access Go Math enrichment materials on-line. Sunshine Math, Math Blitz will also be used as additional enrichment.	Administration Math Vertical Planning Team	Number of students participating in the program.	Big Idea Tests FCAT BAT1 & BAT2

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

2b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 7 in mathematics.	N/A
---	-----

Mathematics Goal #2b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #3a:	By June 2013, 73% (299) of all students in grades 3, 4, and 5 will demonstrate learning gains in Math.
---	--

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

As of June 2012, 71% (201) of students in grades 3-5 made learning gains in math .	By June 2013, 73% (299) of all students in grades 3, 4, and 5 will demonstrate learning gains in Math.
--	--

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack the foundational skills necessary to solve multi-step mathematical problems.	Increased student exposure to solving real world math problems using multiple strategies. Teacher models problem solving strategies. Use of small group differentiation for specific math skill intervention.	Classroom teacher Math Vertical Planning Team Administration	Classroom observations include students working collaboratively solving real world math problems.	Data analysis of progress monitoring check-points.
2	Students don't receive enough skill based instruction in their areas of need.	Teachers will implement small group skills instructions as needed	Administration, Classroom teachers	Progress Monitoring checkpoints	Chapter Test Big Idea Test BAT1 & BAT2 FCAT
3	Transitioning from Next Generation Sunshine State Standards to Common Core Standards, students may lack foundational skills.	Utilize the Instructional focus calendar and adapt to meet the needs of the students based on disaggregation of data to ensure coverage of "fair game" items.	Administration Math Vertical Planning Team	Progress monitoring checkpoints	Chapter Test Big Idea Test BAT1 & BAT2 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:

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.	N/A
---	-----

Mathematics Goal #3b:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

4. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #4:	By June 2013, 60% (37) of all students in the lowest quartile in grades 3, 4, and 5 will demonstrate learning gains in Math.
---	--

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

As of June 2012, 56% (34) of students in the lowest quartile made learning gains in math.	By June 2013, 60% (37) of all students in the lowest quartile in grades 3, 4, and 5 will demonstrate learning gains in Math.
---	--

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack foundational skills in computation and problem solving.	Teachers will incorporate computation drills in daily warm-ups and model problem solving strategies	Classroom teachers Math Vertical Planning Team MTSS Administration	Progress monitoring check points	Big Idea Tests Mock FCAT FCAT 2.0
2	Teachers need additional guidance in identifying their lowest 25% students and their areas of weakness.	Data chats will be scheduled in early September to discuss students in the lowest quartile and their individual needs.	Administration	Results of Data Chats, frequent assessments	Benchmark Assessments
3	Additional Professional Development on remediation strategies.	Teachers will be given additional training in remediation strategies. Students in the lowest quartile will be identified and monitored along with the MTSS using the RtI process and offered appropriate intervention.	Administration MTSS Math vertical planning team	Evaluation of data collected using the MTSS process	Formative and summative Assessments

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

5A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year school will reduce their achievement gap by 50%.	Elementary School Mathematics Goal # In six years our gap will decrease to 22% not making learning gains in mathematics
5A :	

Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	44%					

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:	14% of White student not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. 22% of Blacks not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. 21% of Hispanics not making satisfactory progress in mathematics
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
18% of White student not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. 26% of Blacks not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. 25% of Hispanics not making satisfactory progress in mathematics	14% of White student not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. 22% of Blacks not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. 21% of Hispanics not making satisfactory progress in mathematics

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Lack of data available due to state waiver	Identify students in each subgroup and monitor their progress. Implement appropriate interventions to address student individual needs.	Classroom teachers Reading Coach Administration	Progress monitoring of check-point data	BAT1 & BAT2 FAIR Mid and EOY tests
2	The lack of understanding the vocabulary for problem solving at grade level.	Student will be exposed to vocabulary words in context on grade level.	Classroom teachers Vertical math team Administration	Progress monitoring vocabulary checkpoints	BAT1 & BAT2 Classroom 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:	Decrease the number of students not make satisfactory progress in mathematics by 4% (46%).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
50 % of the students did not make satisfactory progress in math.	Decrease the number of students not make satisfactory progress in mathematics by 4% (46%).

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 mastery of skills necessary for school success.	Teachers will implement ESOL teaching strategies to scaffold language acquisition.	ESOL Contact Classroom teachers Administration	Student progress on check-point assessments	IPT and CELLA

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:	Decrease the number of students not make satisfactory progress in mathematics by 4% (41%).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
45% of the students did not make satisfactory progress in mathematics.	Decrease the number of students not make satisfactory progress in mathematics by 4% (41%).

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	FCAT 2.0 expectations do not reflect student present level of performance	Scaffold instruction for SWD to close achievements gaps	Classroom Teachers ESE specialist	Analysis of progress monitoring check points	Data from Big Idea tests, Mini BATs, Unit tests, BAT1 and BAT2

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

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	Decrease the number of students not make satisfactory progress in mathematics by 4% (28%).
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
32% of economically disadvantage students did not make satisfactory progress in math.	Decrease the number of students not make satisfactory progress in mathematics by 4% (28%).

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack exposure to experiences that build background knowledge.	Teachers will access and build background knowledge when introducing new material.	Classroom teacher Vertical planning teams Administration	Progress monitoring of checkpoint data	Classroom and District Assessments

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
Math Vertical Planning Team teams to address staff needs as it relates to CCSS and NGSS.	All grade levels	Lourdes Carrillo Yolanda Rodriguez	Grade level representative	monthly	Progress monitoring checkpoints Data chats with vertical team and administration	Administration Classroom teacher Math vertical team

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
FCAT Math Camp	Supplemental resources for math	School budget/Accountability	\$1,500.00
			Subtotal: \$1,500.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
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: \$1,500.00

End of Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science.		By June 2013, 52% (73) of students in grade 5 will score a level 3 on the Science FCAT.			
Science Goal #1a:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
As of June 2012, 50% (77) of students in grade 5 scored a level 3 on the science FCAT.		By June 2013, 52% (73) of students in grade 5 will score a level 3 on the 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	Usage of grade level labs with fidelity.	Each grade level will develop a schedule and common lab activities on a weekly basis to enhance classroom science instruction and provide hands on experiences.	Administration, Team Leader, Science vertical team	Monitor usage of science labs.	Benchmark assessments
2	Integrate vocabulary instruction throughout the content areas.	Enhance science vocabulary knowledge with interactive science word walls,	Administration, Science vertical team	Vocabulary assessments, science journals	Pre and post tests, benchmark assessment

	direct vocabulary instruction, and real life applications.		
--	--	--	--

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:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in science. Science Goal #2a:	By June 2013, 32% (50) of students in grade 5 will score level 4 or 5 on the FCAT Science Assessment.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
As of June 2012, 28% (43) of students in grade 5 scored a level 4 or 5 on the Science FCAT.	By June 2013, 32% (50) of students in grade 5 will score level 4 or 5 on the 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	First-fourth grade teachers have difficulty implementing Science labs with fidelity.	Science Vertical Planning Team will identify specific lessons and accompanying labs that grade levels must teach per quarter. Science Vertical Planning Team will identify progress monitoring data points	Science Vertical Planning Team Administrators	Classroom observations and Monitoring of data points	Progress monitoring data

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.	N/A			
Science Goal #2b:				
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:			
N/A	N/A			
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement				
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
No Data Submitted				

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Science Vertical Planning Team teams to address staff needs as it relates to CCSS and NGSS.	All grade levels	Lourdes Carrillo Jillian Large	Grade level representative	Monthly	Progress monitoring checkpoints	Classroom teachers Science Vertical Planning Team Administration

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Sciencesaurus	Supplemental Science material	School budget/non-state adopted	\$600.00
			Subtotal: \$600.00
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: \$600.00

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, 92% (126) of students in grade 4 will score level 3 or above on the FCAT writing. By 2012, Our target for 2013 is to have at least 50% (69) at a level 4 and above.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
As of June 2012, 88% (123) of students in grade 4 scores a level 3 or above on the FCAT Writing. 29% were at a level 4 or above.	By June 2013, 92% (126) of students in grade 4 will score level 3 or above on the FCAT writing. Our target for 2013 is to have at least 50% (69) at a level 4 and above.

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack of familiarity with the writing process.	Teachers will provide specific writing strategies to increase student writing proficiency.	Administration, Reading Coach, Writing Vertical Planning Team	Frequent collection of writing samples.	Scoring rubric
2	Students lack of proficiency of writing elements.	Teachers will conference with student to review monthly writing prompts and discuss strategies for improvement in the writing elements.	Administration, Reading coach, Writing Vertical Planning Team	Review of monthly writing prompts.	Scoring rubric
3	Teacher lack of familiarity with the new FCAT 2.0 writing rubric.	Teachers will receive professional development in the implementation of the new rubric.	Writing Vertical Planning Team 4th grade team Reading Specialist Administration	Review monthly writing prompts BAT Writing Data	FLDOE Scoring Rubric

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing. Writing Goal #1b:	N/A
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
N/A	N/A

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g. , PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Writing Vertical Planning Team teams to address staff needs as it relates to CCSS and NGSS.	All grade levels	Lourdes Carrillo Johanna Giunta	Grade level representative	Monthly	Progress Monitoring Checkpoints	Writing Vertical Planning Team Administration

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Develop the 4th grade writing plan and facilitate implementation of FLDOE scoring rubric	4th Grade teachers Reading Specialist	School Budget/substitutes	\$1,000.00
			Subtotal: \$1,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$1,000.00

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

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

1. Attendance Attendance Goal #1:	For the 2012-2013 school year, we will maintain our attendance rates of 96% (727). The number of students shows a decrease due to decreased enrollment.
2012 Current Attendance Rate:	2013 Expected Attendance Rate:
During the 2011-12 school year an average of 96% (818) of our students were in attendance on a daily basis.	For the 2012-2013 school year, we will maintain our attendance rates of 96% (727). The number of students shows a decrease due to decreased enrollment.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)
In the 2011-12 school year, 6% (53) students had 10 or more absences.	For the 2012-2013 school year, we will maintain 6% (45) or less of students with 10 or more absences.
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)	2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)
In the 2011-12 school year, 14% (121) of students had 10 or more tardies.	For the 2012-2013 school year, 13% (98) or less students will have 10 or more tardies

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Students lack motivation and may not understand the academic impact excessive school absences have on student achievement.	Encourage good attendance of students and avoidance of unnecessary absences, Teachers will send home notices to parents with excessive absences.	Administration Classroom Teacher Social Worker IMT	Closely monitor attendance rates, Follow BTIP process	Attendance on Pinnacle

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:	For the 2012-2013 school year, we will decrease the number of suspensions in the school to seven or less.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
In the 2011-2012 school year, there were 13 internal suspensions	For the 2012-2013 school year, the expected number of in school suspensions is seven or less.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
In the 2011-2012 school year, there were 7 internal suspensions	For the 2012-2013 school year, the expected number of in school suspensions is four or less.
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
In the 2011-2012 school year, there were 5 out of school suspensions.	For the 2012-2013 school year, the expected number of out of school suspensions is three or less.
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
In the 2011-2012 school year, there were 4 out of school suspensions.	For the 2012-2013 school year, the expected number of out of school suspensions is two or less.
Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement	
	Person or Process Used to

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible for Monitoring	Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Consistency among teachers in implementing the Discipline Matrix.	Refresh teachers on the process of referring students to the office and train them on the county Discipline Matrix System.	Administrator Classroom Teacher Guidance Counselor ESE Specialist	Analysis of the number and type of referrals.	DMS

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>		For the 2012-2013 school year, we will increase our parent involvement to at least 85% (643). Please note that our enrollment has decreased.			
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:		2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:			
For the 2011-2012 school year, 80% (686) of our parents participated in at least one school activity.		For the 2012-2013 school year, we will increase our parent involvement to at least 85% (643). Please note that our enrollment has decreased.			
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 who cannot attend during the school day.	Schedule and advertise activities outside of school and on evenings or weekends.	Administration, Team Leaders	Monitor number of volunteers signing into the STAR system and attendance at family nights.	STAR Reports and sign in sheets

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:			By April 2013, familiarize 5th grade students with computer based testing. (STEM Goal #3)		
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	5th grade students are not familiar with computer based testing	5th grade Math teachers will be given access to laptop carts so that students are given opportunities to take math assessments online.	Fifth grade Math Teachers Math Vertical Planning Team Administration	Teacher observation that students have ease with access of assessments and tools.	Teacher made rubric

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

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

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

STEM Budget:

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

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

End of STEM Goal(s)

Additional Goal(s)

No Additional Goal was submitted for this school

FINAL BUDGET

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Increase non-fiction reading across grade level.	Non-fictional reading materials for all grade levels	Fund raising, school budget(non-state adopted), media budget	\$2,500.00
Reading	Provide after school FCAT reading camp to lowest quartile students	Supplemental FCAT materials	School accountability	\$1,000.00
Mathematics	FCAT Math Camp	Supplemental resources for math	School budget/Accountability	\$1,500.00
Science	Sciencesaurus	Supplemental Science material	School budget/non-state adopted	\$600.00
				Subtotal: \$5,600.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	To motivate students to read for recreation and independently.	AR web-based program	PTA	\$3,500.00
				Subtotal: \$3,500.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	To incorporate increased text complexity and integrate Common Core State Standard	Brainshark, Defining the core, FCRR	N/A	\$0.00
Writing	Develop the 4th grade writing plan and facilitate implementation of FLDOE scoring rubric	4th Grade teachers Reading Specialist	School Budget/substitutes	\$1,000.00
				Subtotal: \$1,000.00
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: \$10,100.00

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.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
SAC funds are used to provide FCAT Camp for grade 3-5 (lowest quartile) Field Day celebrations: all grade levels	\$10,000.00

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

The SAC members will assist in identifying needs and recommend programs to foster a positive learning environment for our diverse student population.
The members will facilitate, monitor implementation, and the effectiveness of the School Improvement Plan.
The members of SAC will assist with the preparation of the school budget.

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 CHAPEL TRAIL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	90%	91%	95%	70%	346	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%	62%			135	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?	68% (YES)	56% (YES)			124	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					605	
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 CHAPEL TRAIL ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	87%	90%	93%	66%	336	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?	58% (YES)	64% (YES)			122	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					600	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested