

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: CORAL SPRINGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Broward

Principal: Dr. Rene Shaw

SAC Chair: Kendra Marks

Superintendent: Robert Runcie

Date of School Board Approval: December 4, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/18/2012

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)
					Year Grade AYP 2002-2003 C No 2003-2004 A No 2004-2005 B Yes 2005-2006 A No 2006-2007 B Yes 2007-2008 A Yes 2008-2009 A No 2009-2010 A No 2010/2011 B No 2011-2012 C High Standards R/M/W/SC 2002-2003 62/60/80 2003-2004 67/69/81 2004-2005 68/74/86

Principal	Dr. Rene Shaw	Doctorate in Educational Leadership, Certification in Specific Learning Disabilities, Emotional Handicaps, Gifted, Elementary Education, ESOL, Educational Leadership	10	19	2005-2006 78/80/72 2006-2007 76/78/86/42 2007-2008 73/76/87/40 2008-2009 75/80/92/30 2009-2010 68/73/86/46 2010/2011 71/82/79/42 2011-2012 52/50/80/34 Learning Gains R/M 2002-2003 57/63 2003/2004 66/77 2004/2005 55/74 2005/2006 64/78 2006/2007 68/65 2007/2008 65/67 2008/2009 67/75 2009/2010 59/71 2010/2011 57/71 2011/2012 62/54 Lowest 25% LG - R/M 2002-2003 53 2003-2004 69 2004-2005 41 2005-2006 65 2006-2007 43/65 2007-2008 54/64 2008-2009 62/78 2009-2010 61/70 2010-2011 49/60 2011-2012 66/37
Assis Principal	Shari Brown	Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education, Masters in Educational Leadership, ESOL endorsed	7	7	Year Grade AYP 2005-2006 A No 2006-2007 B Yes 2007-2008 A Yes 2008-2009 A No 2009-2010 A No 2010/2011 B No 2011-2012 C High Standards R/M/W/SC 2005-2006 78/80/72 2006-2007 76/78/86/42 2007-2008 73/76/87/40 2008-2009 75/80/92/30 2009-2010 68/73/86/46 2010/2011 71/82/79 2011-2012 52/50/80 Learning Gains R/M 2005/2006 64/78 2006/2007 68/65 2007/2008 65/67 2008/2009 67/75 2009/2010 59/71 2010/2011 57/71 2011-2012 62/64 Lowest 25% LG - R/M 2005-2006 65 2006-2007 43/65 2007-2008 54/64 2008-2009 62/78 2009-2010 61/70 2010/2011 49/60 2011-2012 66/37

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)
					Year Grade AYP 2002-2003 C No 2003-2004 A No 2004-2005 B Yes 2005-2006 A No 2006-2007 B Yes 2007-2008 A Yes 2008-2009 A No 2009-2010 A No 2010-2011 B No 2011-2012 C High Standards R/M/W/SC 2002-2003 62/60/80 2003-2004 67/69/81

Reading	Carol Pillsbury	Bachelor of Education in Masters of Education in Certified in Specific Learning Disabilities, Elementary Education, Emotionally Handicapped, Reading Endorsed, ESOL Endorsed	23	1	2004-2005 68/74/86 2005-2006 78/80/72 2006-2007 76/78/86/42 2007-2008 73/76/87/40 2008-2009 75/80/92/30 2009-2010 68/73/86/46 2010=2011 71/82/79/42 2011-2012 52/50/80/34 Learning Gains R/M 2002-2003 57/63 2003/2004 66/77 2004/2005 55/74 2005/2006 64/78 2006/2007 68/65 2007/2008 65/67 2008/2009 67/75 2009/2010 59/71 2010/2011 57/71 2011-2012 62/54 Lowest 25% LG - R/M 2002-2003 53 2003-2004 69 2004-2005 41 2005-2006 65 2006-2007 43/65 2007-2008 54/64 2008-2009 62/78 2009-2010 61/70 2010/2011 49/60 2011-2012 66/37
---------	-----------------	--	----	---	---

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	Professional development/School based PLC's	Administration/Reading Coach	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
0% (0)	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
46	0.0%(0)	4.3%(2)	26.1%(12)	69.6%(32)	54.3%(25)	95.7%(44)	15.2%(7)	17.4%(8)	93.5%(43)

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

Colleen Kelly	Kathryn Fournier Ana Ruiz Kasie Campbell	New to first grade New to school	Modeling/observations
Sylvia Simmons	Sandra Boone	New to kindergarten/school	Modeling/Collaboration
Cathy Sullivan	Fabiola Bennett	New to third grade	Modeling/collaboration

ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Coordination and Integration

Note: For Title I schools only

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

Title I, Part A

Title 1 funds provide additional teachers to assist students, particularly low performing students. Staff development funds are used to develop a comprehensive professional training program to improve delivery of instruction through a variety of workshops designed to move teachers to mastery and improve student achievement. Funds are also set aside for substitutes for teachers to attend district trainings. Parent involvement funds are utilized to fund parent nights that provide parents with new skills to support student learning at home. Improving the frequency and quality of family participation and increasing family literacy are also goals of the parental involvement component. Monies are used to purchase food, supplies/materials, and provide stipends for teacher presenters. Extended learning opportunities are supported with district Title 1 funds.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

N/A

Title I, Part D

N/A

Title II

N/A

Title III

Materials for use with ESOL students are provided such as dictionaries in other languages. Funds were also used to purchase a site license for Rosetta Stone.

Title X- Homeless

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

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

Pay for part of a teacher that provides support for Level 1 and 2 students

Violence Prevention Programs

G.R.A.D.E.; Character Education Program; Anti-Bullying; Pro-Kids Assembly

Nutrition Programs

N/A

Housing Programs

N/A

Head Start

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

Adult Education

N/A

Career and Technical Education

N/A

Job Training

N/A

Other

N/A

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

School-based MTSS/RtI Team

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Dr. Rene Shaw, Principal; Shari Brown, Assistant Principal; Carol Pillsbury, Reading Coach; Kendra Marks, SLP; Dr. Ellen Ahiyon, ESE Specialist; Dr. Jennifer Klein, School Psychologist; Jodi Samson, School Social Worker; Maureen Miller, Guidance Counselor

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?

Our team is facilitated by our SLP, Kendra Marks. We meet biweekly. The classroom teacher is brought into the initial meeting for a child. At this meeting, baseline data is presented and interventions are recommended. Each student is assigned an individual case worker who then continues to meet with the classroom teacher and monitor student progress. Case workers discuss specific cases at our biweekly meetings as a way of monitoring progress, determining if new interventions are necessary and providing feedback to the teacher as well as to families of the students. This process also helps to identify successful interventions which may then be replicated with other students.

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 following process is utilized by the team: Identify the problem; analyze the data; develop and implement intervention plan; monitor progress; and evaluate effectiveness. Since the MTSS leadership team works with all aspects of the curriculum and all subgroups, their input is valued in the review 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.

Tier 1 data are routinely inspected in the areas of reading, math, writing, science, and behavior. Data are used to make decisions about modifications and interventions needed for all students. The MTSS team also considers how to best proceed and considers interventions that follow the core curriculum and behavior strategies. These same data are also used to screen for at-risk students who may be in need of tier 2 or 3 interventions. For tier 2 and 3, data sources the intervention records and progress monitoring graphs generated for individual students. Online graphing tools are utilized to record and track tier 2 and 3 interventions. Evidence based interventions are selected from those on the Struggling Reader and Struggling Math charts.

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Training will be delivered by members of the MTSS team including our school psychologist and social worker. Training will include a review of RTI as well as by not limited to the following: Tier 2 and 3 interventions in academic areas as well as behavior; assessing to monitor progress; evaluating the success of interventions. Training will occur during staff meetings as well as during consultation with case workers.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Teachers will be trained to use intervention programs such as Foundations, Phonics for Reading and Intermediate Rewards. Teachers at each grade level will work collaboratively to provide tiered instruction for students needing it. The reading coach will also support the implementation by providing coaching, modeling and direct services to students using intervention programs.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

School-Based Literacy Leadership Team

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

Carol Booth, Kindergarten teacher; Colleen Kelly, First grade teacher; Phyllis Scarpa, Second grade teacher; Cathy Sullivan, Third grade teacher; Ann Stewart, Fourth grade teacher; Karen Krant, Fifth Grade teacher; Michele Dowling, ESE Teacher; Mara Payton, Media Specialist; Carol Pillsbury, Reading Resource Teacher; Dr. Rene Shaw, Principal; Shari Brown, Assistant Principal; Maureen Miller, Guidance; and Dr. Ellen Ahiyon, ESE Specialist.

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

Meet monthly to discuss implementation, differentiation of instruction, and RTI. The principal, assistant principal, and reading resource teacher will guide the LLT.

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

The initiatives will be based on student and teacher data and will be aligned to the SIP reading goals. In grades K-2, implementation of the Common Core State Standards will be a major focus with a school-wide focus on expecting students to read closely to determine what the text says explicitly and make logical inferences from it. Also students will be able to cite specific textual evidence when writing or speaking to support conclusions drawn from the text.

Public School Choice

Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification
[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 10/16/2012)

*Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition

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

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

*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:	In grades 3-5, 25% of students will achieve mastery (level 3) on the 2013 administration of the FCAT Reading Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
21.4% (58)	25% (68)

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 assessment data to drive instruction and determine specific interventions.	Use of assessment and reteaching calendar along with BEEP lesson plans to promote rigorous instruction utilizing the core reading series as well as reading material containing more rigorous text.	Administration	Data meetings utilizing benchmark assessments will be conducted monthly with administration and teachers to determine academic progress and needs	FAIR & BAT; informal assessments
2	Student motivation to utilize online resources for practice in school and at home.	Use of technology resources correlated to standards.	Administration	Administration will monitor usage utilizing IObservation and data chats.	BAT; Treasure assessments
3	Rollout and training in Common Core State Standards	Explore BEEP lessons as well as Common Core State Standards to incorporate more differentiated instruction and rigor.	Administration	Data meetings utilizing benchmark assessments will be conducted monthly with administration and teachers to determine academic progress and needs.	FAIR & BAT; Treasures assessments

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

2a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4 in reading. Reading Goal #2a:	In grades 3-5, 33% of students will achieve levels 4 and 5 on the 2013 FCAT Reading Test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
28.8% (78)	33% (89)

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	Use of complex text	Provide training in CCSS, specifically the use of complex text and non-fiction to teach students to determine what the text says explicitly as well as make logical inferences	Administration	Data meetings utilizing benchmark assessments will be conducted monthly with administration and teachers to determine academic progress and needs	FAIR & BAT; informal assessments

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

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

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

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

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

3a. FCAT 2.0: Percentage of students making learning gains in reading. Reading Goal #3a:	In grades 3-5, 66% of students will make learning gains in reading on the 2013 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
61.5% (118.7)	66% (127.38)

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 assessment data to drive instruction and determine specific interventions	Administer diagnostic assessments to level 1 students to determine specific areas of concern and interventions	Administration	Data meetings utilizing benchmark assessments will be conducted monthly with administration and teachers to determine academic progress and needs.	FAIR; BAT; assessments aligned with intervention programs
2	Students are unaware of what they need to achieve in order to make learning gains.	Student achievement data chats will be conducted with students in grades 3-5 following school-wide assessments.	Administration	Administration will review goal sheets for data chats.	BAT; 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 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:	In grades 3-5, 70% of students in lowest 25% will make learning gains in reading on the 2013 FCAT.
---	--

2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
65.8% (31.6)	70% (33.6)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Appropriate utilization of student assessment data to drive instruction and determine specific interventions	Administer diagnostic assessments to all level 1 students to determine specific areas of concern and appropriate interventions	Administration	Data meetings utilizing benchmark assessments will be conducted monthly with administration and teachers to determine academic progress and needs.	FAIR; BAT; assessments aligned with intervention programs
2	Students below the 25% ile not receiving enough intensive reading instruction.	Establish at least three reading groups within the classroom for small group differentiated instruction.	Administration and reading coach	Administration will monitor implementation through IObservation and data meetings.	BAT; assessments aligned with Treasure and Triumphs

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 2012-2013, the school will reduce its achievement gap to 75% achieving mastery.					
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	50%	58%	62%	66%	70%	

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.	In grades 3-5, the percent of students of different ethnicities who achieve mastery on the 2013 FCAT in reading will increase as indicated:
Reading Goal #5B:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White:32.1% (18) Black: 52.5% (62) Hispanic: 65.2% (43) Asian: 0% (0) American Indian: 100% (1)	White: 36% (20.16/56) Black: 56% (66.08) Hispanic: 70% (46.2) Asian: 50% (94) American Indian: 100% (1)

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 assessment data to drive instruction and determine specific interventions	Administer diagnostic assessments to all level 1 students to determine specific areas of concern and appropriate interventions	Administration	Data meetings utilizing benchmark assessments will be conducted monthly with administration and teachers to determine academic progress and needs	BAT, FAIR, informal 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:

<p>5C. English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</p> <p>Reading Goal #5C:</p>	<p>In grades 3-5, the percent of ELL students who do not achieve mastery on the 2013 FCAT in reading will decrease to 50%.</p>
<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</p>
<p>92.9% (13)</p>	<p>50% (7)</p>

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 assessment data to drive instruction and determine specific interventions	Administer diagnostic assessments to all level 1 students to determine specific areas of concern and appropriate interventions	Administration	Data meetings utilizing benchmark assessments will be conducted monthly with administration and teachers to determine academic progress and needs.	BAT/ FAIR ; informal assessments
2	Exposure to a rich vocabulary	Use of Rosetta Stone software to build vocabulary	Administration	Data meetings utilizing benchmark assessments will be conducted monthly with administration and teachers to determine academic progress and needs.	BAT, FAIR, 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:

<p>5D. Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in reading.</p> <p>Reading Goal #5D:</p>	<p>In grades 3-5, the percent of students with disabilities who do not make satisfactory progress on the 2013 FCAT reading will decrease to 70%.</p>
<p>2012 Current Level of Performance:</p>	<p>2013 Expected Level of Performance:</p>
<p>82.5% (47)</p>	<p>70% (39)</p>

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 assessment data to drive instruction and determine specific interventions	Teachers of students with disabilities will assist teachers in identifying and utilizing accommodations and differentiated strategies to meet specific needs of students in the general education classroom	Administration	Data meetings utilizing benchmark assessments will be conducted monthly with administration and teachers to determine academic progress and needs	DAR/ BAT/ FAIR; informal 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:

In grades 3-5, the percent of economically disadvantaged students who do not make satisfactory progress on the FCAT reading in 2013 will decrease to 40%.

2012 Current Level of Performance:

52.8% (115)

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

40% (87.2)

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 assessment data to drive instruction and determine specific interventions	Administer diagnostic assessments to all level 1 students to determine specific areas of concern and appropriate interventions	Administration	Data meetings utilizing benchmark assessments will be conducted monthly with administration and teachers to determine academic progress and needs.	BAT/FAIR/ informal assessments
2	Understanding the instructional impact of living in an economically disadvantaged condition	Infuse within the PLC a discussion of the needs of students from poverty	Administration	Data meetings utilizing benchmark assessments will be conducted monthly with administration and teachers to determine academic progress and needs.	BAT/FAIR/ informal 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
FAIR	1-2	Reading Coach	Teachers in grades 1-2	August 29, 2012	Data meetings	Administration
CCSS	All	Grade Chair	Grade level PLC's	Staff meetings monthly Grade level team meetings monthly Early Release day/planning day meetings quarterly	Grade Chair meetings/Data meetings	Administration
Daily Five Training	All	Reading Coach and Media Specialist	All	Staff meetings monthly, early release/planning day meetings	Administration will monitor through IObservations and data meetings.	Administration

Reading Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Assessment	Diagnostic Assessment Of Reading	Accountability	\$500.00
Alternate Reading Program	Phonics for Reading Workbooks/Intermediate Rewards Workbooks/Fundations	ESE/Instructional Materials money	\$1,000.00
			Subtotal: \$1,500.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Use of online programs to provide additional practice in comprehension	Ticket To Read site license	Accountability	\$3,500.00
			Subtotal: \$3,500.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Train Teachers in CCSS	Substitutes to release teachers for training	Title 1 Staff Development	\$2,500.00
Train Teachers in CCSS	Stipends to participants	Title 1 Staff Development	\$2,500.00
			Subtotal: \$5,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Data meetings	Substitutes to release teachers for meetings	Accountability	\$3,000.00
Extended learning opportunities for level 1 and 2 students	Salaries for teachers to provide instruction in before and after school camps	Accountability/ELO funds	\$4,000.00
			Subtotal: \$7,000.00
			Grand Total: \$17,000.00

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.		The % of ELL students in grades 3-5 who score proficient in Listening/Speaking on the 2013 CELLA will increase to 40% (7.2).			
CELLA Goal #1:					
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in listening/speaking:					
22% (4)					
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	Limited facility with English vocabulary	Use of technology programs designed to increase vocabulary	Administration	Data meetings utilizing benchmark assessments will be conducted monthly with administration and teachers to determine academic progress and needs.	CELLA

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:

The % of ELL students in grades 3-5 who score proficient in Reading on the 2013 CELLA will increase to 30% (3.9).

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:

15% (2)

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	Limited English sight vocabulary	Use of technology programs to increase sight vocabulary	Administration	Data meetings utilizing benchmark assessments will be conducted monthly with administration and teachers to determine academic progress and needs.	CELLA

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

3. Students scoring proficient in writing.

CELLA Goal #3:

The % of ELL students in grades 3-5 who score proficient in Writing on the 2013 CELLA will increase to 25% (4.5).

2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:

11% (2)

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	Diverse levels of skills and writing abilities	Use of modeling, differentiated instruction, independent writing, conferencing and publishing	Administration	Data meetings utilizing benchmark assessments will be conducted monthly with administration and teachers to determine academic progress and needs.	Writing Prompts

CELLA Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount

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

End of **CELLA** Goals

Elementary School Mathematics Goals

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

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

1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #1a:	In grades 3-5, 40% of students will score level 3 on the 2013 FCAT in Math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
20.7% (56)	40% (108)

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	Rollout and training in Common Core State Standards	Grade level PLC's will collaborate to insure use of BEEP and Go Math lessons correlated to FCAT 2.0 as well as to Common Core State Standards	Administration	Data meetings utilizing benchmark assessments will be conducted monthly with administration and teachers to determine academic progress and needs.	BAT; Big Idea assessments; Go Math chapter tests
2	Appropriate utilization of student assessment data to drive instruction and determine specific interventions.	Use of assessment and reteaching calendar along with IFC's and BEEP lesson plans to promote rigorous instruction utilizing Go math series	Administration	Data meetings utilizing benchmark assessments will be conducted monthly with administration and teachers to determine academic progress and needs.	BAT; Big Idea assessments; Go Math chapter 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 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:	In grades 3-5, 35% of students will achieve levels 4 and 5 on the 2013 FCAT math test.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
27.4% (74)	35% (94.5)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement

	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Rollout and training in Common Core State Standards	Explore Go Math resources and BEEP lessons as well as Common Core State Standards to incorporate more differentiated instruction and project-based learning	Administration	Data meetings utilizing benchmark assessments will be conducted monthly with administration and teachers to determine academic progress and needs	BAT; Big Idea Assessments; chapter 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 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:	In grades 3-5, 60% of students in the lowest 25% will achieve learning gains in math on the 2013 FCAT.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:

54.2% (104.1)			60% (115.2)		
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 assessment data to drive instruction and determine specific interventions.	Use of assessment and reteaching calendar along with IFC's and BEEP lesson plans to promote rigorous instruction utilizing Go math series	Administration	Data meetings utilizing benchmark assessments will be conducted monthly with administration and teachers to determine academic progress and needs.	BAT, Big Idea Assessments; chapter tests
2	Students lack prerequisite skills necessary for grade level concepts	Use of technology resources designed to build prerequisite skills	Administration	Administration will monitor the reports of technology usage	BAT, Chapter tests, Big Idea Assessments

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

3b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making Learning Gains in mathematics.		
Mathematics Goal #3b:		
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:		In grades 3-5, 50% (25.5/51) of students will make learning gains on the FCAT 2.0 Math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:	
37.5% (19.1)	50% (25.2)	

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

			Monitoring	Strategy	
1	Appropriate utilization of student assessment data to drive instruction and determine specific interventions.	Use of assessment and reteaching calendar along with IFC's and BEEP lesson plans to promote rigorous instruction utilizing Go math series	Administration	Data meetings utilizing benchmark assessments will be conducted monthly with administration and teachers to determine academic progress and needs.	BAT; big idea assessments; chapter tests

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 2012-2013, the school will reduce its achievement gap in math to 64%.				
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017
	48%	64%	68%	72%	76%	

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.	In grades 3-5, the percent of students of varying ethnicities who do not achieve mastery on the 2013 FCAT in math will decrease as indicated:
Mathematics Goal #5B:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
White: 33.9% (19/56) Black: 61.5% (72/117) Hispanic: 51.52%(34/66) Asian: 25%(2/8) American Indian:100%(1/1)	White:30%(16.8/56) Black:50%(58.5/117) Hispanic:45%(29.7/66) Asian:12%(1/8) American Indian: 0% (0/1)

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 assessment data to drive instruction and determine specific interventions.	Use of assessment and reteaching calendar along with IFC's and BEEP lesson plans to promote rigorous instruction utilizing Go math series	Administration	Data meetings utilizing benchmark assessments will be conducted monthly with administration and teachers to determine academic progress and needs	Benchmark assessments and Big Idea 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.	In grades 3-5 the percent of ELL students who do not achieve mastery on the 2013 FCAT Math will decrease to 75% (10.5/14)
Mathematics Goal #5C:	
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
85.7%(12)	75%(10.5)

Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
1	Appropriate utilization of student assessment data to drive instructions and determine specific interventions	. Use of assessment and reteaching calendar along with IFC's and BEEP lesson plans to promote rigorous instruction utilizing Go math series	Administration	Data meetings utilizing benchmark assessments will be conducted monthly with administration and teachers to determine academic progress and needs	Benchmark assessments and Big Idea 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:	In grades 3-5, the percent of SWD who do not achieve mastery on the 2013 FCAT 2.0 math will decrease to 80% (44.8/56)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
89.3% (50)	80% (44.8)

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	Collaboration between general education teachers and teachers of students with disabilities	Teachers of students with disabilities will assist teachers in identifying and utilizing accommodations and differentiated strategies to meet specific needs of students in the general education classroom	Administration	Data meetings utilizing benchmark assessments will be conducted monthly with administration and teachers to determine academic progress and needs	Benchmark assessments and Big Idea Assessments; chapter 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:

5E. Economically Disadvantaged students not making satisfactory progress in mathematics. Mathematics Goal #5E:	In grades 3-5, 78% of economically disadvantaged students will achieve mastery on the 2012 FCAT in math.
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
75% (178)	78% (186)

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
	. Appropriate utilization of student assessment	Use of assessment and reteaching calendar along	Administration	Data meetings utilizing benchmark assessments	BAT/Big Idea tests; chapter

1	data to drive instructions and determine specific interventions.	with IFC's and BEEP lesson plans to promote rigorous instruction utilizing Go math series	will be conducted monthly with administration and teachers to determine academic progress and needs	tests
---	--	---	---	-------

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
Training in CCSS	All	CCSS leadership team	All	Staff meetings, PLC's on early release and planning days	Data meetings	Administration

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/Material(s)			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Assessment	Key Math Test and protocols	ESE funds	\$300.00
			Subtotal: \$300.00
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
Training in Common Core State Standards in area of math	Substitutes for teachers attending training	Title 1 Staff development funds	\$2,000.00
After school and summer training/curriculum planning meetings	Stipends to participants	Title 1 Staff development funds	\$2,000.00
			Subtotal: \$4,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$4,300.00

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.

The percent of students in grade 5 who score level 3

Science Goal #1a:	on the 2013 FCAT Science will increase to 25% (25)
2012 Current Level of Performance:	2013 Expected Level of Performance:
21% (21)	25% (25)

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 comprehending content area material and text	Infuse use of science content text during reading instruction.	Administration	Data meetings utilizing benchmark assessments will be conducted monthly with administration and teachers to determine academic progress and needs	BAT and chapter assessments

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

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

Science Goal #1b:

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 percent of students in grade 5 who score levels 4 and 5 on the 2013 FCAT Science test will increase to 17% (17/100)

2012 Current Level of Performance:

2013 Expected Level of Performance:

13% (13)

17% (17)

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	Difficulty comprehending content area material and text	In addition to infusion of content area text in reading instruction, enrich with real-world applications as well as inquiry based investigations.	Administration	Data meetings utilizing benchmark assessments will be conducted monthly with administration and teachers to determine academic progress and needs.	BAT and chapter 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
Common Core State Standards as they apply to content area text	All – science/reading	Team leader	Grade level teams	Staff meetings monthly Grade level team meetings monthly Early Release day/planning day meetings quarterly	BAT 1 & 2 data; chapter assessments	Administration

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
After school and summer training/curriculum planning meetings	Stipends for participants	Title I staff development funds	\$2,000.00
Training in common core state standards as they apply to science.	Substitutes to release teachers to attend training	Title 1 Staff development funds	\$1,000.00
			Subtotal: \$3,000.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$3,000.00

End of **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.			The percent of students who score level 3 or higher on the 2013 FCAT Writing test will increase to 85% (74).		
Writing Goal #1a:					
2012 Current Level of Performance:			2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
75.9% (66)			85% (74)		
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	Diverse level of skills and writing abilities	Analyze student prompts and utilize District's BEEP writing curriculum that includes modeled writing, small group differentiated writing instruction, independent writing, conferencing and publishing	Administration	Data meetings utilizing writing prompts will be conducted monthly with administration and teachers to determine academic progress and needs	Writing prompts

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

1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing.	
Writing Goal #1b:	

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

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

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade Level/Subject	PD Facilitator and/or PLC Leader	PD Participants (e.g., PLC, subject, grade level, or school-wide)	Target Dates (e.g., early release) and Schedules (e.g., frequency of meetings)	Strategy for Follow-up/Monitoring	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring
Common Core State Standards as they apply to writing	All/Writing	Team Leader	Grade level team	Staff meetings monthly Grade level team meetings monthly Early Release day/planning day meetings quarterly	Data meetings	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
After school and summer curriculum planning meetings	Stipends for participants	Title I staff development	\$500.00
Training in Common Core State Standards as they apply to Writing	Substitutes to release teachers to attend training	Title I staff development	\$1,000.00
Subtotal: \$1,500.00			
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
Subtotal: \$0.00			

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		Average daily attendance will increase to 97% during the 2012-2013 school year.			
Attendance Goal #1:					
2012 Current Attendance Rate:		2013 Expected Attendance Rate:			
95 (680)		96% (685)			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)			
52		45			
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)			
135		120			
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	Parent's lack of awareness of the positive impact of good attendance	Communications with parents through open house meetings, conferences, social worker contacts; follow BTIP process;	Administration; IMT; Teachers; social worker	Review daily attendance reports and BTIP reports	Average daily attendance; BTIP data

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
Train teachers on communication strategies with parents	All	Administration	Instructional Staff	Monthly staff meetings	Documentation of parent communication	Administration

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 total number of suspensions will decrease to 10 external and 15 internal in the 2011-2012 school year.
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions
11 (1.53%)	10 (1.40%)
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended In-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended In-School
9 (1.26%)	8 (1.12%)
2012 Number of Out-of-School Suspensions	2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions
21 (2.94%)	15 (2.10%)
2012 Total Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out-of-School
13 (1.82%)	10 (1.40%)

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 effective classroom management strategies applied on a consistent basis	Implementation of a school-wide proactive positive behavior plan	Administration	Number of discipline 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
Review of Proactive Positive Schoolwide behavior plan	All	Team leader	Grade level teams	Monthly team meeting	Review of referrals in DMS	Administration

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>		Parent involvement in school activities will increase to 72% during the 2012-2013 school year.			
2012 Current Level of Parent Involvement:		2013 Expected Level of Parent Involvement:			
70% (455)		72% (468)			
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	Parent cooperation	Increase communication via newsletters, flyers, student planners, website, Parent Link, parent training sessions	Administration	Attendance at events	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
Increase communication via newsletters, flyers, student planners, website, Parent Link, parent training sessions	All	Team leader	Grade level teams	Team meetings	Classroom walkthroughs	Administration

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:				
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						

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	Assessment	Diagnostic Assessment Of Reading	Accountability	\$500.00
Reading	Alternate Reading Program	Phonics for Reading Workbooks/Intermediate Rewards Workbooks/Fundations	ESE/Instructional Materials money	\$1,000.00
Mathematics	Assessment	Key Math Test and protocols	ESE funds	\$300.00
				Subtotal: \$1,800.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Use of online programs to provide additional practice in comprehension	Ticket To Read site license	Accountability	\$3,500.00
				Subtotal: \$3,500.00
Professional Development				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Train Teachers in CCSS	Substitutes to release teachers for training	Title 1 Staff Development	\$2,500.00
Reading	Train Teachers in CCSS	Stipends to participants	Title 1 Staff Development	\$2,500.00
Mathematics	Training in Common Core State Standards in area of math	Substitutes for teachers attending training	Title 1 Staff development funds	\$2,000.00
Mathematics	After school and summer training/curriculum planning meetings	Stipends to participants	Title 1 Staff development funds	\$2,000.00
Science	After school and summer training/curriculum planning meetings	Stipends for participants	Title I staff development funds	\$2,000.00
Science	Training in common core state standards as they apply to science.	Substitutes to release teachers to attend training	Title 1 Staff development funds	\$1,000.00
Writing	After school and summer curriculum planning meetings	Stipends for participants	Title I staff development	\$500.00
Writing	Training in Common Core State Standards as they apply to Writing	Substitutes to release teachers to attend training	Title I staff development	\$1,000.00
				Subtotal: \$13,500.00
Other				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Data meetings	Substitutes to release teachers for meetings	Accountability	\$3,000.00
Reading	Extended learning opportunities for level 1 and 2 students	Salaries for teachers to provide instruction in before and after school camps	Accountability/ELO funds	\$4,000.00
				Subtotal: \$7,000.00
				Grand Total: \$25,800.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

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

Are you a reward school: Yes No

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

[View uploaded file](#) (Uploaded on 10/16/2012)

School Advisory Council

School Advisory Council (SAC) Membership Compliance

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

Yes. Agree with the above statement.

Projected use of SAC Funds	Amount
	\$0.00

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

SAC will meet monthly to discuss and monitor implementation of the school improvement plan.

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 CORAL SPRINGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2010-2011						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	71%	82%	79%	42%	274	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	57%	71%			128	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	49% (NO)	60% (YES)			109	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					511	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					B	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested

Broward School District CORAL SPRINGS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 2009-2010						
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	68%	73%	86%	46%	273	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	59%	71%			130	3 ways to make gains: ● Improve FCAT Levels ● Maintain Level 3, 4, or 5 ● Improve more than one year within Level 1 or 2
Adequate Progress of Lowest 25% in the School?	61% (YES)	70% (YES)			131	Adequate Progress based on gains of lowest 25% of students in reading and math. Yes, if 50% or more make gains in both reading and math.
FCAT Points Earned					534	
Percent Tested = 99%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					A	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested