_

FLORIDA DIFFERENTIATED ACCOUNTABILITY PROGRAM 2012-2013 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

School Name: RIVERGLADES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

District Name: Broward

Principal: Shelly Isenberg

SAC Chair: Ana De La Rosa

Superintendent: Robert Runcie

Date of School Board Approval: December 4, 2012

Last Modified on: 10/24/2012



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	Shelly Isenberg	BA- University of Central Florida MA – Ed Leadership	8	16	2010-2011 Grade A Reading Mastery 95% Reading Learning Gains 68% Lowest 25% 67% Math Mastery 98% Learning Gains 83% Lowest 25% 86% Science Mastery 84% Writing Mastery 90% AYP ESE did not meet criteria in reading or math 2009-2010 Grade A Reading Mastery 93% Learning Gains 78% Lowest 25% 72% Math Mastery 95% Learning Gains 74% Lowest 25% 76% Science Mastery 97% Writing Mastery 95% AYP Yes in all subgroups

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	Diane Jordan	Elementary Ed 1- 6, Reading K-12, Specific Learning Difficulties K-12. Emotionally Handicapped K- 12,	20	16	2010-2011 Grade A Reading Mastery 95% Reading Learning Gains 68% Lowest 25% 67% Math Mastery 98% Learning Gains 83% Lowest 25% 86% Science Mastery 84% Writing Mastery 90% AYP ESE did not meet criteria in reading or math 2009-2010 Grade A Reading Mastery 93% Learning Gains 78% Lowest 25% 72% Math Mastery 95% Learning Gains 74% Lowest 25% 76% Science Mastery 77% Writing Mastery 95% AYP Yes in all subgroups

EFFECTIVE AND HIGHLY EFFECTIVE TEACHERS

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

	Description of Strategy	Person Responsible	Projected Completion Date	Not Applicable (If not, please explain why)
1	New Educator Support System	NESS Coach	on-going	

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	Provide the strategies that are being implemented to support the staff in becoming highly effective
No data submitted	

Staff Demographics

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

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

	Fotal Number of Instructional Staff	% of First-Year Teachers		% of Teachers with 6-14 Years of Experience	% of Teachers with 15+ Years of Experience	% of Teachers with Advanced Degrees	% Highly Effective Teachers	% Reading	% National Board Certified Teachers	% ESOL Endorsed Teachers
3:	2	0.0%(0)	0.0%(0)	59.4%(19)	40.6%(13)	53.1%(17)	100.0%(32)	3.1%(1)	9.4%(3)	65.6%(21)

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
Kevra Finkelsteiin	Carla Puebla		monthly meetings on curriculum
Joy Kertes	Genna Trost		monthly meetings on curriculum

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.

itle I, Part A	
Title I, Part C- Migrant	
Title I, Part D	
Title II	
Title III	

Title X- Homeless
Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)
Violence Prevention Programs
Nutrition Programs
Housing Programs
Head Start
Adult Education
Career and Technical Education
Job Training
Other
Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)/Response to Instruction/Intervention (RtI)

-School-based MTSS/RtI Team-

Identify the school-based MTSS leadership team.

Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing RtI, conducts assessment of RtI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support RtI implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based RtI plans and activities.

Select General Education Teachers (Primary and Intermediate): Provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction/intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities.

Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teachers: Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as coteaching.

Instructional Coach(es) Reading/Math/Science: Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/ programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches. Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk;" assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.

Reading Instructional Specialist: Provides guidance on K-12 reading plan; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning; supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans.

School Psychologist: Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation; facilitates data-based decision making activities.

Speech Language Pathologist: Educates the team in the role language plays in curriculum, assessment, and instruction, as a basis for appropriate program design; assists in the selection of screening measures; and helps identify systemic patterns of student need with respect to language skills

Student Services Personnel: Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students. In addition to providing interventions, school social workers continue to link child-serving and community agencies to the schools and families to support the child's academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.

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?

Describe how the school-based Rtl Leadership Team functions (e.g. meeting processes and roles/functions). The Leadership Team will focus meetings around one question: What curricular adjustments need to be implemented to maximize the instructional potential of exceptional students at the school?

The team meets once a week to engage in the following activities: Review universal screening data and link to instructional decisions; review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development and resources. The team will utilize the Struggling Behavior Chart to address any behavioral concerns and interventions. The team will also collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skills. The team will also facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation.

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

The RtI Leadership Team met with the School Advisory Council (SAC) and principal to help develop the SIP.

-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.

Baseline data: Progress Monitoring and Reporting Network (PMRN), Broward Assessment Test (BAT 1 & 2 for reading, math, and science), Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT)

Progress Monitoring: PMRN, Mini Assessments, FCAT Simulation

Midyear: Florida Assessments for Instruction in Reading (FAIR), Diagnostic Assessment for Reading (DAR), Early Reading

Diagnostic Assessment (ERDA)

End of year: FAIR, FCAT

Frequency of Data Days: twice a month for data analysis

Describe the plan to train staff on MTSS.

Describe the plan to support MTSS.

Professional development will be provided during teachers' common planning time and small sessions will occur throughout the year. Two PD sessions entitled: "Rtl: Improving the effectiveness of Differentiated Instruction and "Rtl: Challenges to Implementation Data-based Decision-making, and Supporting and Evaluating

Interventions" will take place in early September and in October.

The RtI team will also evaluate additional staff PD needs during the weekly RtI Leadership Team meetings.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) -School-Based Literacy Leadership Team Identify the school-based Literacy Leadership Team (LLT). Administrators, Reading Coach, ESE Specialist and team leaders. Describe how the school-based LLT functions (e.g., meeting processes and roles/functions). The purpose of the Literacy Leadership Team is to create capacity of reading knowledge within the school building and focus on areas of literacy concern across the school. The principal, reading coach, mentor reading teachers, content area teachers, and other principal appointees should serve on this team which should meet at least once a month. What process will the principal use to form and maintain a Reading Leadership Team? Under the guidance of administrators and the reading coach, the team will focus on literacy initiatives, programs, data, and literacy concerns throughout the school. One of the key goals of the School Leadership Team will be to ensure that all school stakeholders understand and support the work of the reading coach/reading resource specialist and obtain support for achieving the school's reading goals through a whole-school approach. What will be the major initiatives of the LLT this year? Monitoring student achievement, implementing new generation of standards for reading, ensuring differentiated instruction is occurring in classrooms Public School Choice Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Notification No Attachment *Elementary Title I Schools Only: Pre-School Transition Describe plans for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs as applicable. *Grades 6-12 Only Sec. 1003.413(b) F.S. For schools with Grades 6-12, describe the plan to ensure that teaching reading strategies is the responsibility of every teacher. *High Schools Only

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

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

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

Postsecondary Transition

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

Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School

Feedback Report		

PART II: EXPECTED IMPROVEMENTS

Reading Goals

* Whe	n using percentages, i	nclude	the number of students the	perc	entage repre	sents	(e.g., 70% (35)).		
	I on the analysis of sprovement for the following		t achievement data, and i group:	refer	ence to "Gu	uiding	Questions", identify	and	define areas in need
readi		scorin	g at Achievement Level	3 in	On the 201		AT, 32% 100/311 of cy in reading.	stude	ents will score
2012	Current Level of P	erforr	nance:		2013 Expe	ected	d Level of Performa	nce:	
25% 8	80/320				32% of stu	ıdent	s 100/311		
		Pr	oblem-Solving Process	to I	ncrease St	uder	nt Achievement		
	Anticipated Bar	rier	Strategy	R	Person of Position esponsible Monitorin	for	Process Used t Determine Effectiveness o Strategy		Evaluation Tool
1	Role out/training of Common Core State Standards		Teachers will attend PLC and/or training on Common Core Standards	Adı	hool ministrators		PLC agendas Administrative Observation tools documenting use of strategies designed teach CCSS	to	PLC notes and Marzano Tool
of imp 1b. F Stude	provement for the following Asternate As	llowing sessn		refer	rence to "Gu	uiding	g Questions", identify	and	define areas in need
2012	Current Level of P	erforn	nance:		2013 Expe	ected	d Level of Performa	nce:	
		Pr	oblem-Solving Process	to I	ncrease St	uder	nt Achievement		
Antio	cipated Barrier	Strat	regy F	Posit Resp for	on or ion onsible toring	Dete Effe	cess Used to ermine ectiveness of ategy	Eva	luation Tool
			No E)ata	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.

On the 2013 FCAT, 62% 192/311 of students will score above proficiency in reading on the Florida Assessment in

	ing Goal #2a:				reading				
2012	Current Level of Pe	erform	nance:		2013 Expect	ed L	_evel of Performar	nce:	
57%	177				62% 192				
		Pro	oblem-Solving Process	s to I	ncrease Stud	lent	Achievement		
	Anticipated Barr	ier	Strategy	R	Person or Position Pesponsible for Monitoring	or .	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy		Evaluation Too
1	in the proper utilizat	y is ement ion of	Teachers in grades K-5 create reading groups and conduct groups utilizing research based reading enrichment programs/strategies.	Cla	assroom teach	re m	valuation results that eflect an increase of naintenance in stude eading proficiency	r ent	Teacher and district made formative assessments evaluated monthly
readi Read	_		Achievement Level 7 i	n	2013 Expect	- ad I	_evel of Performan	200	
Antic	cinated Parrier		oblem-Solving Process	Perso Posit	ncrease Stuc	lent	Achievement ss Used to mine		ration Tool
Antio	cipated Barrier	Pro Strate	egy	Personante Posit Resp for Moni	on or prition Doonsible Eftoring	lent roce	Achievement ss Used to mine iveness of		uation Tool
Antio	cipated Barrier		egy	Personante Posit Resp for Moni	on or tion Donsible	lent roce eteri	Achievement ss Used to mine iveness of		uation Tool
Based		Strate	egy No achievement data, and	Perso Posit Resp for Moni Data	on or tion Donsible toring Submitted	roce eterr ffect	Achievement ss Used to mine iveness of egy	Evalu	
Based of imp 3a. F	d on the analysis of si provement for the foll	Strate	egy No achievement data, and	Personal Per	ncrease Students on or tion proposible toring Submitted By June of 20 students will documented	roce eterifect trate	Achievement ss Used to mine viveness of egy Questions", identify a service of the footbase o	Evaluand d	efine areas in nee and fifth grade reading as
Based of imp 3a. F gains Read	d on the analysis of si provement for the foll CAT 2.0: Percentage s in reading.	Strate tudent lowing e of st	egy No achievement data, and group: udents making learning	Personal Per	ncrease Students on or prition ponsible entering Submitted By June of 20 students will documented School Gradin	roce eterifect rrate	Achievement ss Used to mine viveness of egy Questions", identify a service of the footbase o	and dourth ains in	efine areas in nee and fifth grade reading as
Based of imp 3a. F gains Read	d on the analysis of si provement for the foll CAT 2.0: Percentage s in reading. ling Goal #3a:	Strate tudent lowing e of st	egy No achievement data, and group: udents making learning	Personal Per	ncrease Students on or prition ponsible entering Submitted By June of 20 students will documented School Gradin	roce eterifect rrate	Achievement ss Used to mine iveness of egy Questions", identify a service se	and dourth ains in	efine areas in nee and fifth grade reading as

	Anticipated Barri	er	Strategy	R	Position esponsible for Monitoring	or			Evaluation Tool
1	A barrier for students achieving learning ga in reading is the proputilization of differentiated instruc	ins ber	Teachers will identify students not achieving learning gains and will monitor their progress monthly utilizing district and classroom assessments.		Classroom teachers Evalu reflec maint		Strategy Evaluation results th reflect an increase o maintenance in stude reading proficiency	r	Teacher and district made formative assessments evaluated monthly
	I on the analysis of stoprovement for the follo		t achievement data, and	refer	ence to "Guid	ding	Questions", identify	and c	lefine areas in nee
3b. F Perce readi	lorida Alternate Ass entage of students m	essm	nent:						
	Current Level of Per	rforn	nance:		2013 Expec	ted	Level of Performar	nce:	
		Pr	oblem-Solving Process	s to I	ncrease Stud	den	nt Achievement		
Antic	Anticipated Barrier Strategy Posi Resp		Posit Resp for	on or cion Determine Effectiveness of Strategy			uation Tool		
	<u>'</u>		1		Submitted				
Rasen	I on the analysis of st	udent	t achievement data, and	refer	ence to "Guid	lina	Ouestions" identify	and c	lefine areas in nee
of imp	provement for the follo	owing	group:	TCTCT			Questions, identify		Territe di cas in ricei
makii	ng learning gains in ing Goal #4:		udents in Lowest 25% ing.		tested stude	nts by	e, 80%(166) of the low will demonstrate lear the FCAT and as defi System.	ning	gains in reading as
2012	Current Level of Per	rforn	nance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
34					44				
		Pr	oblem-Solving Process	s to I	ncrease Stud	den	nt Achievement		
	Anticipated Barri	er	Strategy	R	Person or Position esponsible for Monitoring	or	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness o Strategy		Evaluation Tool
1	A barrier for students achieving proficiency the lowest 25% in reading is the proper utilization of differentiated instruc	for	Teachers will identify students in the lowest 25% and will monitor their progress monthly utilizing district and classroom assessments.	Cla		ners	Evaluation results th reflect an increase o maintenance in studereading proficiency	r	Teacher and district made formative assessments evaluated monthly

Position

Determine

Measu school	A. Ambitious but Achievable Annual leasurable Objectives (AMOs). In six year chool will reduce their achievement gap y 50%.			n six year		stud	lents will to the Read			ient in read 92	ling	in 2016
1	ine data 0-2011	2011-2012	2 20	012-2013	2013-20	014	2014	1-201	5	2015-2016	6	2016-2017
		82% of stude	nts 82%	% of students	86% of stu	dents	88% of	fstude	ents	90% of stude	nts	
		analysis of s			ent data, and	l refer	rence to "Gu	uiding	J Quest	tions", identify	and o	define areas in nee
Hispa satisf	nic, Asia	subgroups ban, America progress in #5B:	n Ind	ian) not m			84% of stureading po				readi	ng on the 2013
2012	Current	Level of Pe	rform	nance:			2013 Expe	ected	d Leve	l of Performa	nce:	
		5/209 of studing portion c			ient in readir	ng on				tts will be prof of the FCAT	ficient	in reading on the
			Pro	oblem-Sol	ving Proces	s to I	ncrease St	uder	nt Ach	ievement		
	Anticipated Barrier St		rategy	R	Person oi Position Responsible Monitorin	for		rocess Used t Determine ffectiveness c Strategy		Evaluation Tool		
1	Common Core State and/or train		and/or train	ill attend PLCs School		hool ministrators	-	PLC agendas Administrative Observation tools documenting use of strategies designed to teach CCSS			PLC notes and Marzano Tool	
of imp 5C. Er satisf	nglish La	nt for the follomers anguage Le progress in	owing arner	subgroup: s (ELL) no		l refer	rence to "Gu	uiding	J Ques	tions", identify	and (define areas in nee
2012	Current	Level of Pe	rform	nance:			2013 Expe	ectec	d Leve	l of Performa	nce:	
			Pro	oblem-Sol	ving Proces	s to I	ncrease St	uder	nt Ach	ievement		
Antic	ipated E	3arrier	Strate	egy		Posit Resp for	on or tion ponsible itoring	Dete Effe	ermine	sed to e less of	Eval	uation Tool
					No	Data :	Submitted					

satis	Students with Disabilitie factory progress in read ling Goal #5D:		By June 201 proficient in	2 75% of Students Wir reading	th Disabi	ilities will be
2012	Current Level of Perfor	mance:	2013 Exped	cted Level of Perform	nance:	
73			75			
	F	Problem-Solving Process	to Increase Stu	dent Achievement		
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible f Monitoring)	Evaluation Too
1	A barrier for students achieving proficiency in reading is the proper utilization of differentiated instruction	Teachers will identify students not achieving proficiency and will monitor their progress monthly utilizing district and classroom assessments.	Classroom teach	ners Evaluation results reflect an increase maintenance in st reading proficiency	e or udent y	Teacher and district made formative assessments evaluated monthly
2	A barrier for SWD achieving proficiency in reading is that teachers need common planning time to conduct Professional Learning Communities in order to vary learning styles of students within each class setting	Teachers will have uninterrupted time monthly to discuss ways to differentiate instruction in order to meet the needs of SWD and implement in lessons	School Administration Administrative classroo walkthroughs should indicate a harmony of reading instruction strategies throughout grade level.		uld y of n	Team Meeting Notes. Administrative Classroom Walkthrough
Raser	d on the analysis of stude	nt achievement data, and	reference to "Guid	ding Ouestions" identi	fy and d	efine areas in nee
of im	provement for the following	ng subgroup:		unig Questions , identi	ry and d	
l	.conomically Disadvanta factory progress in read	aged students not makin ding.	g			
Read	ling Goal #5E:					
2012	Current Level of Perfor	mance:	2013 Exped	cted Level of Perform	nance:	
	F	Problem-Solving Process	to Increase Stu	dent Achievement		
Antio	cipated Barrier Stra	rtegy F	Responsible or	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evalu	uation Tool
		No E	Data Submitted		,	

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade		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 Positic Responsible for Monitoring
ELA Common Core	K-5	Team Leaders	school wide	Waakly maatings	Class visits/PLC Notes	administration

Reading Budget:

Friday as based Duscus (c) (Mate	min I (n)		
Evidence-based Program(s)/Mate Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Common Core District workshops	Substitutes	Inservice	\$600.00
			Subtotal: \$600.00
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 Reading Goa

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)).

Stude	nts speak in English and	understand spoken Englis	sh at grade level in	a manner similar to nor	-ELL students.		
	1. Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking. 90% of students will be proficient in listening and speaking in 2013.						
2012	Current Percent of Stu	udents Proficient in liste	ening/speaking:				
85%	(13/15)						
	Pro	blem-Solving Process t	o Increase Stude	nt Achievement			
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
	Our students speak	solicit community	Administrators	Acquisition of English	CELLA		

1	foreign languages for which we have no interpreters	volunteers to assist in the classrooms		Language					
Stud	ents read in English at gr	ade level text in a manne	r similar to non-El	L students.					
2. St	udents scoring proficie	ent in reading.							
CELI	_A Goal #2:		60% of studer	its will be proficient in rea	ading in 2013				
201:	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in reading:								
85% (13/15)OF STUDENTS WERE PROFICIENT IN LISTENING AND SPEAKING									
	Pro	blem-Solving Process t	to Increase Stude	ent Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool				
1	Our students speak foreign languages for which we have no interpreters	solicit community volunteers to assist in the classrooms	Administrators	Acquisition of English Language	CELLA				

Stude	Students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students.								
	3. Students scoring proficient in writing. CELLA Goal #3:			In 2013 46% of students 6/13 will score proficiently in writing					
2012	2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in writing:								
In 20	In 2012 41% of students were proficient in writing Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement								
	Prol	blem-Solving Process t	to Increase Stude	ent Achievement					
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool				
1	Our students speak foreign languages for which we have no interpreters	solicit community volunteers to assist in the classrooms	Administrators	increased ability to read English	CELLA				

CELLA Budget:

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Developm	nent		
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

Mathematics Goal #2a:

* 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 By June of 2013, 35% (108) of third, fourth and fifth grade mathematics. students will demonstrate proficiency (Level 3) in math as documented by the FCAT and as defined by the Florida Mathematics Goal #1a: School Grading System. 2012 Current Level of Performance: 2013 Expected Level of Performance: 28% (87 students) 35% (108 students) Problem-Solving Process to Increase Student Achievement Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier **Evaluation Tool** Strategy Responsible for Effectiveness of Monitoring Strategy Teachers will attend PLCs School PLC agendas PLC notes and Role out/training of Common Core State and/or training on Administrators Administrative Marzano Tool Common Core Standards Standards Observation tools documenting use of strategies designed to teach CCSS 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 Person or Process Used to Position Determine Anticipated Barrier Strategy Responsible **Evaluation Tool** Effectiveness of for Strategy Monitoring 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 By June of 2012, 55% (211) of fourth and fifth grade Level 4 in mathematics. students will demonstrate above proficiency (Level 4 and 5)

in math as documented by the FCAT and as defined by the

Florida School Grading System.

2012	2 Current Level of Perf	ormance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:					
52%	110			55% 116					
		Problem-Solving Pro	ocess to	Increase Stu	den	t Achievement			
	Anticipated Barrie	r Strategy		Person or Position Responsible f Monitoring		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy		Evaluation Tool	
1	Role out/training of Common Core State Standards	Teachers will atter and/or training on Common Core Star	А	school dministrators		PLC agendas Administrative Observation tools documenting use of strategies designed t teach CCSS	:0	PLC notes and Marzano Tool	
of im 2b. f Stuc	d on the analysis of stude of the followed of	ving group: ssment:		erence to "Guid	ding	Questions", identify a	and d	define areas in nee	
	nematics Goal #2b:			2012 5.00	-4	I Level of Performan			
Anti	icipated Barrier St	Problem-Solving Problem-Solving Problem-Solving Problems	Per Pos Res for	rson or Sition E Sponsible	Proc Dete	cess Used to	Eval	uation Tool	
				a Submitted					
of im 3a. F	d on the analysis of stude oprovement for the follow FCAT 2.0: Percentage of s in mathematics.	ving group:		On the 2013	B FC	Questions", identify a AT, 82% 173/211 of to Mathematics as docu	:he s	tudents will make	
Math	nematics Goal #3a:					by the Florida School			
2012	2 Current Level of Perf	ormance:		2013 Exped	cted	Level of Performan	ice:		
160	(208)			173 (211)					
		Problem-Solving Pro	ocess to	Increase Stu	den	t Achievement			
	Anticipated Barrie	r Strategy		Person or Position Responsible f Monitoring		Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy		Evaluation Tool	
	Role out/training of	Teachers will atter	nd PLCs S	School		PLC agendas		PLC notes and	

1	Common Core State Standards		and/or training on Common Core Standard		dministrators		Administrative Observation tools documenting use of strategies designed to teach CCSS	0	Marzano Tool
	d on the analysis of stoprovement for the follo		t achievement data, and	d refe	erence to "Gu	uiding	g Questions", identify a	ınd c	define areas in nee
3b. F	lorida Alternate Assentage of students mematics.	essn	nent:						
Math	ematics Goal #3b:								
2012	Current Level of Per	rforn	nance:		2013 Exp	ecte	d Level of Performan	ce:	
		Pr	oblem-Solving Proces	ss to	Increase St	uder	nt Achievement		
Antio	cipated Barrier S	Strat	egy	Pos Res for	son or ition ponsible	Det Effe	cess Used to ermine ectiveness of ategy	Eval	uation Tool
			No	Data	a Submitted				
of imp 4. FC maki	provement for the follo	owing of stu	udents in Lowest 25%		On the 20°25% will demon	13 Masstrated by	ath FCAT, 74% 156/21 e learning gains in Mat the FCAT and as defir	1 of	the the lowest atics as
2012	Current Level of Per	rforn	nance:		2013 Expected Level of Performance:				
69%	144/208				74% 156				
		Pr	oblem-Solving Proces	s to	Increase St	uder	nt Achievement		
	Anticipated Barri	er	Strategy		Person o Position Responsible Monitorin	for	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy		Evaluation Too
1	Role out/training of Common Core State Standards		Teachers will attend Pl and/or training on Common Core Standard	А			PLC agendas Administrative Observation tools documenting use of strategies designed to teach CCSS		PLC notes and Marzano Tool
Basec	d on Ambitious but Act	nieva	ble Annual Measurable	Obje	ctives (AMOs), AN	IO-2, Reading and Matl	h Pe	rformance Target
Meası	mbitious but Achievab urable Objectives (AMo Il will reduce their ach	Os).	nual 92 % o	f st	ool Mathemat udents will math,		oal # proficient accordi	ng t	to state

5A :

			1							
Baseline data 2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-201	4	2014-201	5	2015-2016	5	2016-2	2017
	80% of studer	nt 88% of student	89% of stude	ent	90% of stud	dent 9	91% of stude	ent		
		udent achieveme	ent data, and re	eference t	o "Guidinç	g Questions	s", identify	and de	efine areas	in nee
Hispanic, As	ian, Americar progress in r	y ethnicity (Wh n Indian) not m nathematics.		state Black	assessme	will increa ent White: 8	se to the fo	llowin	g accordin	g to the
2012 Curren	t Level of Per	formance:		2013	Expected	d Level of	Performar	nce:		
White: 78.% A Black: Hispanic: 75%				Black	::87 45/20 : nic:88 13/					
		Problem-Sol	ving Process	to Increa	se Studer	nt Achieve	ement			
Anti	cipated Barri	er Sti	rategy	Pos Respor	son or lition sible for toring	De Effec	ess Used to etermine etiveness o etrategy		Evaluatio	on Tool
of Com Standa Hispani	c: Role	and/or train Common C	ore Standards vill attend PLCs	Administi	rators		ative on tools ting use of s designed	I	PLC notes Marzano T	
	ning of Comm tate Standar		ning on ore Standards	School Administr	rators		ative on tools ting use of s designed	ı	PLC notes Marzano T	
Daniel an Hai		and a suck as a last as a succession			- 1100 dallar	0	-11 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1 - 1		- F!	
of improveme	nt for the follo	udent achieveme wing subgroup:		eference t	o "Guiding	g Question:	s", identify	and de	efine areas	in nee
_		rners (ELL) no nathematics.	t making							
Mathematics	s Goal #5C:									
2012 Curren	t Level of Per	formance:		2013	Expected	d Level of	Performar	nce:		
		Problem-Sol	ving Process	to Increa	se Studer	nt Achieve	ement			
Anticipated	Barrier S	itrategy	Po Ro fc	erson or osition esponsib or lonitoring	Det Effe	cess Used ermine ectiveness ategy		Evalu	ation Toc	ol
			No Da	ata Submi	ted					_

	on the analysis of stud provement for the follow	dent achievement data, and ving subgroup:	refere	ence to "Guidi	ng Questions", identify	and o	define areas in nee
satis	tudents with Disabilit factory progress in m ematics Goal #5D:	ies (SWD) not making athematics.		By June 2012 proficient in r	73% of Students With mathematics.	Disab	oilities will be
2012	Current Level of Perfe	ormance:		2013 Expect	ed Level of Performa	nce:	
58				73			
		Problem-Solving Process	toIr	ncrease Stud	lent Achievement		
	Anticipated Barrie	r Strategy	Re	Person or Position esponsible fo Monitoring	Process Used t Determine or Effectiveness o Strategy		Evaluation Too
1	A barrier for students achieving proficiency is mathematics is the proper utilization of differentiated instructions.	proficiency and will monitor their progress	Cla	ssroom teache	ers Evaluation results the reflect an increase of maintenance in stude mathematics proficies.	or Ient	Teacher and district made formative assessments evaluated monthl
2	Role out/training of Common Core State Standards	Teachers will attend PLC and/or training on Common Core Standards	Adr	nool ministrators	PLC agendas Administrative Observation tools documenting use of strategies designed teach CCSS		PLC notes and Marzano Tool
	d on the analysis of stud provement for the follow	dent achievement data, and ving subgroup:	refere	ence to "Guidi	ng Questions", identify	and o	define areas in nee
	conomically Disadvan factory progress in m	ntaged students not makin athematics.	g				
Math	ematics Goal #5E:						
2012	Current Level of Perfe	ormance:		2013 Expect	ed Level of Performan	nce:	
		Problem-Solving Process	toli	ncrease Stud	lent Achievement		
Antio	cipated Barrier St	rategy F	or	ion De onsible Ef	rocess Used to etermine ffectiveness of trategy	Eval	uation Tool
		No [Data S	Submitted			

End of Elementary School Mathematics Goa

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

PD Content /Topic and/or PLC Focus	Grade	and/or DI C	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	K-5	Team Leaders	PLC	weekly meetings	class visits/PLC Notes	administration

Mathematics Budget:

Evidence-based Program(s)/	'Material(s)		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Development			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Common Core Trainings	substitutes	inservice	\$600.00
			Subtotal: \$600.00
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 Mathematics Goals

Elementary and Middle School Science Goals

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

1	Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and reference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas in need of improvement for the following group:					
1a. FCAT2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 in science. Science Goal #1a:			will demonstra documented b	By June of 2012,74% (82)of the fifth grade students will demonstrate proficiency (level 3) in science as documented by the FCAT and as defined by the Florida School Grading System.		
2012	Current Level of Perf	ormance:	2013 Expecte	2013 Expected Level of Performance:		
69 (7	7 students)		74 (82 studen	74 (82 students)		
	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	
	Role out/training of Common Core State	Teachers will attend PLCs and/or training on	School Administrators	PLC agendas Administrative	PLC notes and Marzano Tool	

teach CCSS	1	Standards	Common Core Standards	Observation tools documenting use of strategies designed to teach CCSS
------------	---	-----------	--------------------------	--

3	of student achievement day vement for the following g		reference	to "Guiding Questions	s", identify and define	
1b. Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6 in science. Science Goal #1b:						
2012 Current Level of	f Performance:		2013 Exp	pected Level of Perfo	rmance:	
	Problem-Solving Proce	ess to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	t	
Anticipated Barrier	on or tion oonsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool			
	No Data Submitted					

	d on the analysis of stud in need of improvemen			Guiding Questions", ider	ntify and define	
Norme vernient zever i in sereniee.			will demonstra	By June of 2012 32% (40) of the fifth grade students will demonstrate above proficiency as documented by the FCAT and as defined by the Florida Grading System		
2012	2 Current Level of Perfo	ormance:	2013 Expecte	ed Level of Performan	ce:	
29 32						
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	A barrier for students achieving proficiency in science is that teachers need common planning time to conduct Professional Learning Communities	set on the schools	School Administration	Administrative classroom walkthroughs should indicate a harmony of reading instruction strategies throughout the grade level.	Team Meeting Notes Walkthrough tool	
2	math is the proper	Selected teachers in grade K-5 and ESE will attend the summer workshop on science	School Administration	Administrative classroom walkthroughs should indicate a harmony of	Walkthrough tool	

Hew science se		instructional materials	· .		strategies throug the grade level.		
		dent achievement data t for the following grou		reference	to "Guiding Questions	", ident	ify and define
2b. Florida Alterna Students scoring a in science. Science Goal #2b:		ssment: ve Achievement Leve	el 7				
2012 Current Level of Performance:				2013 Exp	pected Level of Perfo	rmance	e:
	Prob	lem-Solving Process	to I	ncrease S	Student Achievement		
Anticipated Barrier	Stra	tegy	Posit Resp for	on or tion oonsible toring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evalu	uation Tool
		No [Data :	Submitted			

reading instruction

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.

instructional materials.

new science series

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
differentiated instruction	K-5	Team Leader	PLCS	bimonthly	class visits	administration

Science Budget:

Evidence-based Prograi	m(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 Developme	ent		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00

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

End of Science Goals

Writing Goals

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

	d on the analysis of stude ed of improvement for the		nd reference to "Gu	uiding Questions", identify	y and define areas	
1a. FCAT 2.0: Students scoring at Achievement Level3.0 and higher in writing.Writing Goal #1a:			will demonstra	By June of 2013, 43% (43) of the fourth grade students will demonstrate level 4 in writing as documented by the FCAT and as defined by the Florida School Grading System.		
2012	Current Level of Perfo	rmance:	2013 Expecte	ed Level of Performance	: :	
40 (4	0/100)of students will ac	chieve a level 4 on the FO	CAT 43% (43/100) FCAT	43% (43/100)of students will achieve a level 4 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	A barrier for students achieving proficiency in writing is the lack of implementation of differentiated instruction with fidelity.	Teachers will identify students achieving proficiency and will monitor their progress monthly utilizing district and classroom assessments.	Classroom teachers	Evaluation of student writing samples.	Classroom Walkthroughs	
2	A barrier for students achieving proficiency in writing is the varying learning styles of students within each class setting.	Teachers will create and implement reading lessons addressing a variety of students learning styles.	Classroom teachers	Administrative classroom walkthroughs should reveal evidence of utilization of varied instructional styles designed to meet the needs of differing student learning styles.	Walkthrough tool	

Based on the analysis of student achievement data, and r in need of improvement for the following group:	eference to "Guiding Questions", identify and define areas
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 I	ncrease Student Achievement

Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Position Responsible	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
Differentiating Instruction	K-5	Team Leader	School wide	Early Release	observations/lesson plans	Administration

Writing Budget:

Evidence-based Progran	n(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 Developme	nt		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Writing Goals

Attendance Goal(s)

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

1. Attendance

The number of students with excessive tardies will

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

Atter	ndance Goal #1:			decrease by 3% (36).			
2012	2 Current Attendance R	ate:		2013 Expected Attendance Rate:			
95.8	95.8				97		
2012 Current Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)				2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Absences (10 or more)			
5% 36				3% 18			
	2 Current Number of Stries (10 or more)	udents with Excessive		2013 Expected Number of Students with Excessive Tardies (10 or more)			
8% 4	0			5% 36			
	Pro	blem-Solving Process t	to I	ncrease Stude	ent Achievement		
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Re	Person or Position esponsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool	
1	Parents are not aware of the importance of dropping their children off at school on time	Teachers will make personal contact with parents of students who have excessive tardies and reward students in order to motivate them to get to school on time.	Теа	am leader	Pull attendance/tardies	Attendance record/tardy record	

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:

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

Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Developme	ent		
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)).

3 / 1 1 3 1	,	,		() ()	
Based on the analysis of improvement:	f suspension data, and refer	ence	to "Guiding	Questions", identify a	nd define areas in need
1. Suspension					
Suspension Goal #1:	Suspension Goal #1:				
2012 Total Number of In-School Suspensions			2013 Expected Number of In-School Suspensions		
2012 Total Number of	Students Suspended In-Se	chool	2013 Exp School	ected Number of Stu	idents Suspended In-
2012 Number of Out-c	of-School Suspensions		2013 Expected Number of Out-of-School Suspensions		
2012 Total Number of School	Students Suspended Out-	of-	2013 Expected Number of Students Suspended Out- of-School		
	Problem-Solving Proces	s to I	ncrease S	tudent Achievement	
Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Posit Resp for	on or tion ponsible Itoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool
	No		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							

Suspension Budget:

Evidence-based Progra	am(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 Developm	nent		
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
		-	Subtotal: \$0.00
Other			
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
			Subtotal: \$0.00
			Grand Total: \$0.00

End of Suspension Goal(s)

Parent Involvement Goal(s)

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

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

1. Parent Involvement

Parent Involvement Goal #1:

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

By June 2013 89% of parents will participate in school activities

2012	Current Level of Parer	nt Involvement:	2013 Expecte	2013 Expected Level of Parent I nvolvement:			
84%	of parents participate in	school activities.	89% of parents	89% of parents will participate in school activities.			
	Prol	olem-Solving Process t	o Increase Stude	nt Achievement			
	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person or Position Responsible for Monitoring	Process Used to Determine Effectiveness of Strategy	Evaluation Tool		
1	Effective communication could be a barrier to parent involvement	Classroom teachers speak to and send out flyers about family events in addition to phone blasts and use of marquee	Team Leaders and Administration	Sign in 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	
No Data Submitted							

Parent Involvement Budget:

Evidence-based Progr			Available
Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	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 Developn	nent		
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

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 o	f school data, identify a	nd define areas in ne	eed of improvement:		
1. STEM					
STEM Goal #1:					
	Problem-Solving Pr	ocess to Increase S	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:

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

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 Prog	gram(s)/Material(s)			
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Technology				
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
No Data	No Data	No Data	No Data	\$0.00
				Subtotal: \$0.00
Professional Develop	ment			
Goal	Strategy	Description of Resources	Funding Source	Available Amount
Reading	Common Core District workshops	Substitutes	Inservice	\$600.00
Mathematics	Common Core Trainings	substitutes	inservice	\$600.00
				Subtotal: \$1,200.00
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: \$1,200.00

Differentiated Accountability

School-level Differentiated Accountability Compliance

jn Priority jn Focus jn Prevent jn NA

Are you a reward school: jn Yes jn 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
V	workshops, books and materials	\$3,000.00

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

Meet monthly and review student achievement data in all content areas, present Common Core, and review attendance and parent



involvement goals.

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 Distric RIVERGLADES ELEMEN 2010-2011	I VERGLADES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL 010-2011								
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned				
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	95%	98%	90%	84%	367	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	68%	83%			151	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?	67% (YES)	86% (YES)			153	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					671				
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested			
School Grade*					А	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested			

Broward School Distric RIVERGLADES ELEMEN 2009-2010		DOL				
	Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Grade Points Earned	
% Meeting High Standards (FCAT Level 3 and Above)	93%	95%	96%	76%	360	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	78%	74%			152	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?	72% (YES)	76% (YES)			148	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					660	
Percent Tested = 100%						Percent of eligible students tested
School Grade*					А	Grade based on total points, adequate progress, and % of students tested